

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 9442. A bill to amend Public Law 92-181 (85 Stat. 383) relating to credit eligibility for public utility cooperatives serving producers of food, fiber, and other agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 9443. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for more effective motor vehicle emission controls at high altitudes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 9444. A bill to establish additional land use criteria for comprehensive planning, revision of zoning regulations, improved economic opportunity, and an increased tax base in the redevelopment of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 9445. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by repealing chapter 102 (the antiriot provision) thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS (by request):

H.R. 9446. A bill to authorize the government of the District of Columbia to control the manufacture, sale, and storage of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 9447. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 to provide for a sharing of the financial obligations of such stadium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ERLÉNBERG (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. THONE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HANRAHAN, and Mr. McCLOSKEY):

H.R. 9448. A bill to amend the Freedom of Information Act to require that all information be made available to Congress except where executive privilege is invoked; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FULTON (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. ABDNOR, and Mr. TOWELL of Nevada):

H.R. 9449. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical, hospital, and dental care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part

for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GINN:

H.R. 9450. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer the NS Savannah to the city of Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 9451. A bill to name the Federal office building, South, in New Orleans, La., as the "F. Edward Hébert Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 9452. A bill to postpone the effectiveness of the new regulations proposed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the administration of the public assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9453. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 9454. A bill to provide for the awarding of a medal of honor for policemen and a medal of honor for firemen; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9455. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. BRADEN, Mr. PEYSER, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. LEHMAN):

H.R. 9456. A bill to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for 3 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. FORTSYTHE):

H.R. 9457. A bill to transfer St. Elizabeths Hospital to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 9458. A bill to strengthen and improve the protections and interests of participants and beneficiaries of employee pension and welfare benefit plans including emergency pension protection; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York (for himself, Mr. BAPALIS, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, and Mr. POWELL of Ohio):

H.R. 9459. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to carry out any research activity on a live human fetus or to intentionally take any action to kill or hasten the death of a live human fetus in any federally supported facility or activity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 9460. A bill providing for the distribution of seeds and plants for home gardens; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 676. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the third week beginning on a Sunday in November of each year as "National Traffic Safety Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 677. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim September 28 of each year as "Teacher's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 678. Joint resolution, a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. Con. Res. 271. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the missing-in-action in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 272. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries omit recommendations for pay increases for Members of Congress in its report to the President on the results of its 1973 salary studies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McKINNEY:

H. Res. 500. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any individual who serves as the Director of the Energy Policy Office should be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 9461. A bill for the relief of Thomas E. Nicholson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 9462. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles Bernstein, of Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RAIN OF PLENTY IN FARM BELT

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, last night's Washington Star-News contained an editorial by Charles Bartlett, entitled "Rain of Plenty in Farm Belt." He centers his comments from Moline, Ill., which I am proud to represent. Bartlett's reflections upon this year's farm crop are indeed interesting and refreshing. Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the review of my colleagues:

CXIX—1590—Part 20

RAIN OF PLENTY IN FARM BELT

(By Charles Bartlett)

MOLINE, ILL.—These are days which make it refreshing to escape the morass of mistrust that is Washington for the rolling plains which laugh with a harvest when they are tickled with a plow.

The corn is green and growing, so barring an early freeze, the prospects are bright for a record harvest which will ease the tight supply of food, exert downward pressure on grocery prices, contribute significantly to the balance of trade and leave the farmers richer than ever.

It is a blessing normally taken too much for granted. The citizen who laments the rising grocery costs at home would be cheered by the experience of shopping abroad to learn how much foreigners pay for a commensu-

rate diet. Flying over the barren reaches, the large areas of the world where farming is confined to the narrow valleys of rivers, he would contemplate more thankfully this country's liberal endowment of arable land.

Some talk of Australia and the Argentine as potential competitors in the world food market, and yet these two nations together have less than one-quarter of the United States share of cultivable land. The area around Paris is Europe's only approximation of the Great Plains. The American emergence as the most efficient producer of food and feed grains is not yet open to challenge.

So the rising demand for proteins means swelling profits for American farmers, whose gross income will probably rise some 25 percent between 1971 and 1973. Their land is rising in value at about 10 percent a year. But farmers always frown in the sunshine,

and the visitor finds them complaining now, uncertain about the economy and unhappy about inflation.

But they have been luckier lately than they will admit. Last winter they were warned that a gasoline shortage would likely hobble their machines. That never materialized. Their spring planting was threatened by unusual rains, but the skies cleared long enough in mid-May to allow them to plant 40 million acres of corn in a dramatic race against the weather.

The corn blight of 1971 raised some dark fears of a shrinking cornucopia. It developed that the hybrids then in use were vulnerable, under prevailing weather conditions, to the growth of a crippling spore. However, the advanced state of corn belt technology made available a new variety of seed for the next planting season and it yielded the largest crop in history. It is almost 40 years since they have had anything approaching a crop failure.

Now the fields are planted fence to fence and the concern is that improved weather in Russia and Asia will mean a world glut of wheat, perhaps in 1974. The farm belt is well aware of its potential to produce excess supplies that will mean low prices and low income for the farmer.

Another concern is with the President's order restricting the export of scarce commodities. American farmers like the fact that they produce 80 percent of the world's supply of soybeans and they are not anxious to inspire new producers abroad. They cannot yet discern whether the President's order on export controls is mere political rhetoric, designed to keep the public patient until new crops come in, or a serious shift of policy. The latter, they believe, would be a mistake.

The farm belt has no choice. It is going to have to swallow its philosophy of scarcity and go all out to meet the world's expanding need for food. So long as Congress provides a price floor, there is no good reason to avoid the challenge.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, since 1959, under the administration of the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the third week of July has been designated as Captive Nations Week pursuant to Public Law 86-90. During this time, American citizens observe the sobering realities faced by the people in the nations of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, North Caucasia, Ukraine, Far Eastern Republic, Turkestan, Mongolian People's Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Poland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia.

The Congress must bring to the public's attention the continued violations upon human rights and freedoms by the Communist regimes in these regions.

Consistently these people have spoken out against the violations of their human rights. Workers revolted in Pilsen and East Berlin in 1953. In Poland and Hungary there were widespread uprisings in 1956. Polish students in 1968 revolted against the Communist regime. In the same year, the Czechoslovakian fight for freedom under the leadership of Alexander Dubcek was suppressed by an armed invasion of the Soviet army and

its Warsaw Pact satellites. In 1970 there were widespread revolts in the port cities along the Baltic in Poland. In 1972, there were widespread demonstrations in Lithuanian cities. It is the duty of all Americans who believe in American freedoms and the right of self-determination, to stand up for these freedoms around the world.

Living in America, we can easily forget and take for granted the freedoms and liberties that have become a way of life. People of the Eastern and Central European nations cry for these same freedoms. Yet they are deprived of fundamental principles of human dignity by Communist regimes.

During this week, the 15th annual observance of Captive Nations Week, we see the United States improving relations with the Soviet Union, which is to a great extent the result of recent summit talks between President Nixon and Secretary Brezhnev. Although we are grateful for these improved relations, Americans must also look upon the true horrors of the denied people of the captive nations.

Although the official observance of Captive Nations Week lasts for only 1 week, let us remember that the rights and freedoms granted to all Americans insuring our human dignity are being denied to the people of the submerged nations of Eastern and Central Europe.

THE 48TH ANNUAL NATIONAL BAR ASSOCIATION CONVENTION

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the National Bar Association has been working on ways to insure equal representation of minorities in the American judicial system; the acceptance of minorities into the Nation's law schools and increasing the number of minority students that pass the State bar examinations. Also, the NBA has been working on proposals to expand and strengthen legal aid services available to lower income groups.

The 48th Annual National Bar Association Convention will be held July 30 through August 4, 1973, San Francisco, Calif., at the Hyatt Regency Hotel.

The history follows:

NBA OBJECTIVE AND HISTORY

The National Bar Association was organized August 1, 1925 in Des Moines, Iowa for the purpose of advancing the science of jurisprudence, improving the administration of justice, serving the independence of the judiciary, working for a more equitable representation of all racial groups in the judiciary of our cities, states and nation, promoting legislation that will improve the economic condition of all the citizens of the United States, aiding all citizens regardless of race or creed in their efforts to secure a free and untrammelled use of the franchise guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, promoting social intercourse among the members of the American Bar, upholding the honor of the legal profession, protecting the civil and political rights of the citizens and residents of the several states of the United States and working for the integration of the American bar.

The germ of the idea originated with George H. Woodson, a native of Virginia and a practicing attorney of Des Moines, Iowa, joined by C. Francis Stratford and Judge Wendell E. Green of Chicago, on August 1, 1925 in the Polk County Courthouse.

OFFICERS

President—O. T. Wells.
1st Vice President and President Elect—Archie Weston.
2nd Vice President—Charles P. Howard.
3rd Vice President—W. George Allen.
4th Vice President—Carl J. Character.
Secretary—Allie Latimer Weeken.
Assistant Secretary—Wilhelmina Rolark.
Membership Secretary—Elmer C. Jackson.
Treasurer—C. C. Spaulding.

BUDGET REFORM: ENCOURAGING PROSPECTS

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing H.R. 8762, my budget reform proposal, and I am delighted to announce that it has now been sponsored by 20 Members of Congress.

Today is an especially significant day since it marks the beginning of hearings by the Rules Committee on budget reform legislation. The Rules Committee has taken a major step toward enabling the Congress to meet the most serious challenge confronting it.

My budget reform legislation differs from that of the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control chiefly in three areas: the composition of the new Committee on the Budget; the time made available to the House to consider the budget resolution prepared by that committee; and the duties of the joint legislative budget staff and its availability to all the Members of Congress. The goal of my legislation is to make the vitally necessary reform in our budgetary process both workable and responsive to all the Members of this House.

I am, therefore, especially pleased by the testimony presented this morning to the Rules Committee by the distinguished cochairmen of the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control, Congressmen ULLMAN and WHITTEN both indicated that a workable procedure responsive to the will of the House is their goal as well, and suggested changes in the Joint Study Committee's proposal to accomplish it. Their flexibility, notably in the very areas of budget committee composition, time for consideration, and the duties and accessibility of the staff, is extremely heartening and encourages the prospect that viable budgetary process reform will become a reality in this Congress.

The following Members are now cosponsors of my budget reform proposal: Mr. BURGNER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MANN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. WARE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WOPAT.

LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON REPORT ENTITLED "WIRETAPPING"

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include my Washington Report entitled, "Wiretapping," in the RECORD.

The report follows:

WIRETAPPING

(By Congressman LEE HAMILTON)

In February of this year, King Hussein of Jordan accepted an invitation from me to meet privately with members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the King came to the Committee hearing room for a candid, give-and-take session with us on the sensitive Arab-Israeli dispute. A few hours after he left the room, to my very great embarrassment, a highly sophisticated bugging device was found in the Committee room. The device was taped underneath the conference table and it enabled someone to hear every word spoken at the meeting. The FBI has the incident under investigation, and our Committee rooms are now debugged prior to every meeting with a foreign dignitary.

That was my first direct experience with electronic surveillance. But, apparently, similar experiences are commonplace in this day of sophisticated monitoring devices.

Wiretapping has come a long way from the "dirty business" condemned by Justice Holmes and Brandeis. It has been aided by new technology, approved by the Congress in certain circumstances and by federal judges in others, and it has gained a new respectability. Requests to install wiretaps and bugs are on the rise with private detectives, especially for divorce and business cases, and one survey shows that one-fourth of the politicians and judges in Washington thought they had been bugged or tapped.

The 1968 Omnibus Crime Control Act requires federal and state governments to apply to courts for eavesdropping warrants, except in national security cases. The figures show a clear upward trend:

1969—304 applications, 2 denials.
1970—597 applications, no denials.
1971—816 applications, no denials.
1972—860 applications, 4 denials.

The full extent of electronic surveillance is not known, of course, because eavesdropping in national security cases is not reported and much of it is done secretly.

In 1972, federal and state governments spent \$4.3 million to overhear 4,100 Americans engaged in 480,000 conversations. In return, the government achieved 2,861 arrests and 402 convictions.

All of this surveillance has produced a growing uneasiness, fed recently by the sensational disclosures of Watergate and the Daniel Ellsberg trial. Serious questions are raised about the clash of two legitimate interests—the right to individual privacy and the national security. Are we more or less secure with widespread wiretapping? What kind of controls can be placed on wiretapping? Under what circumstances is wiretapping desirable? The most perplexing question for Americans is whether the Constitution can guarantee both the security of the state and the liberty of the individual.

The U.S. has not really developed a national policy toward wiretapping and the value to be placed on privacy. Most Americans would approve wiretaps in cases involving the national security, but this very valid national concern is vague and difficult to define. Without much question, wiretapping represents a serious assault upon freedom and privacy. Justice Brandeis, in a famous 1928 dissent, insisted that the makers

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

25211

of the Constitution conferred upon us "the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men."

Since wiretaps obviously pose threats to our liberties, their use must be carefully safeguarded. Safeguards against overuse are provided in the present law in the form of actual and punitive damages and reimbursement of legal expenses, which can hurt a wiretapper's pocketbook if he is found guilty. But vigorous Congressional oversight and effective judicial controls are also important and necessary safeguards to assure against misuse of the power to wiretap.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Retirement and Employee Benefits, I have a great and continuing concern over the benefits available to Federal employees in their health insurance program.

One issue which has been brought to my attention regards the question of whether duly licensed and/or certified psychologists and optometrists should necessarily be required to perform under the direction or supervision of physicians.

This bill would provide that any participant in the Federal employee program would have direct access to such psychologist and optometrist without prior referral.

Hearings will be held by the subcommittee before we reach a final conclusion on this very important policy matter.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9440

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8902 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

(J) "If the contract benefits include a service or services which may be provided by a psychologist or optometrist licensed and/or certified as such under applicable State or Federal statutes, then the Federal employee beneficiary, annuitant, or family member covered by such contract shall be free to select such psychologist or optometrist of his or her choice, shall have direct access to the same, without supervision or referral by another health practitioner; and shall be entitled under such contract to have benefits paid to him or on his behalf for such service or services."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective with respect to any contract entered into or renewed on or after the date of enactment of the Act.

EQUAL RIGHTS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, although there has been progress toward the goal of equal rights and responsi-

bilities for men and women in recent years, sex discrimination continues to permeate our social, cultural, and economic life.

At the present time there is no constitutional amendment which protects an individual from sex discriminatory practices. The legal status of women has changed very little since the adoption of the 19th amendment in 1920. Some laws which were originally designed to "protect" women have ironically limited their opportunities and equality in the fields of employment, education, credit, insurance, housing, to name just a few.

However, the legal system is not the only force which discriminates against women and impedes their advancement in our society. The concept of sex roles has added to the problem women face in obtaining a major voice in the economic and political decisions which affect their lives. These roles have impaired equal opportunities and self-development of all individuals.

Recent studies have shown that competition, competency, independence, intellectual achievement, and leadership reflect positively on the concept of masculinity but are inconsistent and contradictory to society's concept of femininity.

I would like to include in the RECORD an article entitled, "Why Women Take—and Keep—Low Paying Jobs," by Mary Rowe, published in *Business and Society Review*, spring of 1973. The article addresses itself to the discriminatory images of men and women. Because of space limitations in the RECORD, I have deleted some portions at the beginning of the article dealing with legal and structural barriers to equality.

Oftentimes we are unaware of certain ways of thinking so ingrained in our culture that they precipitate certain behavior patterns. To me this article is valuable because it crystallizes some of these thought and behavior patterns. None of us can change until we recognize the need for change and how to accomplish it.

I do not believe that all the answers to equality of opportunity lie in this article, but I think its points are telling and I recommend it to my colleagues. The article follows:

WHY WOMEN TAKE AND KEEP LOW PAYING JOBS

THE IMAGE OF WOMEN

Legal and structural equality for women will help enormously to provide for equal employment opportunity, but there are many more subtle issues involved in our discriminatory images of men and women. Much imaginative research has been conducted on this topic in recent years. Several studies of children's books and TV demonstrate the inferior lot of girls and women ("role models") in the media. The *Oxford English Dictionary's* illustrations of words pertaining to "women," "mothers," and "women's work" have been found to be full of irrelevant derogatory images, e.g., under work (women's): "[her work was to] reform an extravagant husband."

Many a parent has come to realize how very differently he or she treats boys and girls and to muse on the effects this will have on their children's later jobs. And many psychologists are beginning to be seriously concerned about the generic use of "man" to mean "human."

Of all studies in this area, possibly the most illuminating are those which show

how profoundly we equate "adult" qualities with those of adult males. Research on our images of "adults," of "men," and of "women," consistently show that we see adults as independent, creative, aggressive, outgoing, dominant, assertive, self-controlled innovative. Men are seen the same way. Women, however, are conventionally pictured as dependent, adaptive, submissive, quiet, passive, patient, emotional. It is very hard for a woman in our society to be simultaneously "adult" (creative and independent in paid employment outside the home) and "feminine" (patient and dependent in unpaid employment in the home). There are several studies which show it can be done—but it isn't easy. And the conflict set up in women as a result of mutually exclusive goals (adulthood vs. conventional femininity) often results in a deeply debilitating self-hatred, and/or fear of success, as Dr. Matina Horner has so lucidly described.

In the wide area of cultural discrimination against women, I would like to discuss in more detail several reasons why women find it difficult to "compete" for good jobs in the world of paid employment, and in predominantly male, hierarchical, pyramidal work organizations where only a few can reach the top.

Our society has difficulty determining what women are worth, or even seeing traditional women's work as "work." Most of the economy is relatively "free" (resources move quite readily, with few exceptions) and most of the economy is monetized (products and services are ordinarily exchanged for money, not for each other). In a relatively free, monetized economy, a good or service is said to be worth its "opportunity cost" (the price or wage it would bring in its next-best use). Thus, a man earning about \$25,000 a year and fringe benefits and prestige at ITT would probably earn about the same salary and benefits from ITT's nearest competitor; otherwise, over time he would be sacked or would move. Because we rationally evaluate movable, monetized resources roughly at opportunity cost, there is a strong psychological tendency to also evaluate homemakers' services at their apparent opportunity cost—zero. The fact that the market for mothers and housewives is not really "free" (it's relatively difficult to exchange one set of services for another) and that the market is relatively nonmonetized (most housework and child care are not directly reimbursed by wages) gets lost in our thinking.

Women are even more likely to make this error than are men. Quite aside from our mythology that a good mother is "priceless," most men, if pressed, understand their wives' homemaking services to be "worth" thousands of dollars on the open market. For instance, at first glance, most men are likely to be astonished that good day care costs at least \$2,000 per child per year; but, on reflection, they will understand that good quality, monetized child care is worth a good deal. Many women, however, have difficulty seeing themselves as bona fide working adults worthy of serious salaries. This point of view is formally reflected in our national accounts. The Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Department of Commerce do not count homemaking as contributing to GNP, nor as "work." Women refer to themselves as "not working" when engaged in homemaking—"I stopped work when our second child was on the way." (A woman is probably slightly more likely to think of herself as "working" when in volunteer community activities which receive public recognition.)

The fact that the work of many women is not directly paid or evaluated causes many women to think of themselves as having an opportunity cost of zero, as well as depriving them of the experience of being evaluated at a higher rate. This mind-set sometimes also persists even after a woman has entered the paid labor force, and it results in a lack of ambition and initiative on her part. The

lack of recognition of the value of conventional women's work also fosters illegal exploitation in paid employment in situations where women are paid lower wages for equal work. Some men believe it is "all right" to discriminate in paid employment—"After all, women are never paid very much, are they?"—and women lack the self-confidence to protest.

Men and women are taught with great care not to compete with each other as adults. There are several hypotheses as to why this might be so. I suggest that boys are carefully taught not to "fight girls" in part because aggression, competition, and sexual drives are very closely linked. Allowing public, competitive, aggressive behavior between adult men and women is very scary in a world where men and women are not supposed to be overtly attracted to each other. This is one reason why adult men so readily react flirtatiously or seductively when dealing with women in situations which may be seen as competitive. (This reaction is very likely to affront or insult an insecure woman and usually ends the competition of very insecure women.) Also, our conventional sexual mores (men aggressive, women passive) make analogous situations like business competition very uncomfortable when women step into the conventional male role. The woman is inevitably assumed to be mimicking "male" sexual behavior and will often arouse very primitive feelings that "underneath, she must be a lesbian."

There may be another, very primitive linkage between sexual behavior and business success. Men demonstrate virility; potency is directly linked to a man's ability to change appearance, to "produce," to "show off"; virility is visible, and the product is tangible. Women therefore may not have exactly the same need to acquire visible status or to produce a tangible product in the world of paid work. If this hypothesis is true, women would tend to be less interested in seeking status positions. Men, on the other hand, would be very much concerned with keeping status positions for themselves; it is disconcerting to have a woman demonstrate "virility" by acquiring visibility in business.

In 1972 most boys are brought up by women. In 1850, men were very much more involved in the care of boys—in teaching apprentices, working with sons on the farm, teaching elementary school. In 1850, becoming "adult" meant joining the world of men or women. Men and women often worked together for survival. The nuclear family, however, is a very different child-rearing environment, often involving only one woman, and one or two children home at a time, for very long periods of time. In 1972, becoming "adult," for many men, is equated with escaping female direction and/or domination, and escaping work with women. (I am indebted to a colleague, David Warner, for pointing out that this phenomenon also applies to women brought up in too close contact with a domineering mother.) I believe this is one reason why many contemporary men find it difficult to work under or even with women.

Both men and women sense difficulty when a woman is more innovative, or produces more, or is paid more than a male colleague. This is especially true when a wife is more creative in the labor force and/or produces more or is paid more than her husband—a situation which women avoid like the plague and which automatically limits the extent to which they will innovate or seek well-paying jobs. Here again, there is a very primitive energy source for these feelings. Women are seen as creating life itself and as able to nurture life directly from their own beings. For many men, the ability to invent, to "produce" in the process of proving virility, and to support a family is their unique gift and possibility in life. If women can reproduce and nurse and invent and produce and support a family, do they "need" men? Trained

from childhood to repress emotions, a great many men find it difficult to believe and accept that they are of course really needed, interpersonally. If all the other demonstrations of "male achievement" can be performed by women, some men feel they have lost their identities and have become obsolescent.

In the face of many, deep discomforts arising from male-female competition in business, many men tend unconsciously and consciously to band together against the "other"—women. Only 2 percent of top business executives are women; men therefore hold the power. No powerful group is ever likely to give up power gratuitously, especially since underpaying women can be profitable in the short run and for individual businesses. Women therefore must compete and fight even harder than the ordinary drive for profits would dictate, if they wish to gain top positions in business. Since women are socialized not to compete with men in the first place, the necessity for political struggle is simply an added deterrent. This also helps explain why women who have somehow "made it" are reluctant to fight on for their sisters.

CAUSE FOR OPTIMISM

Of course there are exceptions. Women who never leave the labor force after age eighteen need never wonder if their "opportunity cost" is zero. Many men and women find ways of working together in business, minimizing interpersonal competition. Men who were cared for in childhood by both men and women, and who have shared real work with girls in childhood, may not need to "escape" women and may readily find women to be good work companions. Men who bottle-feed and care for children, who are in touch with and enjoy their loved ones' deep need for them, are very much less likely to feel threatened with "obsolescence" as males. Secure as "needed" adults, they find it easier to support the achievements of wives and colleagues. Many men find work with women much less difficult as they grow older. Often a man will have sudden insights into his negative feelings about women colleagues—and suddenly find that women are not so threatening as they once seemed. Women in turn often appear to gain self-confidence and initiative as they gain experience in paid employment.

Moreover, there will always be very large numbers of women and men who are deeply concerned about all interpersonal competition, not just competition between men and women. Many people of both sexes will prefer housewifery and househusbandry to business success, and many will prefer low-paying jobs which offer deep human satisfactions not obtainable from top business success. Clearly men and women of such persuasion who are socially responsible should be encouraged to live their own lives as they will.

I believe more women can and will become self-supporting. Equal employment opportunity for women will someday be a fact. But until then, we must work on the tangled complex of factors which discriminate against women, not the least of which are our deepest feelings about ourselves.

COMMENTS ON PHASE IV

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of phase IV marks a turning point in the economic policy of our Nation. For agriculture, especially, it marks the welcome end to a heated debate over the wisdom of controls.

This debate has not been over the

question of whether or not the market will work. It will, and it does. The market reflects supply and demand conditions. Market prices signal increases or decreases in production and allocate the product available. The market works with controls. It works without controls.

With controls, the market sends out manipulated and misleading signals. For instance, price ceilings do two things. They tend to call for less production than would be the case if prices were allowed to rise, and they tend to induce more consumption than would be the case if prices were allowed to rise. Scarcity soon results, and shortages will follow unless some form of rationing is implemented. The longer that controls remain in place, the greater the potential distortion. Yet the market itself works. It is just that controls throw exactly the wrong signals into the works, and the results are not as we would prefer.

Without controls, the market sends out accurate signals. Prices indicate exactly what each product is worth considering the state of the economy, the demand for the product, and the supply of it available. In times of shortage, prices increase. That encourages production and tends to cool consumption. When supplies increase, prices level off and consumption picks up.

The market worked during phase III, during the meat price controls, and during the recent food price controls. The problem has been that price controls have curtailed production when the only effective antidote for high prices is increased production.

Price ceilings increased rather than moderated demand, thus placing added upward pressure on prices. As a result, severe shortages and potential scarcity have threatened. Export controls of some products—protein food products particularly—have followed.

Wisely, we have seen that our market system clearly reflects the distortions we impose on it. The results of controls have been found unacceptable. With phase IV, the market for farm products will be gradually freed from the controls which have provided distorted production in recent months—and recent weeks in particular.

Adjustment away from controls will be neither easy nor painless. We face potential shortages in several commodities—meat, milk products, and eggs, specifically. As control pressures are removed, prices of these commodities are bound to increase.

It boils down to this: If we want more food, farmers are only going to produce more if they have prospects for making money by doing so. It takes unshackled farm and food prices, and a commitment that we will not distort the market mechanism again, to provide that assurance.

When production does increase, prices will no doubt moderate—and that will tend to keep production and consumption somewhat in line.

Under phase IV, prices can once again perform their function as an effective allocator of our food supplies—a function which price controls crippled. Fruits and vegetables, especially, depend upon fluctuating prices to move them through the channels of trade. Yet price controls

impair the operation of that movement. That is why the supplies of fruits and vegetables have been so erratic this season.

Phase IV reflects the realization that the market system, unfettered by controls, is the best means of obtaining the farm production we want, of allocating the food we have, and of moving our agricultural abundance through the marketing channels from the farm to the table.

ROAD RUNNERS CLUB OF AMERICA CALLS FOR SUPPORT FOR SPORTS LEGISLATION

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, for far too many years competing amateur athletes have been prevented from having any meaningful voice in those decisions, policies and programs which directly affect them. All too frequently runners, swimmers, football and basketball players, and others in a wide variety of amateur sports have become nothing more than pawns in the hands of national sports federations or governing bodies. This situation has been seriously exacerbated by the senseless dispute between the Amateur Athletic Union and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. There can be little question but that this issue, which seriously threatens the very foundation of amateur athletics in this country, came to a head during last summer's Olympic games at Munich.

Since last October a number of meetings of various national sports organizations have been held and certain far-reaching decisions have been made. However, the athlete continues to play little, if any, role in the decisionmaking process, even though he or she may spend hours each day in training and then competing in events and under rules and regulations in which they have had no say. Because of this situation and the recognition that some affirmative action must be taken to end damaging feuds and rivalries and to restore some balance into amateur athletics in this country, a number of different measures have been introduced in the House and Senate.

Earlier this week the Road Runners Club of America announced its strong support for legislation being developed in the other body by Senator JOHN V. TUNNEY of California. In calling for support for the Amateur Athletic Act of 1973, the Road Runners Club—the majority of whose members are also registered AAU athletes—noted that this measure is necessary to “end the current situation of athletic serfdom.” Spokesman for the 40,000 competing long distance runners throughout the country, the Road Runners Club is also one of the most active and effective nationwide organizations promoting physical fitness and competitive amateur running. This organization believes that the Amateur Athletic Act “will herald a new age of physical fitness throughout the country and democracy and excellence in athletics.”

Mr. Speaker, as we will hopefully consider legislation relating to amateur athletics within the near future, I believe we should give the Road Runners' statement full and careful consideration. I am pleased, therefore, to present the text of the Road Runners' announcement herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

ROAD RUNNERS ASK CONGRESS TO SUPPORT AMATEUR ATHLETIC ACT OF 1973

The Road Runners Club of America, the spokesman for the 40,000 competing long distance runners throughout the United States announces its support for the Amateur Athletic Act of 1973.

Recent media coverage of statements by spokesmen for the AAU and NCAA oligopolies have ignored the existence of many other athletic groups and the athletes that do support the Act. Long distance runners have led the amateur athletic world the past 16 years in the promotion of the interests of their sport and other amateur athletes' rights through their democratically controlled organization the Road Runners Club of America. The RRCA experience in the efforts to remove their sport from the influences of those governing cliques whose interest is to maintain their power structure rather than help athletes develop their own sport, makes it imperative that Congress pass the Amateur Athletic Act.

Road Runners feel it is a sound proviso that the so-called governing bodies which control sports on a national level will have to justify periodically their position of power. At this time there is no mechanism to remove from control groups that do not meet the needs of the athletes nor are willing to put on the programs athletic groups desire. The protection of the right of choice of where, when and with whom to compete must be given to the athlete. Athletes must also have the right to choose who should govern them and the manner of such governance. The time has come for athletes to have the same protection under law from overbearing monopolistic practices that other citizens now enjoy.

The Road Runners Club of America was organized in 1957 by active long distance runners to be run by athletes for athletes. At that time there were few long distance races and road runs and only three marathons. Today there are 120 marathons a year throughout the country most of which were organized by the athletes themselves. The RRCA puts on nearly 5000 athlete organized and controlled long distance events a year around the country through its local RRCA affiliates. Many areas of the country today would not have any long distance program if the RRCA concept of athletic controlled programs had not put them into effect.

Some of the major accomplishments originated by the RRCA are:

1. The Run For Your Life and Run For Fun physical fitness programs. RRCA impetus and assistance led to the adoption of these programs on a national level by the “Y” organizations of this country. Present estimates show that, as a result of the RRCA originated concept, an estimated 6.5 million Americans participate in some sort of distance running or jogging for their physical health and wellbeing. The popularity of these programs led to the formation of the National Joggers Association.

2. The concept and proof that distance running is beneficial for all ages followed the successful initiation of the RRCA age-group long distance running program. The RRCA age-group national championships involves over 2000 athletes under the age of sixteen.

3. The over-40 age-group Veterans and Masters Program. Since the RRCA started this program it has enabled the men and women of these most neglected ages to enjoy the thrill of competition and the benefits of physical fitness once more. Many other

sports have now adopted the Masters concept.

4. The prime force responsible for the acceptance and encouragement of the rights of women to participate equally in long distance events. The only association to establish a national program of long distance events for women.

5. Because of the gross inaccuracies of long distance road racing courses in 1957 the RRCA set up the criteria and standards for accurate course measurement. Today, all courses for local and national championships must be certified by RRCA standards. All U.S. Olympic marathon candidates qualify for the trials on RRCA certified courses.

6. Through the RRCA long distance and road running as a sport gained its rightful recognition and status separate and distinct from the conglomerate sport of Track and Field in both its operation and philosophy. The success of the RRCA program is evidence by the vast increase in competitive opportunities for the long distance runner. These in turn have finally established a level of excellence among U.S. distance runners which led to the outstanding performances of the 1972 U.S. Olympic marathon team.

These accomplishments of the athletic directed and controlled Road Runners Club of America and its progressive influence on all aspects of long distance running prove that athletes can promote and regulate their own sport.

The Amateur Athletic Act of 1973 will remove many of the restrictions which presently hinder athletes who want more control over their own sports, and will bring democracy to the sporting arena. We commend the fine efforts of the Senate and House of Representatives for continuing under much duress their goals to protect the amateur athletes of the United States. The Road Runners Club of America urges each member of the Senate and the House to vote for adoption of the Amateur Athletic Act of 1973.

\$10,536,600 IN PRECIOUS FOREIGN EXCHANGE IS THE COST OF EACH DAY'S DELAY OF THE ALASKA PIPELINE.

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I direct attention to the following letter which should reach each Member's office Friday morning:

JULY 20, 1973.

DEAR COLLEAGUE:

Yesterday at an Interior Committee meeting I estimated off-hand that each day's delay getting Alaskan oil down to the lower 48 states costs the United States about \$5.5 million in foreign exchange.

This is because Mideast oil must be purchased if the domestic product is unavailable.

Actually the monetary drain on U.S. resources calculates out at almost twice my quick estimate.

Based on 2 million barrels per day capacity of the proposed Alaskan or Canadian pipelines, it is as follows:

2 mil. bbl Mideast oil at \$2.95..	\$5,900,000
Transportation: (97% by foreign flag vessels) at \$2.39..	4,636,600
Daily total.....	10,536,600
Annual total.....	3,848,859,000

This dramatically demonstrates the eco-

nomic damage being done to the country by wrangling over a pipeline route.

Let's get going—

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Nixon took a small step in the right direction. He declared that it will be the policy of this administration to let the economic system work. I would have preferred a total abolishment of controls and I am still dedicated to that end. The economic system, after all, is the direct expression of the wishes of the people. The economy holds a national election every day. The people of the nation vote with their dollars each day on what they want. They decide between choices, very difficult choices.

This system acts quickly to express the will of the people—through the sum total of all of their decisions each day as they vote with their dollars.

There are some people, many of them in Washington, D.C., who think that a few men sitting in a room can make better economic decisions than the combined judgment of the people. These controllers want strict artificial economic controls. And they want to do the controlling.

The folly of that has been shown in agriculture over the last few weeks. The temporary price freeze of June 12 was a short-run move, based on political expedience not economic commonsense. That freeze on food prices did not put more food in the store. We were headed for shortages. The freeze made some kinds of production in the food chain unprofitable.

We saw on television that the poultry industry was drowning baby chicks because it was unprofitable to raise them.

Hog farmers were sending pregnant sows and heavy gilts—the mothers of their breeding herds—to market.

Why? Because of the dim prospect for meeting their costs if they carried the young animals through to the final marketing. They were in a squeeze.

Farmers respond to price, the same as in any other business.

Farmers are not enthusiastic about a losing proposition. They do not willingly increase production when the prospects for making money at it are poor.

Consumers have learned that you cannot get more by paying less. It does not work in food, just as it does not work elsewhere in the economy.

With no controls the economic system will work. The food production machinery, from farm to retail food store, will turn faster.

Farmers have demonstrated through the years that they are the most efficient of any major segment of our national economy. Output per man hour in agriculture has been increasing twice as fast as in industry. That is why we get our food cheaper than anywhere else in the

world in terms of the percent of take-home pay spent for food. That is why our food exports are competitive with the rest of the world. Industry and labor could take a page from the book of agriculture.

The actions taken yesterday in phase 4 appear to be an improvement over phase 3½ and hopefully will not be as destructive to agriculture.

Let us push for phase 5 to be a complete return to the market system and let the individual make the decisions—not the bureaucrats.

PIPELINE DECEIT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, several questions remain to be answered in our debate over approval of the trans-Alaska pipeline. As such, I call particular attention to some rather pertinent views raised by the New York Times in an editorial of July 18. I am submitting the editorial at this time:

DEBACLE IN THE SENATE

In a shocking display of irresponsibility, the Senate has voted to give the oil industry an exemption from the National Environmental Policy Act with regard to the Alaskan pipeline. Since it is always difficult to combat the oil industry on Capitol Hill because it contributes to so many political campaigns and has so many strategically placed allies, the environmental forces can take some comfort from the hair's-breadth closeness of the key vote, a tie decided in the wrong way by Vice President Agnew. But it is cold comfort.

Fearing what the courts might do if they looked behind the inadequate environmental impact statement issued in behalf of the pipeline by Secretary of the Interior Morton, the oil industry fought hard for the amendment successfully offered by Senator Gravel of Alaska to forbid any judicial review in this instance.

One of the important requirements of the Environmental Policy Act is that a Government agency prove that it has chosen a course of action that does the least environmental damage. In the case of the pipeline, the choice is between a route across Alaska leading to transshipment of the oil in huge tankers to the West Coast or across Canada to the Middle West. The Administration has consistently disparaged the Canadian alternative; and the Canadian Government itself has apparently not been enthusiastically for it.

However, Senator Mondale of Minnesota yesterday released a collection of diplomatic documents which on their face strongly suggest that the State Department has deliberately misled Congress and misrepresented the Canadian Government's position on a pipeline in that country. Canada may turn out to be more receptive to such a pipeline and more open-minded about its terms than the State Department had indicated. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee now has the clear duty to determine whether the Administration has indeed engaged in deliberate deceit.

On the vote itself, the Senators from New York and New Jersey all voted against the amendment as did Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut. Conservation-minded voters, however, are likely to take note of the fact that Senators Weicker of Connecticut, Brooke of Massachusetts, and Schweiker and Scott of Pennsylvania voted in favor of undermining

the National Environmental Policy Act. This is a vote that must not be forgotten.

The scene of the battle now shifts to the House of Representatives. A House Interior subcommittee yesterday approved a bill by Representative Melcher of Montana that has substantially the same language as the Gravel amendment. A vote in the full House Interior Committee is expected today.

The fate of Alaska's fragile Arctic environment is of enormous ecological significance to the entire North American continent. Equally important is preserving the integrity of the Environmental Policy Act and its judicial safeguards. As Senator Jackson of Washington, a friend of the Alaskan route and also a long-standing conservationist, said in explaining his opposition to the Gravel amendment: "It sets a dangerous precedent by attempting to exempt a project which all parties admit represents a potential threat to the environment from the requirements of environmental law."

When the public is fully aware of the large implications of this legislation, the public interest may yet speak with a louder voice than the honeyed whispers and raucous shouts of the oil industry which have prevailed up to now. If so, the House of Representatives may yet redeem the Senate's folly. The Administration clearly will not.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING SERVICE AND WATERGATE

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the Watergate hearings have had an interesting effect upon the public and upon the Public Broadcasting Service, which has broadcast, in full, the Watergate hearings. The handling of the broadcasts by the PBS has resulted in many individuals making some substantial financial contributions to their stations, including station KUED, Channel 7, at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City. I think Members might be interested in reading a news article from the Salt Lake City Deseret News on June 29 to that effect:

PBS TV STATIONS AIDED BY HEARINGS

Although the educational stations have had to abandon their regular schedules to telecast Watergate hearings in prime time, they are being helped by this action.

This is the feeling of Dr. Rex Campbell, general manager of KUED (Ch. 7) at the University of Utah. He points out that letters have complimented the channel for telecasting the hearings "and nearly every letter contains a check to help us with operations."

He says the station has received a couple of thousand dollars in donations since the hearings started, and these would not have been contributed if PBS had not called attention to the need for funds. Educational stations and the network are operated on government appropriations, which are being slashed: Foundations, state legislatures and contributions.

Dr. Campbell explained that most of the programs KUED is unable to telecast because of the Watergate tapings are carried on KBYU (Ch. 11.) He says some will be telecast Saturday on Ch. 7. He also said the hearings "give us an audience we would not have had before this. We might keep many of them."—Howard Pearson.

THE BOMBING OF CAMBODIA

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, like many other Americans, I have felt a deep sense of dismay over the continuing bombing of Cambodia at a time when, with the August 15 deadline a matter of law, such bombing can only kill people and cannot affect the outcome of either the military conflict or any bona fide diplomatic negotiations.

Many of those asked to carry out this almost inexplicable policy apparently share this dismay.

I recently received a letter from an Air Force captain who has spent 1,400 hours as a B-52 copilot in missions over Southeast Asia. His letter expresses a sense of horror over what we, the world's most powerful nation are doing to one of the smaller nations of the world. His words justify the careful attention of all of us who also seek to serve a nation for which we would hope to once again feel pride and honor.

JUNE 19, 1973.

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have chosen to send this letter to you because of your past record as a critic of our involvement in Southeast Asia. The intent of this letter is that it receive the widest possible circulation in the House of Representatives or that it be read during a session of the House, if that is possible and useful.

I am a B-52 co-pilot currently on temporary duty with the 307th strategic wing at Utapao Royal Thai Naval Base. I was graduated from the Air Force Academy in 1969, and at that time I was very proud of being an American and an Air Force officer. Until March 1972, the end of my first Southeast Asia tour in the B-52, I had every intention of making the Air Force a career. Last month, I submitted a letter of resignation to be effective in August 1974, when my current commitment expires.

The reason I plan to resign is my total disillusionment with the current United States foreign policy. Today our military policy appears to be conducted exclusively by President Nixon with total disregard of the Congress and the people. Only Congress can now change the current reckless and immoral policy which is being conducted by the bombing of Cambodia.

During the course of the Vietnam war, prior to March 1972, an average of thirty-three B-52 sorties were flown per day covering eleven targets. At present, during this period of "peace with honor," we are flying thirty-nine sorties per day covering twenty targets. I read today in the June 18, "Pacific Stars and Stripes," that President Nixon has stated that "this year, for the first time in a dozen years, America will be at peace on Independence Day." Another article in the same paper stated that in May 1973, 53,761 tons of bombs were dropped on Cambodia. Somehow my definition of peace and that of Mr. Nixon are quite different.

Americans appear to have been convinced that "peace" means that Asians are no longer killing Americans, but that Americans can continue to kill Asians. Intelligence reports indicate that among other lucrative targets hit by the B-52's was a Cambodian wedding attended by a small group of insurgents and

civilians. The number of bombs we are releasing in and around population centers in Cambodia would suggest that we are killing hundreds of civilians as well as creating more orphans and refugees. Contrary to the accepted Christian belief in the United States these dark skinned, mostly Buddhist Cambodians we are killing are people, human beings, just like you and I.

Adding to the senselessness of U.S. policy in Cambodia is a report from the Defense Intelligence Agency that the Lon Nol government is expected to fall by the end of the year even with our continued bombing. This added to the reports that most of the insurgents are non-communists and that the Khmer Rouge grew from three thousand armed members in 1970 to fifty thousand today suggests that United States involvement in this war is all the more ridiculous.

Let me conclude by stating that today while writing this letter I made a decision that I could no longer participate in this immoral war and at 1400 hours I went to my squadron commander to inform him that I was refusing to fly any further missions over Cambodia. Thus far, I do not know what action the Air Force will take against me for this position. What I am asking is that the Members of Congress see the basic moral issue involved and immediately legislate an end to the bombing.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. DAWSON,
Captain, USAF.

WORK IN AMERICA

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the quality of the American work environment has received so little attention that interest at all levels—Government, business, labor, and the press—has only recently surfaced. Perhaps the best known study of this problem is the report of the special task force in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which was submitted to the Secretary last December.

"Work in America" has begun the discussion of this issue that is so sorely needed.

For the information of my colleagues, I wish to insert in the RECORD a cogent analysis of the report by Edgar Z. Friedenberg which appeared in the recent issue of Harpers:

THE HOSTILE DELUSIONS OF THE WORKING CLASS

(By Edgar Z. Friedenberg)

"Work in America," the December 1972 Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is something of a landmark among American public documents.¹ It is a bold study of unusual scope and broadly humane principle; then HEW Secretary Elliot Richardson's willingness to sponsor it may have been a factor in the President's decision to transfer him to the Department of Defense, a post where his humane tendencies would have less scope. Mr. Richardson includes in his foreword a brief quotation from an address by Mr. Nixon asserting that "... the most

¹ By James O'Toole and others. M.I.T. Press, cloth, \$10; paper, \$2.95.

important part of the quality of life is the quality of work, and the new need for job satisfaction is the key to the quality of work." Richardson comments: "This report, I believe, confirms both the President's and my observations." His propitiatory gesture does not suffice to conceal, however, the essential contradictions between the position of the report and that of President Nixon on such fundamental issues as the value of generous welfare programs and the pervasiveness among Americans of what has come to be called—infelicitously and inaccurately—the work ethic.

The major findings of the report are probably already familiar to many readers; its more publicized conclusions are that work is absolutely central to identity in America; who you are, in other words, depends on how you earn your living. Many—perhaps most—Americans, however, feel alienated and constrained by their work, which they cannot adapt to their interests, needs, or even the hourly rhythms of their lives. Moreover, although work satisfaction is clearly related to job status, alienation is now so widespread that "one finds evidence of increasing dissatisfaction with jobs even among such traditionally privileged groups as the nation's 4½ million middle managers." Women, says the report, are trebly disadvantaged; by exclusion from the work force, by discrimination in wages and status once they are admitted to it and by society's refusal to define the duties and responsibilities of the housewife as work at all, which, in our society, means that women are simply taken less seriously than men.

All of this is of prime social importance, though none of it is startling. The conclusion that most readers probably will find startling is that "satisfaction with work appears to be the best predictor of longevity—better than known medical or genetic factors—and various aspects of work account for much, if not most, of the factors associated with heart disease." If this is true—and the evidence seems quite conclusive—then American treatment of the aging amounts to geronticide, with retirement constituting the *coup de mauvaise grâce*. The task force emphasizes especially the irony of maintaining enormously costly programs of medical research designed to combat the terminal diseases of the aged, while the indignities and the frustrations that predispose them to these fatal disorders continue to be heaped upon them by a society that remains unwilling or unable to assess the human costs of economic productivity.

"*Work in America*" is not just a research report, however, and the task force makes very concrete suggestions for remedying the misfortunes and abuses it reports. The most immediately practical of these have to do with reorganizing the work process itself so as to provide jobholders with a sense of greater flexibility and autonomy. Thirty-four "Case Studies in the Humanization of Work" by industries in the United States and Europe are described, and all involve some measure of decentralization of the work process, usually through small, mobile work teams that set their own pace, though not their own overall tasks. Most of these experiments have resulted in considerable increases in productivity as well as job satisfaction; indeed, the task force sees this rise in productivity as a built-in trade-off mitigating the otherwise inflationary effects of the full employment and generous welfare programs it advocates.

The task force makes, I believe, a very strong case for its recommendation that work be humanized; and no rebuttal seems to me either possible or desirable. It does, however, leave out of account certain implications, of both its data and its arguments, for its purposes quite justifiably. Nearly all the thirty-four case studies cited are of relatively small experimental units of much larger organizations that continue otherwise to follow conventional patterns of work organization.

There are exceptions: all 400 employees of the American Velvet Company "plan and organize [their] own work and have a profit-sharing plan," thus clothing the iron hand of economic necessity in a most charming glove. And some of the projects of large organizations are quite large in scale themselves: 19,500 factory floor workers at Imperial Chemical Industries and 6,000 at Monsanto Textiles Company participate in similar projects. Nevertheless, they remain the industrial equivalent of early greenbelt experiments in town planning; they were satisfactory in themselves, and the resulting communities remain viable and in many ways superior as places to live. But they did not provide much useful guidance as precedents for solving the complex problems of full-scale urban redesign.

One small bit of information in an earlier part of the report suggests a possible limitation on procedures for humanizing work. The introduction includes a table of "Percentage in Occupational Groups Who Would Choose Similar Work Again." The top-ranking profession for job satisfaction in this list, rather to my astonishment—especially for 1972 data—is that of "urban university professors," 93 percent of whom, it is said, would choose the same profession again. Now, university professors have traditionally enjoyed precisely the kind of working arrangement the task force advocates for the whole of industry, and this does, apparently result in a high level of job satisfaction. The small group is, of course, the academic department, which does possess a great deal of autonomy in designating its own leadership, dividing up its work load, and defining the standards by which its performance is to be judged—usually so ambiguously as to make such assessments impractical, which contribute substantially to our job security. University professors, moreover, have come to define this situation as true autonomy. It is only four years since the chapter of the American Association of University Professors at the university where I was then teaching haughtily declined to participate in a faculty-wide election to designate a bargaining agent for university employees on the ground that "the faculty cannot represent the university; it is the university."

The AAUP wouldn't talk that kind of nonsense today, I am sure; but the point is that it was nonsense then and always had been, even though many of us believed it, and the belief helped to keep us contented as we nominated on our grants. Yet, as Michael Miles so brilliantly demonstrated two years ago in *The Radical Probe*, university administrations, acting in the interests of their governing boards, control us by exactly the same devices that management uses to control the small, quasi-autonomous work groups recommended in the report. The university administration controls the allocation of funding and can cause a department to wither away if it withholds funds; it effectively controls appointments to departments—for although it cannot usually risk appointing persons unacceptable to a department, it can refuse to appoint or reappoint the members the department desires. Moreover, it negotiates for the department with external agencies; no member of the department can set up a research program with outside funding unless he has the approval of the central grants officer.

The result has kept morale high, but it has also rendered faculty even more docile than they might have been. For the belief in our autonomy made it terribly easy for us to conceal from ourselves that we were, in fact, organization men working uncritically for the Defense Department as surely as if we had been employed by Litton Industries—the dynamic consortium that now includes the United States government. This morale-maintaining function, moreover, is backfiring on us now that times are hard

in academe. Academic departments must contain within themselves the hostilities and anxieties that arise when budgets are cut and staff is reduced—a fairly general condition now—and this makes them hellish. A straight, authoritarian chain of command is much easier to fight than a group of colleagues. This is not to suggest that efforts to humanize work are not desirable; but, more fundamentally, being human is much more satisfying in times of prosperity than of adversity, when it may embrace some very nasty conduct indeed.

The task force would, I am sure, agree with this proposition and would point out that the measures it was recommending were intended precisely to reduce the adversity to which employees are now subjected and provide, instead, a substantially increased measure of dignity and security, from which greatly increased productivity might also, as an extra bonus, be expected to flow. Nobody can really argue against that; though anyone who has seen the movie *Miracle on 34th Street* may recall a certain queasiness at the turn of the plot that required him to believe that behaving more humanely was not only worthwhile for its own sake but also vastly more profitable in dollars and cents. This may well be true; but if it is, one would think that a society that has been obsessed with profit for so long would have discovered it long ago. Yet *Work in America* does contain the seeds of an explanation of this apparent paradox, though it never develops that explanation. One need not go much beyond the report's evidence to construct a plausible hypothesis as to why men continue to choose failure, frustration, and death instead of organizing their lives in such a way as to make self-fulfillment possible.

The stumbling block is, quite clearly, the indignation and even rage that are aroused in the breasts of those whose lives have been suffused by and subordinated to the work ethic at the prospect that anybody else may now be given a better chance in life than they had. This grim political reality of resentment is visible enough in the pages of *Work in America*, though it is never stated as a general proposition. It is there, though, in the task force's discussion of the hostile delusions the American people cherish and act on about shiftless, black welfare bums—delusions that have less basis in reality than the monsters of science fiction, and probably very similar psychic sources. It is also there in this account:

"The first major experiment in Norway [was] carried out in the metal-working industry, a critical but unproductive sector of the Norwegian economy. A dilapidated wire-drawing plant was chosen for the experiment on the ground that if improvements could be realized there, they could be achieved anywhere. But productivity increased so much due to job redesign that the experiment was suspended: the unskilled workers in the experiment had begun to take home pay packets in excess of the most skilled workers in the firm, thus engendering bitterness."

And it is there in an anecdote about a foreman who exploded when he found a team of young cleaning workers reading or sleeping in the early-morning hours, after having finished their stint impeccably in five hours rather than eight, and of the paternal union steward who straightened them out: "The company has the right to expect eight hours work for eight hours pay. . . . They're spacing it out nicely now and everyone's happy," he said, satisfied to have settled the grievance within the understood rules." It seems evident that in this case it is the older workers and their values, rather than management—which had no conceivable economic stake in this hassle—who are the source of the problem.

Throughout the report, it appears to me, the task force authors are reluctant to explore the role of working class values

and institutions in maintaining the alienation they deplore. They do not utterly neglect it: they note, as the fifth of five reasons for the reluctance of employers to move swiftly in the redesign of jobs, that "in some industries there is opposition from trade unions to the notion of job redesign," and follow this with a mildly critical assessment of the role of the trade unions. But that section begins with the statement: "Clearly, the prime responsibility for improving the quality of working life rests with employers." Indeed, I am struck by the failure of the task force to elucidate at any point the prime political role of working-class *resentment* in making such improvement a heroic task. Even when the report reflects some awareness of this obstacle, it appears to envision the wrong task. Altering the American mass attitudes that make humanization of work impossible is going to be less like cutting the Gordian knot than cleaning the Augean stables.

The reticence of the task force seems to me strange even if one attributes it to a sympathy amounting to bias for the difficulties of the working class. For the authors' own arguments make it very clear that *resentment* cannot, in any case, be something to blame people for; it is part and parcel of the whole problem of alienation that is the core of the task force's concern. For this very reason, it is a weakness in the report to underplay it. *Resentment* has become the fundamental fact of political life in mass industrial society. It is certainly not a peculiarly working-class attribute; it is rife among all people who have been obliged to abandon or falsify their own needs and aims in order to fill roles assigned to them by others more powerful than they. This is to some degree a universal experience; but it does not affect all members of society equally and develops most strongly among those who have invested more of themselves in becoming somebody else's tool. It is probably strongest among such people as salesmen, schoolteachers, policemen, clerks, and newspaper reporters—those who can neither go through their work in a state of mechanical detachment nor allow themselves to be fully human as they perform it. And, perfectly clearly, it is the meat on which our President feeds, that he is grown so great.

But it is among the working class that *resentment* is most fully institutionalized and expressed in conventional attitudes and political behavior. Racism in America is not so much an expression of hostility to blacks as of resentment that they should now be receiving, however belatedly, compensatory treatment that whites feel was never given them. Earlier on, Orientals were the target of equally virulent hostility as Herbert Hill, National Labor Director of the NAACP, shows in his recent article, "Anti-Oriental Agitation and the Rise of Working-Class Racism," in the January/February issue of *Society*. Their image was a little different; Orientals were seen not as welfare bums—there being no welfare system to sustain them—but as sly subhumans who traduced the white workingman by accepting wages he could not afford to work for. The issue was powerful enough to fuel the rise of Samuel Gompers—himself a poor immigrant—to the position of founder and president of the AFL and sacred symbol of the American labor movement.

It is hard to assess the actual political force of *resentment* in the United States. Campaigning politicians assume that it is paramount, and the social groups among which it is strongest are traditionally regarded as defenders of liberty, in deference to the democratic myth and in the teeth of the evidence. Consequently, no clean test is ever made. The McGovern candidacy was obviously swamped by *resentment*: most American voters are just too costive to accept a candidate they believed to be soft

on pot and amnesty. But more qualified voters failed to vote than in any previous election; and no major candidate is now likely to take the risk of seeing who would "vote for him if he ran on a platform of pervasive liberation and wrote off in advance the support of Daleys and Meanys, or even of the tabloid dailies and blue-collar meanies. The result would polarize the country, and this is assumed to be a terrible thing. To refuse the risk, however, is to accept in advance the dominance of values that the working class itself may be about ready to outgrow. The policies proposed in *Work in America* would, if put into effect, help us all to outgrow them; meanwhile, the attitudes and values prevalent among the work force continue to constitute a massive barrier to the humanization of work, and one to which the authors of the report have given much less emphasis than is its due.

THE GOOD EARTH AND THE TECHNOLOGICAL FUTURE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, Jr., chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Rockwell International, gave a penetrating and significant talk before the International Purchasing Conference in New York City. Because of the timeliness and significance of these remarks I am including them in the *RECORD* for the benefit of my colleagues and the general public:

THE GOOD EARTH AND THE TECHNOLOGICAL FUTURE

(By Willard F. Rockwell, Jr.)

Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. As much as any group in this country, purchasing executives are aware of the abundance and the shortage of our natural resources.

Today I want to talk about the abundance and that shortage and about the pivotal role of technological development in the great decisions to be made throughout the balance of this century.

If I may borrow a descriptive word from the environmentalists, this spaceship Earth is confronted by very real threats that it may soon be running out of space, running out of energy, running out of air, or, as space technologists would put it, exhausting our life support system.

No one needs to remind us our passenger list is increasing daily—we are more than three billion, seven hundred thousand people at the latest count. The passengers are eating more of our supplies, polluting more, using more energy, and rapidly absorbing space.

The problems we have are global, and they're going to require solutions of comparable proportions.

Those solutions must start now, from us who are aboard now, from the young people we are training to take over. We can't wait for those still unborn to turn over to them the guidance of this planet deep into the 21st Century.

We cannot escape the responsibility during the 27 years remaining in this century of either providing the solutions or making the task easier for those who will come behind us.

Some people are convinced that we are already lost. They believe our present course, with an overpopulated, underfed earth, depleted of finite natural resources within the foreseeable future, is catastrophic.

These are the opinions of some serious, dedicated physical and social scientists who have studied this problem conscientiously. They have given, they believe, every possible consideration to the pluses in the picture and have reached the conclusion that earth has reached its limits of growth.

They have convincing reasoning for their arguments, and their computerized projections stand up under reasonable scrutiny.

You may recall The Club of Rome's sponsorship of a study involving 16 scientists under Dr. Dennis Meadows. Their study entitled "The Limits to Growth" is the product of the greatest technological age this world has ever known. I do not deprecate the team's thoughtful studies and their dedicated concern for this globe of ours.

They utilized in their study a world model, based on computer technology that was not in existence 25 years ago.

Let me repeat that: computer technology and system dynamic modeling techniques were not in existence 25 years ago. If someone had tried to undertake the same kind of world study in 1947, it would have been impossible because there simply was not enough mathematical power available in the world.

The scientists took every precaution, in their viewpoint, to retain credibility.

They have been generous in their extrapolations into the 21st Century, allowing for wide discrepancies in their judgments, for example, of new natural resources being discovered. But with that generous gesture, they have simply shifted their prediction of final catastrophe deeper into the next century.

But with that acknowledgment to the vigor of their study, I contend they haven't given full credit to one key element, the technical ingenuity of this and succeeding generations and the exponential growth of that ingenuity.

I share the view of the educator Peter Drucker that the future impact of new technology is almost always beyond anybody's imagination.

I share the opinion of the scientist John Maddox who said the growth of the world's population is not nearly as inexorable as the environmentalists say.

We are not going to sink under the weight of an ever-doubling population. It's presumptuous to believe that the United States, as *Newsweek* magazine states, may attain population equilibrium in the next 75 years and deny that expectation to the nations of Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America.

I never believed that Lake Erie was dead. It wasn't and it isn't.

I never believed that famine was going to overtake the world in 1970, and it didn't.

I'm an engineer. And I want to stick to that discipline. However, I think this country and this world recently have been confused by sociologists who suddenly speak with more authority on the mechanics of pollution control than do engineers and scientists.

Yet engineers and scientists, whether they like it or not, may be involved in some vast world-wide sociological changes.

It is *they* who will provide the key which will open the door through which the world, if it so wishes, and *only* if it wishes, enters a new era.

We can't permit anything so grave as the survival of the human race to be based on hopeful assumptions. So I say with certitude that technological developments *will* unlock the doors to a future for the world that will be as bountiful as the past 200 years.

Examples of technological innovations that have wrought massive long-range social change are numerous. Historically, the compass and the printing press transformed the entire structure of western European society and led it out of the dark corridors of the Middle Ages to a new geographic and reasoning world.

In our times we've seen, not only the computer, but nuclear energy, television, and

now working satellites orbiting the earth. All of them are changing living and thinking patterns throughout the world.

I can speak with assurance about recent technological development. To use the vernacular, I've been where it's at.

In our company with its 10,000 scientific specialists, we have more than 2,000 scientists and engineers who are working full time on research-and-development activities alone. Multiply that scores of times over, and you begin to get just a glimpse of the unceasing world-wide effort to advance our knowledge.

And this has been going on for generations, although it is true in the past 25 years we have made progress that dwarfed much that had gone before. Our scientific growth has been equally as exponential as our usage of resources, our population growth, and our consumption of power.

The point I want to make is that even the most knowledgeable person cannot fully grasp the magnitude of the technological activity that constantly is going throughout most of the world.

But you can understand now why someone like the writer Henry James could state when he found himself at the Great Exposition of 1900, his (quote) "historical neck was broken by the sudden eruption of forces entirely new." (End quote.)

At this very moment, if we could gather and catalogue with computer speed the efforts of men in every corner of the world to advance our welfare, we might react with the same dramatic words of Henry James. We too would have our historical necks broken by the sudden eruption of forces entirely new.

The scientists I mentioned, who studied the future of the world and predicted disaster, made a mistake. But it's an understandable mistake and one that has been made before by men of repute and integrity.

Back in 1928 Robert Millikin, one of our most eminent scientists and a Nobel Prize winner, declared flatly that the energy available to man through disintegration of radioactive or any other atoms might be sufficient to keep a few corner peanut and popcorn stands for some years to come, but that was all.

It was only four years later the neutron was discovered, and the nuclear energy power gates were opened wide to the world.

So mistakes can be made in undervaluing the role of technological possibilities.

But by the same token, mistakes can be made in expecting too much too soon.

Technological innovation is only one factor, though an important one, among others that are political, economic, environmental, religious, and intellectual in nature. A good example of that interplay is occurring at this very moment in the area of air, water, and solid waste pollution control.

We have the technical capability to achieve every one of our environmental goals. What we lack is the political unity of standards, realistic development time periods, the nation-wide acceptance of the staggering cost, and global action by all nations.

That's why I said earlier that technology can open doors, but the people of the world must exercise the will and determination to walk through them.

I want to emphasize that in the search for the technological developments that will assure survival, we expect evolution, new applications of technology; but we don't expect miracles.

We can't expect to uncover any new or different physical laws.

We can't expect to uncover any new or different chemical elements.

But we logically can expect new and startling applications of existing knowledge. How long will it take?

Electricity didn't come into our homes overnight.

Two hundred years ago Ben Franklin didn't realize he had electricity running down that kite line.

Faraday, in 1831, knew what he had; but it took 50 years from his laboratory experiments to the first central station power generators.

Goddard had a thousand years of rocketry behind him before he demonstrated a successful flight of a liquid-propellant rocket engine in 1926. And then another 43 years of engine development were needed before Neil Armstrong stood on the moon.

The closest we've come to a figurative overnight surprise in recent years was the discovery in 1939 of the conditions that accompanied the nuclear fission process. It was only 18 years later that we had our first commercial use of electrical power generated by nuclear energy.

It's an inescapable fact that there is a finite limit to the world's natural resources. But just how many tons of coal, iron, and lead exist is a matter of debate. And just how long those resources will last, even when pin-pointed, is another matter for legitimate debate.

The scientific team I referred to earlier went to commendable lengths to spell out in exact figures the amounts they believed available and the life span in years they believed remained before those supplies were exhausted.

But even as they prepared their thesis, this nation uncovered what has the potential of being the largest single natural resource project in the world, the discovery of a trillion-and-a-half tons of sub-bituminous coal in Montana, the Dakotas, and Utah.

It's in an area that has been explored for a hundred years by thousands of searchers seeking wealth from the ground. Today we have tireless satellite eyes scanning the world with the same question but with far greater determination and with tireless energy.

Since they have published their thesis, this nation has launched the Earth Resources Technology satellite which is uncovering natural resource information on a scale so vast that it's difficult to grasp. That one satellite alone may hopelessly outdate any previously compiled assessment of the world's natural resources.

But no matter how large these resources may become, we cannot escape the fact that they are finite.

It behooves us to use them well, to recycle whenever possible so that the supply we do have will last longer.

Suppose for the moment we were to accept the exponential tables of the science team and agree that by today's standards and with only the help of today's technology, we can see the time when the limit of arable land will be reached, when we can see the exhaustion of our aluminum in 55 years or copper in 48 years and so on.

What would be the immediate role then of technological development?

I view that role as one of buying us time until we can reach an optimum solution or, in a lesser degree, to help us achieve an equilibrium condition where we'll develop as high a standard of living as possible for the entire world.

But with so many problems and with the sand sifting through the hour glass, where do we start?

The starting point and the key element to the entire growth problem is the improvement in the availability and utilization of our energy sources.

This is the most important single resource available to man. If one has enough energy, it's possible to deal with the problems of food production, of air, water, and solid waste pollution.

With unlimited, economical energy, it's possible to change salt water to fresh in quantities so vast that a desert becomes a potential garden.

With unlimited, economical energy the task of the scientists, engineers, and sociologists in a score of other areas will be made immeasurably easier in the decades to come.

With unlimited, economical energy, food grows, the waters clear, the air becomes wholesome, and the disposal of solid waste less difficult.

Even recycling, which shows promise of being a significant factor in resource stretch-out, depends on adequate energy.

That's why we strongly support national action to solve the present energy crisis.

We've been drifting. No one has listened to the experts. Everyone has listened to the non-experts. As a result, we have on our hands a self-imposed crisis.

This country pioneered in the development of nuclear energy. Yet only recently construction permits for nuclear plants were halted for about a year because of the opposition of environmentalists. Fortunately, we're underway again.

The immediate threat is not life or death for the nation. The threat is to our standard of living. How many brownouts and dim-outs are we willing to accept as part of our way of life? Are we ready to give up air conditioning and elevators as part of existence? To accept gasoline rationing?

I don't think so. Therefore, a fight to maintain a high standard of living becomes a very legitimate part of the challenge facing technology.

The same is true of the fuel crisis. Here again, it's not a matter of life or death for this nation that we import crude petroleum or refined fuels. Overnight we could cut off the 12 percent of imported material, and the sun would still come up in the morning. But that would mean stringent gas rationing, perhaps an outright ban on pleasure traveling; and it might mean the closing of some industries.

I doubt the American people are ready to accept that as the price of self-sufficiency in petroleum. I doubt if they will be ready in 1985 when 30 percent of our total fuel needs may be coming from abroad.

In the 2,000-foot thick oil shale deposits rising from the Colorado River there are 1.8 trillion barrels of oil—six times the 300 billion barrels of crude petroleum in the Middle East reserves.

President Nixon's recent proposal for a multi-billion-dollar research effort to extract oil and gas from that shale is an excellent demonstration of national determination. If we follow his proposal then the nation will be showing its willingness to walk through one door that technology will open.

There may be literally scores of ways in which we will ultimately solve this energy crisis. Our technology task will be to find the one that will be most beneficial and most economical.

The more trained people we have, the better technological tools we have, the more determination we have to solve our problems, the more likelihood the success curve will turn dramatically upward.

We've made the prior transitions from the Iron Age, to the Steel Age, to the Electric Age, and to the Atomic Age.

Perhaps, with a new national determination, we could make a transition into the hydrogen age; and a new energy age could open for us.

Where is the Robert Millikin who will say that it is impossible?

If science and engineering can move a mountain today, there's no reason why they can't move two mountains tomorrow.

The essential point is that the technology for utilizing a wide variety of energy sources is available. We have the trained people, scientific teams unequalled in any country of the world, who can bridge what seems an unbridgeable gap.

Even if we agree that our earth problems have an inexorable exponential growth, I contend that our technological capability to cope with those problems has the same exponential characteristics.

Even if we had remained chained to earth, we could have coped with these problems.

But now our task has been made immeasurably easier, for we have made the transition into space.

In this new realm we have a new opportunity to widen the entire scope of science on earth and the scope of engineering on earth.

The tools are already in space, others are about to be launched, and still others are still in the blueprint stage.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1973

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this week is Captive Nations Week. In 1959 the third week in July was designated in a joint congressional resolution and by a Presidential proclamation so that we as free Americans could express our sympathy for those oppressed peoples in captive nations. Once again I am proud to say that we have always felt, and will always feel, that the cause of the captive nations is a righteous cause, a just and noble cause, and a humane and humanitarian cause.

Next month, on August 21, the Czechoslovakian people and freedom-loving people the world over will commemorate the fifth anniversary of the Soviet Day of Shame. Five years ago the Soviet Union invaded the independent nation of Czechoslovakia and intervened in that nation's rights to determine its own destiny and aspirations. Yet another year has passed and the yoke of oppression continues to squelch the independence of the Czechoslovakian people.

This week, too, we must not forget the plight of the Jews within the Soviet Union who are also prohibited from exercising their basic rights. The same country which continues to violate the independence of another nation also continues to deny its own citizens their freedom.

This is not a week of celebration. Many freedom-loving people throughout the world remain deprived of their most basic human rights. This week, as well as every other week, we must reaffirm our belief that men everywhere must be guaranteed their essential freedom. We must rededicate ourselves to the great task of helping them gain that freedom.

THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY AND FEDERAL POLICY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time has come for a fundamental reconsideration of the proper role for the Federal Government in the economy as far as social policy is concerned. We have seen many expensive, grandiose ill-defined programs fail over the past few decades. The time has come to develop more modest programs that can succeed.

Such new programs to solve domestic social problems need not be Pollyanna schemes. The Manhattan project, the Marshall plan, and the space program were highly successful. My feeling is that this success derived in large part from the fact that the goals of these programs were very clearly defined—inventing the bomb, reconstructing economies from war damage, and reaching the Moon in 10 years. Similar achievements cannot be expected from large agencies like the Department of Transportation or the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are charged with broad policy responsibility. But they could be expected from relatively small agencies with short lifespans—say 10 years—charged with very specific goals of developing the technology to solve specific problems, and given the manpower, technical expertise, and money necessary to achieve results. Less than 2 percent of the Federal budget is devoted to research and development on civilian programs. It seems to me that perhaps the time has come for the Government to devote greater resources to R. & D. in energy, the environment, transportation, housing, health care delivery, and related areas through the creation of such well-defined agencies charged with solving specific problems that affect the lives of millions of Americans.

An article by Robert F. Mathieson appeared in the New York Times July 15, 1973, entitled "Technology: Road to Economic Progress." I would like to insert that article in the Record at this time for the information of my colleagues with regard to this question of the role of the Federal Government and technology in our domestic economy:

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1973]

TECHNOLOGY: ROAD TO ECONOMIC PROGRESS

(By Robert F. Mathieson)

In 1966, Robert Lekachman published "The Age of Keynes." The economist announced the triumph of Lord Keynes's idea—a generation after his death—that government economic policy had finally tamed the "sad cycle of boom and bust."

Unfortunately, as we now know, the economy had to suffer a lot of pain to make up for past excesses. Also, it's not necessary to have a degree in economics to see that supply has not kept up with demand in a number of areas. Some, like food, are short-term imbalances. Others, like energy, are long-term supply problems.

Spurred into action by the boiling price barometer, economists looked into their bag of tools; the best they could come up with was the sledge hammer of tight controls and, in the case of feed grains, rationing. Fine tuning at its best.

In the case of food, the public is learning economics fast. Hold down the price of meat and you smother chicks and slaughter pregnant sows.

It won't be long before the public tells the Government to leave the agricultural marketplace alone.

Let's come out and say it. The grain deal with the Soviet Union was a very expensive piece of business. At the time it was seen as a step to improve our balance of payments.

Devaluation of the dollar was also supposedly going to be good medicine for the United States economy. It would lower the price of our products in world markets and thus also contribute to improving our trade position.

Experience has taught us that the United States is not immune to bad weather and that a sudden surge in agriculture is not all

that good a thing. The energies of Government may be better spent on improving weather forecasting through satellites and analyzing worldwide demand for farm products. Armed with more accurate information our private farm sector has demonstrated that it is well equipped to meet growing domestic and foreign needs.

Devaluation is also a two-sided coin. It does help put downward pressure on export prices. Alone, however, it cannot do the job. Business has to increase its efforts to become foreign-market oriented. It is all too easy to hide behind currency devaluations.

A recession in 1974 cannot offset a dollar that is worth less and less in world markets, or the aftereffects of one-shot trade deals. It can, however, abort the present economic cycle before capital investment goes into operation.

So far, fortunately, monetary and fiscal policies have avoided the damage of an economic overkill. Much like a virus infection, the economic system needs time to bring itself back into balance. New capital spending will not only add capacity and thus reduce cyclical price pressure, but a new plant has the added attribute of giving business the wherewithal to utilize new technology and more efficient production methods and distribution systems.

Energy, however, represents a different problem. The short-term vagaries of nature are less important here than long-term growth trends. Unfortunately, the preoccupation of most economists is still with forecasting the gross national product next year.

In breaking down the components of total demand, economic forecasts will show only more or less consumption, investment and government spending. The one-year focus on controlling the business cycle in terms of the broad aggregate categories of the national income accounts has the economist still thinking in terms of expanding or contracting demand.

The energy problem is seen only as an oil consumption problem. Americans can shift their consumption patterns to conserve more, but the solution is a little more complicated.

The history of human development has traced the evolution of higher levels of energy forms. Shortages in one form or another accelerated the process of developing new ones.

Britain a number of centuries ago cut back the use of timber for other than shipbuilding purposes. Coal became the substitute and the industrial revolution was born.

In the last 30 years many of us have gone from shoveling coal into the home furnace, to having trucks deliver oil to basement storage tanks, to having natural gas piped in. Why is it so hard to think of solar energy in the next 30 years?

The danger of the present crisis atmosphere surrounding energy is that as with food we are liable to jump at short-run solutions without fully weighing the long-run costs of these solutions.

One example is dependence on energy imports, which, if we run ahead with heavy investment in tankers and harbor facilities, may preclude investment in new domestic energy sources. The costs are not just economic.

One of the major attributes of a market economy is that it emphasizes freedom of choice. To the extent that we are dependent on others for energy we limit our options.

Massive dollar and other foreign reserves built up in other countries become a potential threat. Japan and the European countries have learned to live with imported energy, but it doesn't mean they like it.

The United States does have a choice. And the choice fits in with the whole history of economics and the betterment of man. The question is how can we get more out of the earth's scarce resources? The answer is waste less and find more efficient substitutes.

Oil from the Middle East is the energy source that will have to carry us over for the

next few years, if we set our sights on the task, however, we can begin now to accelerate development of indigenous substitutes: coal gasification, oil shale, nuclear energy, geothermal power and eventually solar energy. The Federal Government will have to provide the leadership.

The Government is already involved in energy policy. At least 50 per cent of the remaining United States oil and gas potential, about 40 per cent of the coal, 50 per cent of the uranium, 80 per cent of the oil shale and 60 per cent of the present geothermal sources are located on Federal lands.

The system of Federal taxes, subsidies, import quotas and price regulations drastically affects the forces of energy supply and demand. Environmental standards affect energy uses. Foreign policy and energy policy are becoming more and more intertwined.

What is most lacking is adequate research support. The accomplishments of this country in technological progress are the envy of the world. It's hard to envision that we will not respond to this challenge.

The very nature of government is to see problems as isolated phenomena and to search for quick solutions. The dynamics that are now taking place go beyond national boundaries and are long run in nature.

Inflation today is not a product of the United States economy but a world problem. The World War II reconstruction period has come to an end and the population boom of the late nineteen-forties and early nineteen-fifties has come to maturity.

New demands are being made on the economic system and an adjustment process is now taking place to meet those demands. These pressures go beyond the business cycle and transcend national boundaries.

Many years ago Nikolai Kondratieff, the Russian economist, identified the presence of long waves in the pattern of economic growth. These waves of 40 or 50 years were found to be more powerful than the shorter business cycle that acted mainly as a brake or accelerator on economic activity.

It seems reasonable to suspect that underneath the current business cycle a sorting out is taking place in the world and a new long-term growth curve is about to be shaped. The United States has a role to play in forming the direction and cohesiveness of this wave. To find and implement its role, it seems obvious that economists and policymakers need to look beyond the present cycle.

Business-cycle economics played a very important role following World War II, when confidence in the future had to be built. The question then was will there be a future and economists concentrated on analyzing demand.

In the second generation the question of how to provide for the future is being asked. Economists will now have to look at the supply side of the equation. This will not only mean more food and more energy but a continuation of technological progress to continue the path of history in extending man's reach for more and more efficient allocation of resources. There is a simple formula that says output is equal to input times efficiency.

The United States is no doubt the richest country in the world in terms of human, capital and land resources. Economics now has a challenge to see how to utilize this wealth more efficiently.

PLANS TO MOVE PROJECT SANGUINE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am calling today upon the new Defense Secretary,

Mr. James Schlesinger to reaffirm the Navy's plans to move Project Sanguine from Wisconsin to Texas.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that during the game of musical chairs at the Pentagon some change in Project Sanguine's location may have occurred.

As some of my colleagues may know, former Defense Secretary Melvin Laird first ordered Sanguine out of Wisconsin immediately before he left his post as Defense chief. His successor, Elliot Richardson, confirmed Laird's earlier decision in a letter to me. Now I am asking Mr. Schlesinger to once again reconfirm the decision to move Sanguine from Wisconsin to Texas.

One of the reasons I am making this request is the blatantly dishonest information peddled by the Navy during the earlier controversy about Sanguine's location. When I first asked the Navy to move Sanguine from Wisconsin to Texas, the Navy claimed that the Sanguine site would cost 10 to 15 percent more in Texas. At my request, the General Accounting Office—GAO—reviewed the Navy's figures, and, found them to be totally fraudulent. Since the bureaucracy at the Pentagon has been in such disarray and the Navy has been playing fast and loose with its estimate about Sanguine, I am asking the Defense Secretary to reconfirm the decision of the Department of Defense to move Sanguine out of Wisconsin.

My letter to Secretary Schlesinger follows:

JULY 18, 1973.

HON. JAMES SCHLESINGER,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you today to reaffirm the Department of Defense's determination to move Project Sanguine from Wisconsin to Texas.

I am very concerned that during recent changes in top management at the Pentagon some change in Project Sanguine's location may have occurred.

As you may know, former Defense Secretary Melvin Laird ordered Sanguine out of Wisconsin immediately before he left his post as Secretary. Secretary Richardson confirmed Secretary Laird's earlier decision in a letter to me. Now I am asking you to once again reconfirm the Pentagon's decision to move Sanguine from Wisconsin to Texas.

Let me thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

A. SIDNEY HERLONG, JR., RETIRES

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague and good friend, A. Sidney Herlong, Jr., has just retired from the Securities and Exchange Commission, terminating almost 40 years of public service.

Sidney Herlong served in this House with distinction for 20 years, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Agriculture Committee, and,

for the last seven terms of his congressional career, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Even before coming to Congress in 1949, he had earned a well-deserved reputation in his home town of Leesburg, Fla., as well as throughout the State of Florida, for his devotion to his constituency.

He had been president of the University of Florida Alumni Association, and following his love of all sports, president of the Florida State Baseball League.

He also served for a short time as postmaster of the Leesburg, Fla., Post Office. Just prior to his election to Congress in 1948, he had served with distinction as Lake County judge for 11 years, and was president of the Florida County Judges Association.

Following his retirement from Congress, President Nixon called upon him once again to serve his country and appointed him to the Securities and Exchange Commission in 1969, to fill an unexpired term.

He was reappointed for a full term in 1971. In accepting Mr. Herlong's resignation from the SEC as of June 30, 1973, the President said:

You have had a long and distinguished career in public service. As a member of the bar and the judiciary, as a distinguished member of the Congress, and finally, as a Commissioner, you have worked for your country and your fellow citizens in the finest traditions of national service.

I join the President and my colleagues, as well as Sidney's legion of other friends in saluting him for his outstanding record of public service and wishing him health and happiness in his retirement years.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION BILL A MISTAKE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the export administration bill, H.R. 8547, scheduled for floor consideration Friday is an inappropriate response to the problem of rising food prices. This bill could very well further weaken the dollar abroad and thus contribute to more inflation, not less. It is a grave mistake for Congress even to be considering it.

At the very least, Congress should retain the right to disapprove administration decisions to prohibit or curtail the exportation of U.S. agricultural products, and Congressman SAM GIBBONS and I will offer an amendment to secure that congressional prerogative.

Last year, the United States sold \$11 billion worth of agricultural products abroad. At a time when the dollar was exceptionally unstable, our foreign agricultural sales literally kept us afloat economically. Today, when the dollar remains weak, other nations are willing to hold dollars in large part because they need them to buy U.S. agricultural products. Remove the certainty of that by passing this bill and telling the world that we are going to rely upon export

controls to meet the problem of rising food costs, and the dollar may well tumble again.

Because of the devaluation of the U.S. dollar, it is now possible for foreign nations to buy more of our foodstuffs than ever before with the same amount of their currencies. However, this bill does nothing at all to restore the stability of the dollar. Nor does it address itself to the issue of increasing U.S. food production which must be at the heart of any effort to curb rising food costs.

For years we have been working to develop markets abroad for American farm products. We have used the certainty of our food supply as a primary tool in negotiations with other nations. This is not the time to do an about-face, especially when it may hurt us as much as those who depend upon American foodstuffs. The export administration bill is unworthy of the American people and the Congress.

I include the following:

TEXT OF AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8547

If the Secretary of Commerce shall prohibit or curtail the exportation of any agricultural commodity pursuant to this section, he shall immediately report such prohibition or curtailment to the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. If either House of Congress shall by simple resolution disapprove of such prohibition or curtailment, it shall cease with the passage of said resolution.

REASONS FOR THE AMENDMENT

Section 8 of the Constitution specifically provides that "The Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations. . . ." This amendment keeps the exercise of the constitutional power a step closer to the Congress and the people.

The Congress is equally capable of making the right judgment upon the necessity of curtailing exports of U.S. agricultural products. The factors to be weighed are essentially political and economic. Involved are questions as to how an embargo will affect our domestic economy and how it will affect our relations with our trading partners. These are the same issues we deal with each year when we pass any appropriation bills which have a fiscal impact or trade bills which affect our trading partners.

Congress has been dealing with these questions for 200 years and should not at this late date completely give up all responsibility in this area. Congress should at least retain the right to vote by the Secretary of Commerce to prohibit or curtail the export of American agricultural products.

The amendment recognizes a distinction between an embargo for national security reasons and one to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand. The former needs to be immediate and unconditional in its impact. The latter is quite different.

The impact of exports on inflation is often subject to wide disagreement among economic experts. For example, whether an embargo on soybeans will curb rising food prices today seems quite questionable. Yet for political reasons the administration has seen fit to limit soybean exports. Congress should have an opportunity to make a judgment as to

the necessity and propriety of such export limitations.

What Congressman, whose district has been dealt a disastrous economic blow by the curtailment of agricultural exports, would not want to have the opportunity to initiate positive congressional action to repeal that decision by the Secretary of Commerce?

Remember, American agricultural trade abroad totals more than \$11 billion. The impact of an unwise decision by the Secretary of Commerce could be disastrous to American farmers, consumers, and to our balance-of-payments situation.

CRUSADE FOR PRODUCT SAFETY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my constituent and longtime friend, Col. G. B. Kidwell, of Arlington, Va., and his crusade of many years for product safety, was the subject of an article printed in the American Logistics Association May-June 1973, issue of its publication the Review. As I believe Colonel Kidwell's safety efforts over the years will be of great interest to all who read this RECORD, I insert the article in full.

CRUSADE FOR PRODUCT SAFETY

(By H. R. Kaplan)

One of the most striking developments of recent years has been the growing public interest in product safety. The dramatic rise of "consumerism" was climaxed in 1972 by the enactment of Federal legislation setting up an independent Consumer Protection Agency. Recently, the legislation was implemented by President Nixon's appointment of a five-member Consumer Product Safety Commission. This development represents a major victory for the average American.

One citizen who has played a prominent part in the drive for safer products is Colonel Gaylord B. Kidwell (USA-Ret.) A member of the American Logistics Association since its founding in 1920 as "The Society of Quartermaster Officers," he is presently Vice President of the Arlington Safety Council of Virginia.

Shortly after retiring from the Army in 1953 after 34 years of service, Colonel Kidwell was caught up in the national concern for the hundreds of young children trapped each year in abandoned refrigerators. The statistics were truly alarming. Between 1953 and 1963, an estimated 150 children aged three to six died from suffocation in abandoned refrigerators. What made the figures even more tragic was that most of these deaths could have been avoided by some simple safety precautions.

For example, six-year-old Almond Ira Blair was found after a 24-hour search at his uncle's house across the street from his home. The boy had been found by police in an old icebox in which he had been apparently trapped while playing. Yet while both manufacturers and the authorities were aware of the hazard, they had been unable to come up with some simple, universally applicable solution to combat it.

Convinced that something had to be done quickly, Colonel Kidwell, a grandfather of five, turned his full attention to the prob-

lem. His one-man crusade began with attempts to interest Federal authorities in developing a safety specification covering this hazard. It wasn't long before he found out that the responsibility for product safety was fragmented throughout the Federal establishment. He began to look very much like a frail David taking on the governmental Goliath. But Kidwell persevered, and at last he succeeded in interesting the Federal Safety Council of the Department of Labor in his project. He pointed out that the 1956 Federal regulation requiring manufacturers to equip their refrigerators with doors which could be pushed open from the inside did not go far enough. His objection, later confirmed by government tests, was that very young children, paralyzed by panic, would be unable to take advantage of the push-open feature. One of his own grandchildren, 4-year-old Margaret Grady, took part in the tests. She is now 20, and in her second year at Georgetown University. It has been a long, hard fight.

As Kidwell saw it, the solution was to devise some means of letting air into temporarily or permanently abandoned refrigerators. Something of an inventor, he developed a simple but effective device, consisting of an inexpensive toggle bolt and plate, easily attached to idle refrigerators, and preventing them from closing. The device has since been improved and modified. Kidwell offered his patented invention without charge to the Federal government. He also has four other patents to his credit.

The Colonel's invention has proved so effective that it has been included by the refrigerator industry among several approved solutions to the problem of abandoned units—a sure indication of its success.

Kidwell's enthusiasm and energy attracted to his side some powerful allies, including Congressman Joel T. Broyhill of Virginia, Congressman Kenneth A. Roberts of Alabama, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, as well as such prestigious organizations as the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and the American Academy of Pediatrics. It is beginning to look as though this time the story will have a happy ending. Kidwell, often referred to as "the Ralph Nader of the refrigerator industry," has the satisfaction of having sparked a drive to eliminate needless tragedy. He has also been instrumental in speeding the creation of a Consumer Product Safety Commission with primary jurisdiction over the present crazy-quilt pattern of agency control over product safety. As presently envisaged, the new Commission will serve as a Federal clearing house for all safety legislation. It will provide for centralized management in this area and will include provision for product research and development, testing, and statistical information on which to base safety programming and will offer legislative advice to Congress.

Altogether, the Commission represents a significant safety gain for all consumers of U.S. products. Kidwell's eloquent testimony in July, 1971, before the U.S. Senate's Committee on Commerce was highly influential in bringing the new Commission into being.

One of the most impressive tributes to Kidwell came from Congressman Roberts, who, in a letter to Stephen Alles, Secretary of the Army, wrote: "Col. Kidwell's voluntary collaboration with the Federal Safety Council in the Department of Labor contributed in the issuance of a new safety device for refrigerators conceived by him and donated to the free use throughout the government and the general public . . . It was largely through his able device and constructive criticism that this new guide is presently available."

To anyone who thinks that the opportunity for constructive citizenship ends with retirement, Colonel Kidwell's story is an effective rebuttal.

FEDERAL PAY INCREASES

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, news dispatches in recent days have brought to the attention of the public the possibility that Congressmen and other Federal officials may be in for another whopping pay increase next year. Speculation has it that the Federal Pay Commission will recommend boosting congressional pay from \$42,500 to \$50,000. The Commission's initial action in 1968 resulted in the controversial congressional hike from \$30,000 to \$42,500 and big increases for judges and other Federal officials, including the \$100,000 increase which President Nixon accepted for himself.

The Federal Pay Commission, which was appointed by the President in December 1972, had submitted its report and recommendations on pay increases to the President in June of this year. Under existing law the President could then incorporate his recommendations in the budget message in January 1974, which would then become effective without the necessity of a vote by Congress.

It appears that a move is now underway to amend the existing law; S. 1989, which was passed by the Senate on July 9, 1973, would change the procedure so that the Federal Pay Commission would submit to the President its recommendations on pay increases every 2 years rather than every 4 years. In addition, the present law would be amended to require the President to submit his recommendations to Congress not later than August 31 this year. The current Senate bill would also amend the existing law to include pay increases for the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the majority and minority leaders of the House and Senate.

Needless to say I am unimpressed with the proposed amendment as it would mean only that future pay increases for the executive, legislative, and judicial departments would be recommended by the President every 2 years rather than every 4 years. The underlying problem would still exist; namely, that Congress can get a pay increase merely by ignoring the President's recommendations. Why should congressional inactivity be rewarded in such a manner?

I again want to go on record that I am opposed to further congressional pay increases at this time and will do everything I can to stop them. I fought against the \$12,500 boost and joined with others in introducing legislation to rescind the increase and abolish the Pay Commission which I still consider to be an artful dodge designed to spare Congressmen the necessity of standing up and being counted on their own financial rewards.

In 1968 I stated that the congressional pay increase of \$12,500 could break down both the guidelines set up by President Johnson as well as the other restraints then in effect and trigger an explosion of heavy wage demands throughout the

economy which would worsen the Nation's inflation problem. I think experience has dramatically borne this out. The wave of inflation which finally brought on the Nixon wage-and-price controls can be dated from that time.

Not only this, we have already seen the great damage which the failure to deal directly with the question of congressional pay raises has done to the public's respect for and faith in their Government. A credibility gap was opened at that time which has widened since until everyone in public life now finds his motives and actions under suspicion and his profession as "politician" subjected to ridicule and contempt.

ELKIN, N.C., KIWANIS CLUB CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress, indeed, every holder of public office, knows that public service is the most enriching and ennobling pursuit of men.

We have chosen public service as a full-time career, and while it requires of us sizable contributions of time and energy and effort, these investments are profited by the deep sense of satisfaction that comes with seeing the people's needs met, their opportunities expanded, their will obeyed.

But there are those who are equally committed to public service, though in a private capacity. Among the most active of these groups is Kiwanis International, and among the most active chapters of Kiwanis is the Elkin, N.C., chapter which recently celebrated its 50th anniversary.

The Elkin Kiwanis have proven their dedication to community service time and again over the last half century. Their reward has been found in the progress of their community. Their rewards have been great, because their goals and their efforts have been great as well.

Their future pursuits in the next half century and beyond, will, I am sure, prove equally successful, for I have seen, and continue to see, demonstrations of ability and talent and willingness to work abound in the membership of that Kiwanis chapter.

Eight men have been active in the Elkin chapter since its creation 50 years ago, and they were recently honored by their fellow club members.

These men are W. Marion Allen, J. Henry Beeson, Albert O. Bryan, Hardin C. Graham, Roy B. Harrell, Harvey F. Laffoon, George E. Royall, and Richard G. Smith, Sr.

I am sure my colleagues join me in commending these gentlemen for their long years of service and their fellow club members for their work as well.

For their past accomplishments, they have my congratulations. For their future projects, they have my encouragement, my support, and by best wishes for continued success.

The officers, directors and current membership of the Elkin Kiwanis Club are as follows:

LIST OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF ELKIN, N.C., KIWANIS CLUB

OFFICERS—1973

Richard F. Callaway, President; Cline M. Hendrick, Vice President; James F. Amburn, Secretary-Treasurer; and Max A. Brown, Past President.

DIRECTORS

Joe G. Bivins, Herbert J. Caudle, David H. Craig, Bill Davidson, David Dickson, Jr., Herbert P. Graham, Jr., Dr. J. A. Harrell, Joe E. Harris, Bob D. Johnson, and Frank D. Young.

1973 MEMBERSHIP

Allen, William Marion; Amburn, James F.; Anderson, John E.; Atkinson, Richard J.; Baker, Luther G.; Beeson, John Henry; Biggs, Alex; Bivins, Joe G.; Blackwood, Nat J.; Boose, Samuel A.

Boyles, E. Carl; Brown, Max A.; Bryan, Albert O.; Byrd, Quincy E.; Callaway, Richard F.; Campbell, Dwane R.; Carpenter, N. H.; Carson, James; Case, Thomas; Caudle, Herbert J.

Chatham, Hugh G.; Church, Ray S.; Cline, David H., III; Collier, Ray; Craig, David H.; Davidson, Geo. William; Davis, Clarence L.; Dickson, David C. Jr.; Dillon, Van W. Jr.; Dillon, Henry R.

Edwards, Robert L.; Fleming, Thomas J.; Folger, Franklin; Franklin, John M.; Freeman, J. William; Graham, Hardin C.; Graham, Herbert P. Jr.; Hall, Dr. John Moir; Hall, John D.; Hall, Julius L.

Holthouser, Manuel C.; Harrell, Dr. James A.; Harrell, Dr. Roy B.; Harris, Edwin F.; Harris, Joe E.; Harris, Raymond W.; Harris, Wayne T.; Hauff, Ronald L.; Haynes, John Henry; Henderson, Hoke.

Henderson, Raymond E.; Hendrick, Cline M.; Hensel, Harry; Holcomb, Jones D.; Holcomb, Sigmond; Isenhour, George; Johnson, Bob D.; Johnson, Garland; Johnson, Joe R.; Jones, Robert S.

Kane, Roy H.; Kirk, Haddon S., Jr.; Laffoon, H. F.; Layell, Joe C.; Lillard, James K.; Mayberry, Theodore P.; McCarthy, William; McDaniel, E. Worth; McDonald, A. William; McNeil, Dr. Claude A., Jr.

Miller, Fred C., Jr.; Mosley, John F.; Neaves, Charles M.; Norman, Fred C.; Parks, Eldon H.; Pilcher, Philip; Peters, Carl L.; Pruett, Dr. L. Doyle; Reeves, William B.; Royall, George.

Schiebel, Dr. Edward C.; Sheperd, J. W.; Shillinglaw, John E.; Shores, William Ford; Smith, A. M., III; Smith, David G.; Smith, O. Dewey; Smith, Richard G.; Smith, Richard G., Jr.

Snow, Guy L.; Spainhour, Eugene S.; Swaim, Henry E., Jr.; Tayloe, W. Sid; Taylor, Dr. Vernon, Jr.; Thompson, H. W.; Watson, Avery N.; Wilson, B. E.; Wright, Calvin, C.; Young, Frank D.

IN SUPPORT OF RIGHT TO WORK—VOLUNTARY UNIONISM

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, it is of great concern to me and to many of my colleagues that men and women in the American labor force are compelled to support political activities with which they may disagree. Yet this is exactly what occurs when employees are forced to join a union as a condition of employment. This unique form of compul-

sion, allowed by the Federal Government through provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, has permitted the unions to collect an estimated annual amount of \$1 billion in dues from these "non-voluntary" union members. Many of the political causes supported by union officials and financed through these funds are opposed to by the workers compelled to pay for them. Voluntary support of political activities is one thing, but compulsory support is quite another. As Thomas Jefferson said in 1799:

To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am inserting in the RECORD several news articles deploring the violation of these employees' civil rights:

[From the Washington Post, July 9, 1973]
COMPULSORY DUES AND "SOCIAL UNIONISM"
(By Reed Larson)

We are flattered, as are the rank-and-file workers who support us, at the attention given to the work of the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation by columnist John Herling ("Attacks On 'Social Unionism,'" The Washington Post, June 28). Rather than getting into a debate with Mr. Herling about what is "social unionism"; whether or not union officials are "leaders"; and so on, I think two very important points need to be made—points that Mr. Herling, for some reason, overlooked:

1. The Chicago suit Mr. Herling refers to does not object to union "leaders" spending dues money for alleged illegal purposes." The case was brought by several rank-and-file members of the United Auto Workers who object to the UAW officials using compulsory dues money for political ideological causes they object to. This case is supported by the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation, an organization established in 1968 to provide legal aid for workers who are suffering injustices as a result of employment discrimination under compulsory union membership arrangements. It also assists such workers in protecting human and civil rights guaranteed to them under the constitution and laws of the United States. All the suits involving political spending by union "leaders" (including the Chicago UAW case) involve the use of compulsory union dues—dues forced from the workers and then used for a myriad of social, political, economic and ideological causes they oppose.

In an opinion on *International Association of Machinists v. Street* (1961), U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas (not known for his hostility to organized labor) said:

The collection of dues for paying the costs of collective bargaining of which every member is a beneficiary is one thing. If, however, dues are used, or assessments are made, to promote or oppose birth control, to repeal or increase the taxes on cosmetics, to promote or oppose the admission of Red China into the United Nations, and the like, then the group compels an individual to support with his money causes beyond what gave rise to the need for group action. . . . I think the same must be said when union dues or assessments are used to elect a Governor, a Congressman, a Senator, or a President. It may be said that the election of a Franklin D. Roosevelt, rather than a Calvin Coolidge might be the best possible way to serve the cause of collective bargaining. But even such a selective use of union funds for political purposes subordinates the individual's First Amendment rights to the views of the majority. I do not see how that can be done, even though the objector retains his rights to campaign, to speak, to vote as he chooses. For when union funds are used for that

purpose, the individual is required to finance political projects against which he may be in rebellion."

2. The second point, Mr. Herling overlooks is that the foundation supported cases are being filed at the request of rank-and-file workers. These men and women are workers whose rights are being trampled by both company managers and union officials. With limited resources they have, for far too long, been helpless. In their excellent series last year titled, "The Unions," Washington Post reporters Nick Kotz and Haynes Johnson quoted an unnamed Justice Department lawyer as saying, "The guy fighting for democracy in a union has enormous odds against him. The guys who come in here for help usually walk out disappointed. The federal government doesn't have the tools. The individual union member doesn't have the money to get a lawyer. Anyway, most labor law specialists work either for the unions or management."

At the moment the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation is helping workers in more than 50 separate cases. These include: litigation seeking justice for public employees; helping protect teachers who believe that their academic freedom is threatened by requirements that they pay dues to a teachers union or not teach—dues that often are used to finance union political activities; challenging the violation to freedom of speech on the public airways (this is the case involving *William F. Buckley Jr. v. AFTRA* with Mr. Buckley being supported by noted civil libertarian Nat Hentoff and New York Times columnist Tom Wicker); helping Mexican-American farm workers in California subjected to a blacklisting clause which gives union bosses the power to fire workers for criticizing the union or if he doesn't like the color of their skin; and supporting a black Philadelphia movie projectionist who found that the union is using a compulsory hiring hall to discriminate against him because of his race.

It seems to us that these are social causes Mr. Herling and union officials should be in favor of. Most Americans are.

[From the Nashville Banner, Jackson News, Atlantic City Press, June 4, 1973]

"EARTHQUAKE" RUMBLING IN CALIFORNIA
(By Frank Van Der Linden)

WASHINGTON.—Another California earthquake is in the making. This time it's a political upheaval.

It could arise from a lawsuit by a group of aerospace workers, aimed at making the big labor unions stop giving millions of dollars a year from their members' compulsory dues to support political candidates and causes.

The beneficiaries of the cash are almost always Democrats and liberal groups, sometimes advocating policies which the union members, themselves, oppose.

George Seay, an employee of the McDonnell-Douglas Corp., and several other workers brought the suit in U.S. District Court in Los Angeles against the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (AFL-CIO).

They complained that the misuse of their dues money for politicians, groups and ideas they personally oppose, violates their civil rights under the Constitution and federal laws.

Although the district court dismissed the case, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals gave the plaintiffs a significant victory by remanding the case for trial, and arguments are expected to begin soon.

"This was a major breakthrough," Idaho Congressman Steven D. Symms said in a recent letter appealing for funds to help the plaintiffs and the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation, which is aiding their case.

"Union officials are very concerned about

the Seay case," said Symms, a Republican freshman. "If this case is won, unions could be denied the use of millions of dollars each year in compulsory dues to support political candidates."

Symms claimed that "union officials spent an estimated \$50 million in 1972 to try to elect George McGovern and a friendly, controllable Congress."

The Idaho congressman said the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation needs to raise a minimum of \$110,000 quickly to cover attorneys' and accountants' fees and staff costs for research, briefs, complaints and appeals, "before the suit is settled, probably by the Supreme Court."

"By sending your tax deductible gift of \$25, \$50, \$100, or \$500 today," Symms wrote prospective donors, "You can play a major role in preventing union bosses from spending millions of dollars in compulsory dues to elect their hand-picked politicians."

The unions can be expected to strike back, hard, at the foundation and its friends in Congress, including the gentleman from Idaho. Labor lawyers will question the foundation's right, as a tax-exempt group, to solicit money to cover legal costs for actions against unions.

Symms' letter bore a replica of his official House of Representatives letterhead, but printed at the bottom was this caveat: "Not Prepared or Mailed at Government Expense."

For months, the foundation's lawyers and accountants have been studying the machinist union's books to prove that the union has been spending compulsory dues—not the "voluntary" contributions allowed by federal law—to finance their favorite political candidates. The books show generous gifts to the Democrats, but not to the Republicans.

If the Supreme Court—which now has four Nixon appointees among its nine justices—should finally rule for the plaintiffs in the Seay case, the Democrats conceivably could lose the largest blocks of cash that fuel their election campaign machinery.

That would be the new California "earthquake."

[From Roll Call, July 15, 1971]
CONGRESS MOVES TO CURB UNION POLITICKING

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

As Congress considers the question of campaign spending reform, a number of legislators have pointed out that the real problem is not the amount of money spent on particular campaigns but, in many instances, the source of such funds. While the law sets forth a rather specific standard, that standard has been honored more in the breach than in any adherence. Section 610 of the Criminal Code, for example, prevents national corporations and labor unions from making any campaign contributions or expenditures.

Yet, AFL-CIO President George Meany has been quite frank in exploding the myth that union political activities in federal elections are restricted by this act, or by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. Last September, Mr. Meany stated that "You know we have these laws on the books—and they have been there for many, many years—Corrupt Practices Act and so forth—and honored, so far as I am concerned, they have been honored by everybody in the breach. I don't know of any candidate for office anywhere that gives a damn where he gets the money so long as he gets it when he gets into a campaign."

During the 1970 elections, labor committees reported spending \$5.7 million from "voluntary" contributions from union members—30 per cent more than the Democratic Party itself—in support of candidates considered "friendly." In New Jersey, Senator Harrison Williams, now chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, received at least \$120,000—a substantial portion of his entire budget—from such labor committees.

In the 1968 Presidential race, labor officially reported contributing a whopping \$7.6 million to all candidates, double what it admitted spending in 1964. Others place an even higher price tag on labor's political efforts. Columnist Victor Riesel notes that "America's labor leaders poured out over \$80 million for Hubert H. Humphrey." Theodore H. White details some other AFL-CIO campaign activities in his book, *The Making Of The President 1968*: 72,225 union men and women canvassing house-to-house, 94,457 Election Day Volunteers serving as car-poolers, baby-sitters, and poll watchers; 55 million pamphlets and leaflets mailed by the AFL-CIO from Washington, 60 million more from local unions.

In many states workers are compelled by law to join labor unions in order to work. Under this unique grant of special privileges by the federal government, approximately one billion dollars is collected each year from wage earners who are forced to pay that money or lose their jobs. Union officials then use a substantial portion of that money in political activities, many of which are opposed by those who have been compelled to pay for them. While labor unions spent an estimated \$60 million on behalf of Hubert Humphrey in 1968, public opinion surveys showed that 44% of union members and their families opposed the candidate endorsed by union officials.

It is clear that union political activity is financed by the use of compulsory union dues. Even such a staunch friend of organized labor as Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas finds this situation highly objectionable. In the case of *IAM vs. Street* he declared: "The collection of dues for paying the costs of collective bargaining of which each member is a beneficiary is one thing. If however, dues are used, or assessments are made, to promote or oppose birth control, to repeal or increase the taxes on cosmetics, to promote or oppose the admission of Red China into the United Nations, and the like, then the group compels an individual to support with his money causes beyond what gave rise to the need for group action . . . I think the same must be said when union dues or assessments are used to elect a Governor, a Congressman, a Senator or a President . . . when union funds are used for that purpose, the individual is required to finance political projects against which he may be in rebellion."

A bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Peter Dominick of Colorado, and in the House by Rep. Philip Crane of Illinois which states that "No labor organization shall use, directly or indirectly, any part of the dues, assessments, or other moneys collected from any person covered by an agreement requiring membership in such labor organization as a condition of employment for any political purpose whatsoever. . . ."

Discussing the bill, Rep. Crane states that ". . . the use of compulsory union dues for political purposes seriously jeopardizes our system of representative government. It dilutes political freedom and outrageously violates the basic rights of workers whose money is being misused. I believed strongly that there can be no meaningful campaign reform legislation unless it puts a stop to these political spending abuses."

The need to get labor unions out of political activity is recognized by the friends of organized labor as well as by its critics. Ten years ago, Justice Hugo Black said: "There can be no doubt that the federally sanctioned union shop contract here, as it actually works, takes a part of the earnings of some men and turns it over to others who spend a substantial part of the funds so received in efforts to thwart the political, economic and ideological hopes of those whose money has been forced from them under authority of law."

There are many different ways in which union dues have been unfairly and illegally used for partisan political purposes. "Campaign contributions made from union treasuries may be made under at least 13 differ-

ent headings," claims election-financing authority Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University. A favorite ploy is the "nonpartisan" registration drive, actually designed to recruit large numbers of Democratic voters in pivotal states and districts. In 1970 California unions registered nearly 400,000 new voters in behalf of Democratic candidates. Two years earlier, labor recruited 4.6 million voters for Hubert Humphrey. Experts estimate that the 1968 registration drive was financed by more than \$2 million in union dues.

Each individual American should have the right to support those candidates and causes with which he agrees, both with his money, his time, and his energy. But, in a free society, no one should be compelled to finance causes and candidates with whom he disagrees with the threat of losing his employment if he refuses. Beyond the fact that it is a contradiction to speak of both a free society and one in which men must join private labor organizations before they may work, it is even more unthinkable to speak of campaign spending reform without dealing effectively with the influence of political pressure and financing by labor unions. As Senator Dominick pointed out, ". . . dollar restrictions whether they be on contributions or campaign expenditures are too simplistic to regulate something as individualistic as a political campaign." What we can do, however, is provide for an independent commission to provide full disclosure and publication of all campaign contributions and expenditures, and we can act to stop the abuses of private groups, such as labor unions.

The very integrity of Congress is at stake in this issue. Will men who have received tens of thousands of dollars from labor unions act to curb this flow of funds? Only time will tell.

PLEA-BARGAINING ABUSE, EPITOME OR TURNSTILE JUSTICE, CALLS FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, there have been many proposals before the House for improvements in the criminal justice system to reduce crime and rehabilitate convicted criminals. Billions of dollars are being spent through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in this regard.

Yet, all of these efforts are wasted if the administration of the judicial system is not extensively overhauled. One area where abuse is frequent is in the use of plea bargaining. This is where the prosecution and the defense attorney get together and permit an accused felon to plead guilty to a lesser charge and thus eliminate the need for a trial.

In some cases, plea bargaining is helpful to relieve temporary overloads in court calendars. However, when chronic overloads necessitate extended use of such a device, or when district attorneys argue that it is easier to obtain a conviction on a robbery case than on a rape charge, then extensive overhaul of the court system is urgently needed. The fact is, the conviction and sentencing and subsequent consideration for parole of a rapist is far different than that of a robber. The latter is a crime against property and certainly a serious problem. The

former is one of the most vicious crimes against a person and one that cannot be tolerated or treated lightly by society.

A classic example of the distortion of our criminal justice system made possible by plea bargaining is a recent case that took place in the Parkchester area of my district in the Bronx, N.Y. Three rapist-murders, in what is probably the most bizarre and flagrant misuse of plea bargaining, were able to whittle 187 counts of the most vicious types of crime down to three counts of first degree robbery. This is the epitome of turnstile justice.

After an intensive manhunt was initiated with more than 100 police officers directly assigned to tracking down the three who started their rape-robber rampage in December 1972, they were caught and arrested on March 15, 1973.

The suspects were Philip Rahming, 26; David Hoover, 20; and Dorian Williams, 26. They were arraigned after giving full admissions to the 18 cases of rape and robbery, and were identified by several of the victims. They were arraigned on March 16, 1973—and were held in a total bail of \$1,250,000, because of the severity and viciousness of their crimes.

Philip Rahming was on 4 years of parole after serving 3 years for rape, sodomy, and burglarizing. The two other suspects had a total of 15 arrests including rape charges.

At the time of their arrest they made full admissions to the assistant district attorney, Bruce Goldstone, who was the same assistant district attorney who had prosecuted the prior rape case of Rahming.

The modus operandi of the three was to enter an apartment after midnight, hold knives to the throats of the awakened couples, and then tie up the husband and rape and perform sexual atrocities on the wife, in front of her family. They marauded around an apartment terrorizing a family, usually for a period of 3 hours. Then they robbed the apartments and when they were caught, some of the stolen goods were found on their premises.

The three were brought before a grand jury by the Bronx District Attorney's Office, and eight of the victims appeared before the grand jury. The grand jury returned a total of 187 counts against the three, involving rape, sodomy, burglary, robbery, felonious assault, possession of stolen property, and possession of weapons.

Among those who appeared before the grand jury to testify against the three terrorists were Anzel Grau. Today his home is a fortress with permanent bars covering his windows.

Other victims who appeared before the grand jury to testify against the three included one woman who leaped out of the window onto a fire escape after being attacked, another woman who only 5 weeks before the incident had given birth to a baby, and other families that were victims of all the atrocities with which the three were charged. Not only did the victims identify the trio—but the trio, in a flight of braggadocio, identified the victims by pairing the husbands with the wives.

After the indictment of 187 counts against the three was presented and bail was reset at \$1,250,000—the Bronx Dis-

strict Attorney's Office entered into plea-bargaining with the defendant's attorney—the Legal Aid Society. The result was that 184 counts were dropped and the three pleaded guilty to one count each of first degree robbery.

Sentencing is scheduled for Tuesday, July 17, by Justice Lawrence Tonetti, in Bronx Supreme Court, 161st Street and Grand Concourse. Several of the victims, including Anzel Grau came to my office to complain.

Mr. Grau told me:

All they are being charged with is armed robbery—no more than if they held up my wife and me at knife point in the elevator. That is not what happened. The most vicious of crimes took place, and the most vicious of criminal behavior took place against us and the other 17 families that are the known victims. Justice is not being served here. The crimes are not being punished, and in the name of clearing the calendar, these unrehabilitated criminals will be back on the streets again. And others will become the victims.

It is important that we bring forth these cases where our criminal justice system breaks down—where the courts and our penal system cannot adequately deal with the problems and where the criminal is given a "bargain" that will undoubtedly speed him back into the crime cycle. The public cannot benefit by this system. There is no process of rehabilitation—only a faster process, sanctioned by our courts and district attorneys, to put the criminal back on the streets.

If the Grau family and the other victims are frustrated and angry—and you cannot imagine the viciousness of the crimes perpetrated on them by these terrorists—I can fully understand. We are not trying to solve our crime problems and deal justice—we are only fostering a slipshod system of plea-bargaining to ease the burdens of our courts. This is poor solace for these victims—or the next victims of faulty plea-bargaining.

A TESTIMONIAL SALUTE TO FATHER HENRY E. FABRIZIO

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 15, 1973, I had the pleasure of attending a testimonial dinner in honor of Rev. Henry E. Fabrizio. Father Fabrizio recently retired as pastor of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church in Youngstown, Ohio after serving there for 21 years, including 12 years as pastor.

During the ceremonies, Father Fabrizio received several awards and tributes from his fellow clergymen, led by Most Rev. James W. Malone, bishop of Youngstown, his parishioners, and public officials, for his many years of faithful service to his church and community.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege for me to acknowledge the work of Father Fabrizio, whose spiritual leadership has been a great inspiration to all who know him. He is truly a compassionate man and a decent human being.

CXIX—1591—Part 20

Mr. Speaker, I insert excerpts from the testimonial program in the RECORD at this time:

FATHER HENRY E. FABRIZIO

Our retiring Pastor of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Church, Youngstown, was born in Wilburton, Oklahoma on October 14, 1921. He is the son of Lena and the late Samuel Fabrizio. His father was a coalminer, blacksmith and carpenter and his mother, a seamstress. At age two the family moved to Youngstown. He has a brother, Albert and two sisters, Mrs. Margaret Zena, and Mrs. Loretta DeMarinis. He was educated in Youngstown Parochial and public schools, attending Jefferson, (old) St. Ann's in Brier Hill; Hayes Jr. High and was graduated from Ursuline High. He was a member of the National Honor Society. Prior to entering the Seminary, he attended the School of Architecture of Western Reserve University, and was employed locally by the architectural firm of D'Orazio, Goodwin and Damon. While serving as head counselor of Father Kane's Camp at Lake Milton, he was also employed as a designer of various craft-items for the Cleveland Craft Co. He was awarded by the Butler Art Institute. The royalties merited helped convey further educational expenses. Later he entered St. Charles Prep-Seminary in Baltimore, Md., and completed his studies for the Priesthood at St. Mary's Major Seminary in Cleveland, Ohio. He was ordained on April 29, 1950 by the late Bishop James A. McFadden at St. Columbia Cathedral.

After ordination, his Parish work was interrupted at the Bishop's request for him to attend Kent State University; he then served on the teaching staff of Ursuline High School. He has served as assistant Pastor at St. Nicholas, Struthers, Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, Youngstown; St. Joan of Arc, Canton; St. Rose, Girard. He was appointed Pastor of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, September 29, 1961. His first endeavor was to rehabilitate the parish's spiritual assets by establishing a Confraternity of Christian Doctrine Program for children and adults. In order to develop a combined force of religious education, social and cultural, more room was needed. Father Fabrizio had faith in the Parishioners of Mt. Carmel. Thus, beginning with a practically zero bank account vs. the Good Will of his people a building fund drive was opened. From the original frontage of 87 ft. there now stands an entirely renovated east block on Summit Avenue, which includes a new educational and social center, remodeled church, new rectory, a Majestic Shrine of cut stone housing, a 7 ft. marble statue of St. Anthony, lighted parking space. The entire new building fund assessment was paid in full by July, 1972. The Parish was honored by an award from the Chamber of Commerce. While the physical improvements may be considered small, relative to other larger Parish Sites, they must be considered among the greatest when compared with the obstacles faced. The challenge was forceful, but the results were fruitful. The large return to the spiritual and other church functions are living witnesses of the Parishioners' Faith. In addition to being moderator of each Parish organization, he is a Judge on the Diocesan Tribunal, Moderator of Mahoning County Council of Catholic Nurses, Council of Catholic Women, Chaplain of K. of C. No. 274, Chaplain of Sheriff Dept., ITAMS Veterans of Post No. 3. For his dedicated service to church and community, he is portrayed in the book called, "People of Compassion," published by the McGuffey Historical Society.

Owing to several effects that linger since suffering a stroke, Bishop James Malone and Father Fabrizio have accepted the doctor's advice for him to retire. Today we are proud to honor our Pastor, a man of faith, strong character, leadership and service, Father Henry Fabrizio.

DIOCESE OF YOUNGSTOWN,
Youngstown, Ohio, April 28, 1973.

Rev. HENRY E. FABRIZIO,
Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church,
Youngstown, Ohio.

DEAR FATHER FABRIZIO: Already in an earlier letter I have accepted your resignation from the pastorate of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church in Youngstown, effective July 1, 1973.

At this time, I am writing to acknowledge that you decided upon early retirement on the advice of your physician and with my approval.

Remembering your twenty-three years of service to people in various congregations of this diocese should be a source of genuine satisfaction to you. Especially gratifying are the more than twelve years you have spent as pastor of Mount Carmel.

At Mount Carmel, under your leadership, the parish properties have been enlarged and enhanced; a new catechetical center and new rectory built; and the church entrance and interior renewed.

Since you became pastor of Mount Carmel in 1961, the spiritual life of the people has been strengthened in many ways. More people come to Sunday Mass and more children come for religious instruction. Social ties have been strengthened by various meetings and get-togethers.

With the assurance of my appreciation and with the pledge of my prayers as you look forward to retirement, I remain

Yours sincerely in Christ,

The Most Reverend JAMES W. MALONE,
Bishop of Youngstown.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER—DANCE COMMITTEE

John Cafaro, Chairman.
William Cafaro, Co-Chairman.
Michael Pope, Co-Chairman.
Ann Leone, Secretary.
John Palermo, Treasurer.
Peter Nolfi, Program, Chairman.
Frank J. Valenzisi, Program Treasurer.
Dominic Saulino, Alex Palombo, Oliver Monaco, Michael Lariccia, Nick Minnie, Michael Socca, Joseph Costarell, Nicholas Fortunato.

Anthony J. Ditata, Frank Valenzisi, Nicholas Minnie, Alessio Di Basio, Louis Pizuto, Edmund Fabrizio, Armond Rossi, Bert D'Amico.

Angela Cercone, Hostesses Chairlady.
Helen DiClerio, Rose D'Amico, Carmel DeVito, Virginia Valenzisi, Louise Babbaro, Josephine Becorder.

Dorothy Rizzuto, Rosemarie LaCivita, Jean Centofanti, Yolando Tucci, Eleanor DiClerio, Gloria Passarelli, Bounte Chairlady.
Mary Kotyk, Josephine Saulino, Carmel Socca, Roslyn Monaco, Victoria Hack, Carol Valenzisi.

Helen Occhipinti, Antoinette Palombo, Ida Sabella, Ann Betty Leonelli, Dorothy Bukovi.

GUEST BOOK

Patricia Rossi, Diana Leone, Diana Hammar, Lynda Leone.

PROGRAM

National Anthem, Nicholas DeToro.
Invocation, Rev. Joseph L. Iati, Pastor of Mt. Carmel Church.

Introduction of Toastmaster, Frank J. Valenzisi, President, Vestibule Club.

Toastmaster, Michael R. Pope, Mahoning County Treasurer.

Remarks, John Cafaro, General Chairman.
Principal Speaker, Rt. Rev. Monsignor Wm. J. Fitzgerald, Retired Pastor, St. Joan of Arc.
Remarks, Congressman Charles J. Carney.
Remarks, The Most Reverend James W. Malone, Bishop of Youngstown.

Remarks, Honorable Jack C. Hunter, Mayor of Youngstown.

Remarks, Rev. Henry E. Fabrizio, Retiring Pastor of Mt. Carmel Church.

Benediction, Rev. Msgr. Benedict C. Franzetta.

Dinner Melodies, Anthony Pesa.

Dance Music, Tom Lopresta.
Organ Compliments of Pezzenti Music Mart.

Presentations given by: Elena Di Ciero, Angela Cercone, Michael Lariccia, Frank J. Valenzisi, Alex de Blasio, Peter J. Nolfi, Atty. Joseph Schiavoni, Ann Leone, A. B. Flask, Carmela Foti, John Palermo, Wm. Holt, Harry Meshel, George Tablack, J. Phillip Richley.

OUR LADY OF MT. CARMEL CHURCH,
Youngstown, Ohio.

I want to express my gratitude to the people of Our Lady Mount Carmel Church for the warm welcome you gave me as I return once again to serve you.

May our prayers and good wishes go in unison to wish our pastor—Father Fabrizio a retirement blessed with peace, health and happiness. His total dedication of Love-service to his people will be a lasting tribute to us all. You will always be in our prayers Father, and in our hearts.

With the co-operation of all, we hope to continue Father Fabrizio's life-work toward the unification of all the Italians in this city to the mother church—Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church.

Mount Carmel says: "God's speed, Father Fabrizio."

Father JOSEPH L. IATI.

To Our Beloved Father Fabrizio:

With Great sadness we bid you farewell, but always remember you will be in our prayers and hearts forever.

We now say "Thank You Father" for all your help, kindness and generosity, during the past years and throughout our association at Mt. Carmel. We shall miss you deeply. We remain, very devotedly and respectfully,

THE MOTHERS OF THE CRUCIFIX SOCIETY,
HELEN DICIERO, *President*.
ANN LEONE, *Vice President*.
LENA CENTOFANTI, *Vice President*.
ANN FRATTAROLI, *Recording Secretary*.
JEAN COSTARELLI, *Financial Secretary*.
ELEANOR DICIERO, *Treasurer*.

Dear Beloved Father Fabrizio:

We humbly wish to extend our sincere felicitations for a very Happy and Healthy Retirement.

We wish to thank you for all the compassion and encouragement, you have shown us throughout the years with us at Mt. Carmel.

May God Bless you, and watch over you for many more years to come.

Very devotedly,
THE MEMBERS OF ST. MONICA GUILD,
ANGELA CERONE, *President*.
DOROTHY PIZZUTO, *Vice President*.
DELORES GOOD, *Vice President*.
ROSE D'AMICO, *Secretary*.
PHYLLIS DECHURCH, *Treasurer*.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Youngstown, Ohio, April 30, 1973.

Father HENRY FABRIZIO,
Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Church,
Youngstown, Ohio.

DEAR FATHER FABRIZIO: It is with a deep personal sense of regret that I read of your planned retirement as pastor of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Church.

In looking back over the last few years that I have served the city as mayor, my visits to Mt. Carmel to the Sports Banquets, the CYO Banquets, and other activities, have been a high point. No place have I gone to as mayor have I been made to feel more genuinely welcomed than in your parish. Over the years, I have come to see the warm and deep love that your communicants and the children of your parish hold for you. This has to make a man realize that service to both God and country is, in fact, worthwhile and rewarding.

Again, Father, my congratulations on an outstanding career.

My warmest best wishes in your retirement,

and if I may ever be of service to you, I would hope that you would not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

JACK C. HUNTER, Mayor.

DEAR PARISHIONERS AND BENEFACTORS OF OUR LADY OF MT. CARMEL CHURCH: You are my friends. Words, no matter how laudable, cannot convey the depth of my Pastoral affection felt with and for you during the past twelve years of our many shared experiences. Perhaps, the word 'Friend' explains my feeling best. My Friend, what is a 'Friend'?

A 'Friend' is one attached to another by Esteem, Respect and Affection. To me, a friend means much more as I see a particular significance portrayed in each letter of the word 'Friend'.

F—faith that defies hearsay opinions
R—readiness to praise instead of disapprove
I—integrity that earns respect

E—endearment through long association
N—naturalness that is based on common sense

D—dependability whenever the need arises
Thus, my dear people, with these qualities each one of you is my kind of 'Friend'. And now as time unfolds it is my earnest hope and priestly prayer that I may continue to enjoy your friendship, as my kind of 'Friend', for the remaining years that God will give.

With every best wish and priestly solicitude for you and your family, I remain,
Gratefully yours,

FATHER FABRIZIO.

ORDINATION TO THE HOLY PRIESTHOOD
(Class of April 29, 1950)

Our Blessings and Prayers go with our Classmate Father Fabrizio. However, a feeling of mixed emotions accompany our well wishes because we know that he will no longer be an active Pastor, but we do know that he will remain an active Priest. At our last Class Re-union of a few weeks ago, we all joyfully expressed, "Hank, Good Luck . . . with the Lord's help may you have a healthy and pleasant Retirement."

LIST OF SIGNATURES

Rev. John F. Anderson, Rev. George L. Budimic, Rev. Msgr. Thomas P. Campbell, Rev. John C. Clines, Rev. Francis D. Curran, Rev. Robert W. Donohoe, Rev. George M. Franko.

Rev. Msgr. Benedict C. Franzetta, Rev. Paul A. Gencur, Rev. Joseph A. Goebel, Rev. Robert J. Jenkins, Rev. William J. Johnson, Rev. Msgr. Francis A. Karowski, Rev. James P. Kenny.

Rev. James R. Kolp, Rev. James P. McCann, Rev. Joseph E. McCausland, Rev. John T. McDonough, Rev. James P. O'Brien, Rev. Edward A. Pevec, Rev. Raymond J. Smith.

Rev. Francis S. Snock, Rev. John P. Turk, Rev. Edward F. Varble, Rev. Msgr. Robert C. Wolff, Rev. Cyril Adamko, Rev. Conrad E. Aleckna, Rev. William A. Appell.

Rev. William E. Bantz, Rev. Robert P. Barrett, Rev. Joseph G. Beene, Rev. Robert E. Brengartner, Rev. Felix Carosso, SSP, Rev. James A. Clarke, Rev. Philip Conley.

Rev. John H. DeMarinis, Rev. George M. Duritsa, Rev. Peter J. Faini, Rev. Msgr. Robert C. Fannon, Rev. Anthony Fasline, Rev. Sebastian Fialko, Rev. Msgr. William J. Fitzgerald.

Rev. Msgr. Gordan Gutman, Rev. Msgr. Clarence A. Halter, Rev. Msgr. Thaddeus A. Heruday, Rev. John N. Hoey, Rev. Joseph L. Iati, Rev. Msgr. Norman P. Kelley, Rev. Edward Kowaleski.

Rev. Joseph R. Lucas, Rev. John F. Lyons, Rev. P. Breen Malone, Rev. Joseph A. Malik, Rev. Thomas J. McCarthy, Rev. Robert J. Novotny, Rev. Msgr. J. Paul O'Connor.

Rev. Robert J. O'Dea, Rev. William J. O'Neill, Rev. Joseph L. Palermo, Rev. LeRoy Paul, Rev. John Pavel, Rev. George P. Popovich, Rev. Msgr. Andrew A. Prokop.

Rev. Msgr. Donald J. Reagan, Rev. Orlando D. Rich, Rev. Michael Ronik, Rev. Robert A. Sabatino, Rev. James F. Stenson.

Rev. Martin Susko, Rev. Raymond J. Thomas, Rev. Paul R. Tobin, Rev. Bernard F. Vacca, Very Rev. Joseph A. Viano, SSP, Rev. William Yurko.

Our best wishes to our Pastor, spiritual leader, and charter member, Father Fabrizio.

We will always remember you as our club founder and leader and we will look forward to your continued advice and presence at our meeting and club functions.

THE VESTIBULE CLUB,
FRANK J. VALENZISI, *President*.

May the Lord be with you, Father Fabrizio.

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS
HOLY NAME SOCIETY
MICHAEL T. LARICCIA, *President*.
OLIVER MONACO, *Vice President*.
JOSEPH COSTARELLA, *Secretary*.
ANTHONY DITATA, *Treasurer*.

With the Lord's Help may you have A Healthy and Pleasant Retirement.

Our Lady of Mt. Carmel C.C.D. Teachers and Helpers.

Oblate Sisters, Christina Flickinger, Claire Patoray, Concetta Lariccia, Louis DeVicchio, Delores Good, Betty LoCicero, Helen Occhipinti, Delores Pallotta, Primo E. Bovara, Susan Santucci, Agnes Traficant, Peter J. Nolfi, Sandra Cortell, Louise Fata.

Good luck and best wishes (from the Ladies that kept God's House Clean).

Lucy Bucci, Mary Carnevale, Eleanor DeNucci, Carmel DeVito, Carmel Scocca, Victoria Hack, Roslyn Monaco, Gloria Passarelli, Susan Santucci, Josephine Saulino, Connie Peel.

Special to Altar Linens.
MRS. ROSE D'AMICO.

Our blessing and prayers go with our Dear Pastor and Friend, Father Fabrizio.

Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Commentators:
Primo Bovara, Vincent Campana, Vincent Carnevale, Bert D'Amico, Louis Detoro, Ralph Detoro, William Detoro, Louis DeVicchio, Matthew Giannini, Walter Good, Vito Marafioti, Dr. James Mazzi, John Palermo.

Communion ministers:
Joseph Caruso, Louis DeVicchio, Anthony Ditata.

Best wishes to Father Fabrizio for his Dedicated Service to St. Vincent De Paul Society and his most charitable attributes and service to his church and community.

ALESSIO DI BLASIO, *President*.
ALEX PALOMBO, *Secretary*.
MICHAEL T. LARICCIA, *Treasurer*.
PETER J. NOLFI.
MIKE POPE.
FRANK VALENZISI.

JUSTICE OR REVENGE?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent column in the New York Times, Tom Wicker dealt with the uprising that took place at the Attica Correctional Facility in New York State in September of 1971, and its legal aftermath.

I submit the column for the attention of my colleagues:

JUSTICE OR REVENGE?

(By Tom Wicker)

During the four-day uprising at the Attica Correctional Facility in September, 1971, a total of 43 persons were killed—one correction officer who was assaulted by inmates during the first minutes of the revolt, three inmates apparently murdered by other inmates during the time they held prison yard D, and 37 inmates and hostages killed by gunfire when D yard was recaptured.

Now the preliminary stages of trials arising from these deaths have begun in Buffalo. Sixty persons will be tried under 37 indictments alleging a variety of crimes from minor thefts to kidnapping and murder. All those to be tried under these indictments are present or former inmates.

Yet, said the official report of the New York State Commission on Attica, "the assault of Sept. 13, 1971, and its aftermath were marred by excesses." Not only did 39 persons, including hostages, die but "80 others suffered gunshot wounds . . . one out of every ten persons in D yard that morning was struck by gunfire and more than a quarter of the hostages died of bullet wounds." Among the weapons officially provided and officially fired were "shotguns, loaded with 00 buckshot pellets which would spread at distances exceeding 30 yards and hit unintended targets." The commission said "the conclusion is inescapable that there was much unnecessary shooting." But no state trooper or sheriff's deputy has been indicted.

Governor Rockefeller, the commission pointed out, "had ordered that correction officers, because of their emotional involvement, should be excluded from the assault forces. . . in fact, correction officers joined assault details and discharged weapons in several areas of the prison. Their gunfire killed at least one inmate and one hostage." But no correction officer has been indicted.

The authorities knew that retaking the prison would be a bloody business, but according to the investigating commission "they failed to make adequate provision in advance for the evacuation and treatment of the wounded." It was four hours after the last shots were fired before "emergency surgical procedures began." But no State official or prison administrator has been indicted.

Immediately after the recapture of the prison, inspection officers, and, to a lesser extent, state troopers and sheriffs' deputies, engaged in frequent and systematic acts of retribution against inmates. National Guardsmen and other outside observers, as well as a few troopers and correction officers, confirmed [to the commission] the almost universal inmate descriptions of "widespread beatings, proddings, kickings, and verbal abuse of the vilest nature." But no one who took part in these reprisals has been indicted.

And although the commission found that "no effective steps were taken on Sept. 13 to see that reprisals did not occur and no satisfactory explanation has been given for that failure," no state official has been indicted for this, either.

Of course, the Wyoming County grand jury still is meeting in Warsaw, N.Y., and may bring in more indictments. No inmates, for example, have as yet been indicted for two of the murders of other inmates alleged to have happened during the revolt. Still other inmates may be indicted for yet more crimes. It is even possible that state policemen, correction officers, sheriffs' deputies or state officials may be indicted. The Special Commission, after all, has shown that evidence against them is there for the asking.

But a certain cynicism may be pardoned, everything considered. Across the way in Elizabeth, N.J., for example, Gail Madden and George Merritt will go on trial in Union County Court in October for first-degree murder in the death of a policeman, John V. Gleason, in Plainfield, N.J., on July 16, 1967.

That was three days after the riots in

nearby Newark, in which 23 blacks were killed by police and National Guard gunfire. Patrolman Gleason fired into a crowd of blacks that he considered menacing, and wounded Bobby Lee Williams with three shots. The crowd then rushed the policeman and beat him so severely that he died a few minutes later.

Twelve blacks were indicted for first-degree murder. They were tried en masse, but only Mr. Merritt and Miss Madden were convicted, although the evidence against them was shaky. After they had served thirty months of their life sentence, appellate courts dismissed the convictions on grounds that the judge had incorrectly charged the jury by citing a conspiracy not mentioned in the indictment. The New Jersey Supreme Court upheld the dismissal but ordered a new trial, and the two defendants served nine more months in jail before a Federal judge ordered them released on bail.

Now they will be tried again, more than six years after John Gleason's death. In the meantime, no policeman, National Guardsman, sheriff's deputy, city or state official has been indicted for any of the 23 killings of black people in Newark in July, 1967.

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that we are in the midst of an energy problem—and that problem is how to avoid an energy crisis.

The problem requires a two-pronged attack: first, we need to increase the supply of energy sources; second, we must find practical ways to abate our tremendous demand for energy and to use our resources more effectively.

In order to curb our enormous demand for energy, I believe it is vitally important that this country adopt a national energy policy. For until such a policy is developed, we will continue to consume our available resources at a staggering rate and the shortages of supply and soaring energy prices will continue.

I have received a news release from the Maryland Port Administration which announces that the Port of Baltimore recently established a record by importing over a million tons of petroleum during May. This, coupled with the fuel shortages we have been witnessing in this area, is evidence that demand for petroleum products is continuing at a phenomenal rate.

At this point, I insert in the RECORD the press release from the Maryland Port Administration.

The press release follows:

PORT HAS RECORD MILLION-TON PETROLEUM IMPORT MONTH

The port of Baltimore continued a record 1973 petroleum import surge with its first "million-ton" month during May.

Total petroleum imports during that month registered 1,010,255 tons, according to figures just compiled by the Maryland Port Administration, an agency of the Maryland Department of Transportation.

The May tonnage figure represents the highest monthly petroleum handling total for the port on record. It is better than the same figure of a year ago by 200,000 tons, or about 25 per cent.

The record-breaking month brought Balti-

more's overall petroleum import totals for the first five months of 1973 to 4,358,157 tons, an increase of more than 570,000 tons or about 15 per cent over the pace set in 1972, one of the most active petroleum import years in the history of the port.

Of the overall May figure of 1.01 million tons, more than 80 per cent or 827,541 tons consisted of fuel oil. Gasoline comprised 5.1 per cent of the total, registering 32,502 tons.

Other commodities included in the figure were 121,608 tons of crude oil; 10,610 tons of kerosene; 7,833 tons of aviation fuel; 5,002 tons of diesel fuel; and 5,159 tons of asphalt. The high percentage of fuel oil and other refined petroleum products comprising the overall figure is the result of a Maryland law prohibiting petroleum refineries in the State.

While the majority of the record one million tons was unloaded at Baltimore's 12 petroleum piers, 368,569 tons of fuel oil or about 36 per cent of the overall total, was handled at a petroleum facility located in southern Maryland at Piney Point. All ships calling at this pier are husbanded from Baltimore, Piney Point's official port of entry.

The 1973 upswing in the port of Baltimore's petroleum imports follows a pattern established for that commodity last year when refinery production in the U.S. began to fall behind the unprecedented demand of the domestic consuming market.

In 1972, petroleum products were the largest single item handled in the port, reaching a total of 9.2 million tons.

DON'T DRINK THE WATER

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, until a few years ago, the admonition, "Don't drink the water!" was used only as sage advice for travelers preparing to visit another country. Then, in July of 1970 that warning was sent to the 360,000 Americans who were found by the Public Health Service's Community Water Survey to be drinking water of "potentially dangerous quality."

The results of that survey prompted me to consult with the Cornell University Water Resources and Marine Sciences Center on new legislation which was subsequently introduced to the House as the Pure Drinking Water Act. Our Public Health and Environment Subcommittee has since taken up that proposal, and I applaud the work of my colleagues on that subcommittee, who are most studiously and conscientiously fashioning legislation which promises to put an end to the growing national concern over the safety of household drinking water.

We may soon be able to act on that measure, the Safe Drinking Water Act, which is the product of the testimony and research of virtually every recognized expert in the country. And, I ask my colleagues to join me in moving for quick passage of this legislation, so that when we go home for the August recess we can assure constituents in every part of the country that Congress has taken the aggressive steps necessary to guarantee the safest possible drinking water in every home.

We must do this, because it has been particularly evident during the past year that there is serious national questioning

of the adequacy of treatment systems which furnish drinking water. One indication of the considerable attention this problem is getting is an article in this week's Newsweek magazine, "Don't Drink the Water." I insert that article, Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues can note the pressures that are building for passage of the Safe Drinking Water Act:

DON'T DRINK THE WATER

There was a wave of real fear and anxiety in Duluth, Minn., last month. Environmental Protection Agency scientists discovered an extraordinarily high concentration of asbestos fibers in the city's water supply, presumably dumped in Lake Superior by an industrial firm. Asbestos, of course, has long been associated with cancer. EPA officials doubted that the water should be declared unfit for human consumption, but they did issue a solemn warning to parents: "Prudence dictates that an alternative source of drinking water be found for very young children." Just three months earlier, 176 migrant workers in Florida's Dade County came down with typhoid fever because their water was contaminated with human sewage. In Evansville, Ind., EPA officials found 40 organic pollutants in the city's water system, two of them acutely toxic. In Ames, Iowa, another survey found fifteen poisonous chemicals in the water system.

These incidents may well only suggest the scope of the problem. The fact seems to be that America's drinking water, long deemed the safest and cleanest in the world, has been finally overtaken by the ravages of industrial pollution.

In Washington, Federal officials make no secret of their fear that the nation's outmoded methods of treating drinking water are exposing millions of Americans to cancer-causing agents, viruses, bacteria and a host of exotic new poisons emerging in ever-increasing numbers from industrial plants and factories. At least half the 130 million Americans supplied by municipal water systems drink water that has in fact been discharged from a city or industrial sewer only hours before, treated quickly and often inadequately, and then pumped back into the system. According to the EPA, there is a minimum of 4,000 cases of water-borne illnesses each year. Even more serious, in the view of Federal water experts, are the long-range dangers to health that can result from years of exposure to impure drinking water. "We are not dealing with just acute impacts, but long-term buildups," says the EPA's James McDermott. "We are saying that there are a hell of a lot of things we can't see that we are very concerned about."

DANGEROUS

This concern is reflected almost weekly by government-sponsored studies of the nation's 30,000 to 40,000 municipal water systems. One evaluation by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, for example, suggests that at least 23 million Americans are drinking water that violates the Federal safety standards, set up in 1962. Of those, fully 8 million people are regularly drinking water that government experts regard as "potentially dangerous." Unfortunately, the 1962 standards only apply to water transported across state lines; inside their boundaries, individual states are left to set up and enforce their own standards. The only action open to the EPA is to prevent interstate carriers, such as airlines and railroads, from carrying water taken from the suspect systems. At present some 25 systems, from Asheville, N.C., to Quincy, Miss., are on the EPA's banned list.

The reasons for the bans run the gamut from excessive bacteria to poor water system plumbing to inadequate sampling and treatment of water supplies. Federal experts agree, however, that the greatest threat to drinking water comes from toxic substances such as

arsenic, cadmium, cyanides—and asbestos—that are finding their way into the nation's waters in industrial-plant residues.

At present, 12,000 potentially toxic synthetic organic compounds are manufactured in the U.S., and that number is increasing by 500 annually. But according to a report by the General Accounting Office, many states simply have not bothered to analyze their drinking water for the presence of such poisons. "There has been little research of a scientific nature in the past decade," says McDermott. "The result is that when asbestos is found in Lake Superior, or mercury is discovered in some other waterway, everyone is surprised. We are finding bacteria, viruses and trace metals in drinking water now because we just started looking for them."

When it comes to water treatment, the future is even grimmer. Many of the nation's treatment systems were designed half a century ago to remove coliform bacteria from relatively clean water sources, and to prevent the transmission of typhoid, cholera and dysentery. Those goals have been largely achieved, but the traditional mix of chemical treatment, sedimentation and chlorination is not up to the task of purifying today's technology-polluted water. One of the few sure methods guaranteed to remove such pollutants is to filter the water through charcoal, but at present no more than 35 out of 12,000 public water systems that start off with polluted surface water have installed charcoal filtration systems in their treatment plants.

A major factor militating against prompt—and always expensive—installation of improved water-treatment facilities is inadequate firm evidence to link contaminated water with increased rates of disease and even death. "To be medically sure we will have to wait many years," explains Dr. Irving Selikoff of New York's Mount Sinai Hospital, referring specifically to the possible association of increased cancer risk with the asbestos-tinged water in Duluth.

CRISIS

Already, scientists consider the risk of cancer, genetic diseases and other ailments presented by America's dirty drinking water a problem approaching crisis proportions. Last week the House Public Health and Environment Subcommittee was debating a bill, passed earlier in the Senate on a voice vote, that will give the EPA immediate authority to enforce its drinking-water standards nationwide if states fail to act themselves. That bill seems certain of eventual passage.

Meanwhile, millions of Americans, including a large proportion of Duluth's population, are trying to ease their worries by drinking bottled water. But for them, too, the news is hardly reassuring. An EPA survey of 25 water-bottling plants earlier this year revealed widespread presence of bacteria and other pollutants in the bottled water, poor sanitation in the plants, and water testing so lax that "it compares most unfavorably with community water supplies."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, July 15-21 is the 15th annual observance of Captive Nations Week. Since 1917, the Communist bloc has expanded to cover one-quarter of the Earth's surface. More than 1 billion people live under Communist domination—many without their choice or consent.

Americans have ties of kinship with

all the peoples of the world, and we share the basic love of liberty with all men. During Captive Nations Week, we rededicate ourselves to the principles of freedom and human dignity, while honoring those who continually struggle in their own lands to preserve their national heritage and sovereignty.

In this Congress, I again have introduced a resolution, House Resolution 109, calling for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. This committee would examine the problems of the captive nations and their people.

TRIBUTE TO DAVE CHASEN

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, one of California's most distinguished citizens, Mr. Dave Chasen, died last month. Dave's friends are legion, and his restaurant, Chasen's, was famed throughout the world for its wonderful food and magnificent atmosphere.

The finest tribute to be paid Dave was by his good friend, Jimmy Stewart. I would like to place Mr. Stewart's statement in the RECORD:

DAVE CHASEN, 1898-1973

What do you think the odds would be that a baby born of poor parents in Odessa in southwest Russia in 1898 would one day wind up in Beverly Hills, California, successful, famous, and loved by some of the most celebrated people on earth? But God, as you know, moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform, and when this baby's family left Russia for, of all places, New Britain, Connecticut, the child was at least on the right track. In any case, he had arrived on the right continent. And when the family then settled in a home near the stage door of a Vaudeville theater in New Britain the divine script began to make some sense.

Young Dave Chasen's first step in show business was traditional. Passing through that stage door, he became a small banana in seedy vaudeville acts with which he crossed and recrossed the land, riding in gritty day coaches, sleeping in countless fleabags, eating in greasy spoons and out of tin cans, never dragging down less than a cool eight bucks a week. With a demented red wig and blacked-out teeth, he had become a member of the Noble Company of Clowns, the joy givers to the world.

Now in those days there were giants on the musical stage on Broadway—Al Jolson, Eddie Cantor, Ed Wynn—and when one of that great company, Joe Cook, laid eye on that demented red wig and those blacked-out teeth, young Dave Chasen's transfiguration was sealed. He became as much a part of the eminent Joe Cook as his right arm, and for year after year he was in hit after hit on a Broadway that was then the capital of show business. George White's "Scandals"—Earl Carroll's "Vanities"—"Hold Your Horses"—"Fine and Dandy", to name a few of the hits.

The climax of all Joe Cook shows was a production number that has never known a brother, either before or since. The curtains parted on an enormous erector set filling the entire stage, a stupefying jungle-gym of polished metal tubes, struts, pipes, supports, cunningly arranged gutters, and a tangle of chains and pulleys, not one square inch of it making any sense whatever. And imbedded in this insane tinker-toy, in a comfortable chair suspended in space, was its jewel, a

beaming gnome with a demented red wig and blacked-out teeth holding a musical triangle, adding not an iota to any understanding of the spectacle. Then the orchestra struck up the skater's waltz, with Cook sawing away on a fiddle, and a small metal ball was launched on its appointed mission, which was to roll slowly and inexorably through this flabbergasting labyrinth until finally, timed to a split second, it reached its destination and dropped—plop—squarely on its destination, the precise middle of the demented red wig, cueing our hero's single contribution to this most elaborate musical production on Broadway—one sweet little climactic tinkle on the triangle. As audience after audience stormed its appreciation of this one perfect note, the artist acknowledged the ovation with a gesture so simple, so modest, so winning that no one who ever saw it will ever forget it.

For years it was a gesture with which men and boys of good will greeted each other. It was also the key to the soul of this first and greatest of those satellite clowns called stooges—to all the world, Mazitov!

But, the great Joe Cook fell ill. He lingered long and sadly and then he was gone, and with him, Dave's career. In show business it is a very short step from glory to obscurity, and when Dave Chasen left Joe Cook's funeral it was into the darkest of obscurity.

His last appearance with Cook had been in the movies, in Hollywood, and so now it was back to Hollywood that he drifted to pick up whatever bits and pieces he could find. But there were not many. Finally, to eat and for a roof, he bethought himself of an old private art practiced for the pleasure of his friends. He began to barbecue spare-ribs at home and deliver them in buckets to modest parties and friendly gatherings. At this point in our hero's life the script left much to be desired.

But there was one aspect of Dave's life that many had overlooked. A talent they had forgotten. A talent for friendship. Over the years of both success and failure he had accumulated friends. True friends. Loving friends. Friends who, when they heard of his struggles, were concerned. But what to do?

Well, here is where one is reminded of that line about the "mystery of his ways." Among those friends Dave had accumulated there turned out to be a surprising number who had become great praisers of his spare-ribs. And when he doubled his production with a very superior chili, there were even more. And so, to make sure that none of these friends would ever have to go without this humble but tasty food, one of Dave's more solvent friends, Harold Ross, editor of the New Yorker Magazine, came up with the base cost of a little one-room-and-kitchen shack where it would always be available. Thus was born Chasen's, on the same spot that it still occupies, but at its christening the apparently dazed proprietor named it, for reasons that still defy explanation, the "southern pit barbecue", a name never once used by any known human being.

Now this was in 1936, 37 years ago, and the exodus of actors from Broadway to Hollywood had reached its full flow. Here were all these displaced New Yorkers making fortunes during the day and whimpering all night for the Great White Way, the Astor, Lindy's, and Winchell's column. As is well known, life offers no more heartbreaking sight than the spectacle of a New Yorker doomed to existence in a healthy and comfortable atmosphere.

And then the word swept through this suburb of civilization: At a certain hour in a joint on Beverly Boulevard a perpetually unemployed piano player named Harry Rosenthal, himself a native New Yorker, sat down at a tiny piano and an almost holy hush fell over the premises. Then, with ritual regularity, the first bars of "Give My Regards to Broadway" turned on the evening.

It seemed that a little bit of Broadway had fallen from out the skies one day and was enshrined in this joint called the "Southern Pit Barbecue" where earlier fugitives from the Lambs Club and the Friars, Dave's Original Sparerib and Chili Addicts, had founded a home. All over Hollywood heads lifted and hopes revived as one by one and then in small groups these castaways began to make their way to this branch office of Broadway at 9039 Beverly Boulevard, where a civilized man from a civilized community could gather and converse with other civilized men about such civilized subjects as the New York Giants, Lee and Jake Shubert and Gin Rummy.

And what a pleasure palace it was in those days. Throwing caution to the wind, Dave had added steaks and chops to his menu and brought in a few chairs and tables for the weaker and more fastidious. Still nothing fancy, of course, but members of the more or less fair sex were beginning to show up with their husbands or beaux, and experiments were being made with vegetables. There was even talk of gambling for a night or two with a salad—just to see how it went.

But such progress in the cuisine was only incidental to the main event. Sure enough, precisely at 10 o'clock, that magnificent but permanently unemployed pianist sat himself down at the piano and the moment had come. Just as the British signaled to the world their fealty with "God Save the King", this brave little band of displaced thespians had their anthem: "Give My Regards to Broadway". And by the last note of this musical opening there was rarely a dry eye in the place.

Nor was that all. In those days there was no nightclub anywhere with a show like that at Chasen's every night. If it wasn't Astaire improvising a dance, it was the Italian lark, Jimmy Durante, spellbinding all true music lovers with the magic of his voice. The great Bill Fields, Humphrey Bogart reciting Shakespeare 'til the wee hours of morning. There were no stage waits at all. The least fraction of a second of silence inevitably brought to their feet a quartet of Irish warblers named Jimmy Cagney, Pat O'Brien, Spencer Tracy and Frank McHugh to touch every heart with "When Irish Eyes Are Smiling", "Mavourneen" and other rejects from the emerald isle, following which the great Joe Kerrigan from the Irish players and former patrolman, Ed McNamara of the Paterson, New Jersey Police Force sang softly to each other—*tooralooraloor*—while a dozen other gifted artists were being prevented only by main force from seizing the floor before the current performer had finished his contribution to the evening.

But since there is a limit to all youthful exuberance, in business as well as humans, those larkish days are long gone and the southern pit barbecue is now Chasen's, an aristocrat among restaurants. And its clientele is no longer even mainly theatrical. Gourmets are like termites in tracking down good food and while there is still chili and occasionally spareribs, the menu now lists items incomprehensible to any but top linguists. It is on every honors list of de duxe kitchens and there are few other heights to be conquered. Dave left while he was well ahead.

But unshared success is enough for few men. For Dave it needed one more blessing, someone to turn to and share it with when the doors finally closed at night, and then Maude King Martin came into his life some 30 years ago. A southern belle, now as well as then, she was both beautiful and intelligent, and she was Mrs. Dave Chasen for the rest of his life, his partner in the business as well, and finally the strength that was failing him. And when Kay, her daughter by a previous marriage, presented him with two grandsons and a granddaughter, he had the family he had always yearned for.

It would be hard to think of what more life could have given Dave—a family sealed in by affection, success in his work and art beyond anything he could ever have imagined, great eminence and the love and respect of people whose love and respect is worth having, and finally the knowledge that no matter how long they lived his family need never know want. If death had to come, how better could he have been prepared for it?

But now that he is gone, and all of us here are the losers in more ways than we can yet realize, let us hold back the tears for a minute or two. Whatever our faiths, most of us would like to believe that there is a some kind of hereafter where in time we will all see each other again. In some cases this may be a questionable fate, but in others it is a comforting thought. We've all had ones we loved that we must always look forward to holding again in our arms.

Let it be only a fancy if you must, but let us think for a moment or two of Dave's reunions—of the flash of joy in his heart when he sees again that oldest of his friends, the great Joe Cook—and then when he embraces the one he loved the most, Ross himself. And then McNamara, that flat-broke man who did what he could in the early days of a faltering joint by showing up nightly as a stand-in for a customer. And then the outrageous but eternally Dave's friend, the terrible-tempered Mr. Bill Fields. And the permanently unemployed pianist, longing even in Heaven for those nights when he opened the festivities with "Give My Regards to Broadway". And that kindest and most entertaining of men, Bob Benchley. And Charlie Butterworth and Jimmie Walker and James Thurber. And then Frank Morgan and the elegant Mr. Lucius Beebe and the terrifying Gene Fowler, warning one and all that if a fight started he would make no pretense of fighting fair. Ben Hecht, Herman Mankiewicz, John McClain, Mickey Neilan, Charlie Mac Arthur—but the list is endless. Old friends all together again—and now Dave's company forever.

JUDICIAL ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the District of Columbia is currently considering H.R. 9056, a bill that would provide substantial changes in the government of the District of Columbia, especially as it relates to the courts, the court system, and judicial administration generally.

Yesterday I received a copy of a letter from the Chief Judge Gerard D. Reilly of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals responding to a request from the chairman of the House District Committee, the Honorable CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., of Michigan, to comment on the bill. The views expressed by Judge Reilly are provided in his capacity as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration established by District of Columbia Code 11-1701. He indicated that he was authorized to state that the views expressed in his letter reflect the unanimous recommendations of all the member judges of the committee.

I insert Judge Reilly's letter in the

RECORD at this point because I believe it is an especially well written letter which addresses some of the problems for which I have some concern as they relate to home rule legislation.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

COURT OF APPEALS.

Washington, D.C., July 16, 1973.

Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.,

Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to thank you for asking my comments on H.R. 9056.

The principal objective of the bill is to create a municipal charter for the District of Columbia under which limited legislative authority is delegated to the local government, subject to Congressional oversight. The bill provides that if the charter is adopted by popular referendum, the executive powers will be vested in an elected mayor and the legislative powers in an elected council of 13, five of whom shall be elected at large. The bill contains numerous provisions relating to the reorganization of departments and agencies of the District government, the issuance of bonds, and the continuation of Federal payments by direct Congressional appropriations, with audits by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Inasmuch as the bill also proposes some far-reaching changes in the Act of Congress dealing with the District of Columbia judicial system, I shall confine my comments on the bill to those provisions. I refer particularly to Part C of Title IV, Sections 431-434 inclusive, Section 602(c) of Title VI, and Section 718 of Title VII.

Under Part C (Section 432), vacancies in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and in the Superior Court will be filled through appointment by the elected mayor, with the advice and consent of the elected council, instead of by Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation.

In selecting judges, the mayor is required by Section 434 to make his nominations from a list of not less than three or more than five names for each vacancy submitted to him by a newly created body called the Judicial Nomination Commission. This commission is to consist of seven resident lawyers, four of whom are also to be appointed by the mayor from lists provided him by the District of Columbia bar and the Council respectively, the other three being appointees of the Speaker, the President of the Senate, and the President of the United States respectively. None of the commissioners would be appointed by the judiciary.

Section 432 alters the composition of the five-member Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure. Section 11-1522 of the D.C. Code provides that three members of this body are to be appointed by the President, one by the Commissioner of the District, and one by the Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court. If Section 432 of the bill becomes law, however, the President will play no part in the selection of the Commission, four of the five members to be appointed by the elected mayor when vacancies occur.

Section 718 purports to continue the D.C. Court of Appeals, the Superior Court, and the Commission as provided in the Court Reorganization Act of 1970, subject to the provisions of Part C, Title IV, to which reference has been made, but the duration of such "continuation" seems to be of a temporary character by reason of subsection 602(c), which places only an 18-month's limitation upon the authority of the Council "to pass any act affecting the structure, organization, or jurisdiction of the District of Columbia courts."

From the standpoint of judicial administration, such drastic changes as these in the court system of the District of Columbia seem highly premature. It was less than three years ago that the District of Colum-

bia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act (Act of July 29, 1970, Pub. L. No. 91-358) became law. This statute, the product of extended committee hearings and consideration in the House and Senate, lengthy floor debate, and review by the conference managers of both branches of Congress, accomplished the most comprehensive reform of the judicial system in this jurisdiction undertaken in this century. Its enactment also represented the consensus of studies of law enforcement agencies and the practicing bar for improving the fairness and efficiency of the administration of justice in this city.

As you are aware, the 1970 Act did away with the dual jurisdiction of the federal courts here by making the Superior Court (formerly a combination of the General Sessions, Tax, and Juvenile Courts) a trial court of general jurisdiction over all local matters, both criminal and civil, and elevating the D.C. Court of Appeals to the status of the highest appellate tribunal in the District on appeals from judgment of the trial court and petitions for review of orders of the Commissioner, Council, and agencies of the local government. This Act itself has not become completely effective, as the third and final transfer of jurisdiction from the federal district court to the Superior Court will not occur until August 1, 1973. On that date, the Superior Court will have unlimited jurisdiction over civil actions for damages and probate matters, including supervision of the Office of Register of Wills. The validity of those provisions of the Act giving the new trial court complete felony jurisdiction was upheld against Constitutional challenge in the Supreme Court less than three months ago. See *Palmore v. United States*, 93 S. Ct. 1670 (slip op. April 24, 1973).

Needless to say, the task of judicial administration of a system which is still in the process of transition has not been an easy one, particularly as the courts are scattered in six different buildings. Nevertheless, despite the tremendous increase in the number of trials and appeals, the calendars of both the trial and appellate court are reasonably current. In this respect, our new D.C. judicial system has become a model for courts in other parts of the country. Its ability to dispose promptly of criminal cases at both the trial and appellate levels has no doubt been a contributing factor to the dramatic reduction in the number of crimes committed in the city, although the figure is of course still too high. In any event, the obvious interest of the federal government in the administration of criminal justice here suggests that the new judicial system should be allowed to mature and gain experience before subjecting it to further major modifications.

It should also be noted that the sections of the bill changing the method of appointment of judges would mark an abrupt departure from tradition. Since time immemorial* (including the period from 1871 to 1878 when the District had an autonomous territorial form of government with a legislative assembly elected by the voters), judges of the District have been appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. If H.R. 9056 were a statehood bill, vesting the power of judicial appointment in the chief executive of the newly established state subject to the confirmation by the elected legislature

*This practice began in 1801, when the seat of federal government was moved from Philadelphia to Washington, whereupon Congress established the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia (2 Stat. 103, 105), superseded in 1865 by another trial court of general jurisdiction called the District Supreme Court (12 Stat. 762). While it was ultimately held that the latter court had jurisdiction over cases arising under federal statutes, *Swift & Co. v. United States*, 276 U.S. 311, 324 (1928), the bulk of the business of these courts dealt with purely District of Columbia matters.

might be a logical step. But the pending bill does not confer statehood on the District and indeed could not do so without an antecedent Constitutional amendment. The bill expressly reserves ultimate legislative authority in Congress (Section 603), exempts the National Planning Commission and other agencies from control of the local government (Section 602), and makes any legislative action of the council subject to a veto in either house of Congress. Thus the proposed legislation is much more analogous to the kind of county or municipal charter bills which are enacted from time to time by state legislatures to confer some measure of home rule to county or city governments. I know of no state, however, which authorizes officials of cities or counties, even those exercising a great degree of autonomy, to appoint judges of appellate courts or trial courts of general (i.e., unlimited) jurisdiction. To the extent that power to fill judicial vacancies has even been conferred upon mayors of cities, it has been applicable only to petty courts whose functions are limited to the trial of misdemeanors and small claims.

In any event, whatever decision the committee makes as to the ultimate appointing authority, it is submitted that the provisions of the bill dealing with the courts need to be amended in major respects in order to preserve the independence of the judiciary. It must be remembered that the Administrative Procedure Act makes orders of the Commissioner and the Council as well as subordinate administrative bodies subject to judicial review. Hence the Court of Appeals is frequently confronted with cases in which the highest officers of the District of Columbia are litigants in their official capacities. Such controversies include challenged decisions of the Council or the Zoning Commission on highway closings, development of the Georgetown waterfront, and projected rezoning for major commercial developments in residential areas. Trial judges also are frequently called upon to sit in judgment on the local government in such delicate questions as tax assessments and heavy damage claims against the city by contractors.

It is not the function of the court to interfere with the discretion of the municipal bodies in the handling of such matters but it is its obligation to see to it that their actions are exercised within the limits of the statutory authority and procedural standards prescribed by Congress. Thus it is most important that the judges in passing upon such questions should be free of any possible prospect of retaliation with respect to reappointment.

In my opinion, the provisions of the bill relating to the Nominating Commission, the Commission on Judicial Disabilities, and the authority of the Council eventually to pass acts "affecting all aspects of such courts", severely impair the insulation from political pressures which the Judicial Reorganization Act of 1970 sought to bring about. As previously noted, the membership on both commissions will consist of a majority of mayoral appointees.

Chief Judge Greene of the Superior Court in his letter to you on H.R. 9056 has pointed out in some detail the deficiencies of the bill in those respects as well as the desirability of writing into it provisions designed to preserve the tradition of reappointment of judges of proven competence. He has suggested a number of amendments which would greatly improve the judicial sections of the pending bill.

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration established by D.C. Code 11-1701, I am authorized to state that the views expressed in that letter reflect the unanimous recommendations of all the member judges. It is our sincere hope that your committee in amending H.R. 9056 will adopt these recommendations.

Faithfully yours,

GERARD D. REILLY,

PHASE IV

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, phase IV of the new economic policy is a new set of regulations and guidelines to help us move as rapidly as possible toward the day when we can do away with all controls on our national economy.

Phase IV honors President Nixon's commitment to consumers that he would effectively stabilize the retail price of food.

At the same time, the new regulations indicate a clear understanding of the fact that if food production is to be increased we must allow farmers, processors, and handlers to make a profit.

This fact shows unmistakably in the exemption for raw agricultural products—so farmers can increase production—and in the provision for a dollar-for-dollar passthrough of increased costs to allow processors and retailers to continue operations. Stage A allows a dollar-for-dollar passthrough to reflect raw agricultural costs since June 8. Stage B, effective September 12, will allow all cost increases of food manufacturers and processors to be passed through to the ultimate buyer. Ceiling prices on beef also will be ended September 12.

For 40 years we created and added to perennial farm problems through Government interference in the normal operation of commodity markets.

We had a passion—understandable in depression years, but inexcusable since—to interpose Government direction along with Government payments in an attempt to help farmers derive more income than they could get through commercial marketing of their production.

We set high support prices for commodities, put limitations on farm production and provided Government interference in the marketplace.

The most notable accomplishment of our activities in this area, however, has been that farmers are not getting for their commodities what they actually are worth on the market, and tax dollars are being used to make up the difference in payments to farmers.

By continuing to hang onto these expensive and unrealistic programs long past the time when they could be justified, we have added fuel to the raging fires of inflation that now are threatening to get out of hand.

Constructive steps were taken in the Agricultural Act of 1970 to change from a tightly controlled agriculture based on the outdated historical plantings and allotments of yesteryear to a market-oriented program for wheat, feed grains, and cotton.

The economic wisdom of this move has been evident in the surge of increased net farm income. Last year, farmers earned \$19.2 billion. This year the net farm income may go above \$22 billion.

World demand for grains and oilseeds is growing faster than farmers around the world can keep up. United States farmers with their superior technology

and know-how virtually hold the key to world production of livestock and high quality protein foods in their hands.

This year U.S. farmers are bringing back into production 34 million acres of land that were idled under previous Federal crop-control programs.

Farmers now contract much of their grain, soybean and cotton crops for future sale. They carry commodities under Government nonrecourse loans until delivery. This is a legitimate and proper use of Government power. It offers protection to producers when they need it. At the same time it leaves farmers free to make their own production decisions and to do their own marketing.

By sharing some of the risk with farmers, yet without shouldering the high and unnecessary cost of a heavily subsidized agriculture, the public, including consumers, encourages additional needed food and fiber production to meet actual market demands.

Public recognition and acceptance of this responsibility will be highlighted as we move through stages A and B of phase IV. I fervently hope that we will soon be able to cast off all arbitrary and artificial controls and return again to a free economy. Meanwhile, phase IV will help us move in that direction.

THE WATERGATE—THE TERRIBLE PRICE OF AN ISOLATED PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, it seems reasonably clear by now that the tragedy of Watergate has fallen on the Presidency and, therefore, on all of us, in large part because the President made himself a virtual prisoner of the top members of his staff. By setting up Messrs. Haldeman and Ehrlichman, and their colleagues, as buffers between himself and most of the rest of the world, including majority and minority leaders in Congress, Mr. Nixon placed Haldeman and Ehrlichman in a position to decide what the President saw and read and heard and what communications went out from the President.

As a result, Haldeman and Ehrlichman found themselves in a position of enormous power, being able not only to speak and act in the name of the President, but to influence his actions by controlling the flow of information and people to him. Obviously these two men lacked any fundamental understanding of the nature or importance of our constitutional system or of the democratic political process. They did not arrive in their position as a result of a basic interest in the political process but by the accidental fact that they were the members of a public relations firm that happened to be engaged by Mr. Nixon in some of his earlier political campaigns.

Whether consciously or unconsciously, their actions all moved in the direction of consolidating all power in the White

House, and in their own hands in particular, to the eventual destruction of the system of checks and balances created by the Founding Fathers.

In a recent issue of New York magazine, Mr. Fred W. Friendly, a former president of CBS News, has written with great wisdom and compelling detail about the high price of a President in an isolation booth. As Mr. Friendly puts it:

It isn't just the public's right to know that's been obstructed; it's the President's need to know that's been sacrificed . . .

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Friendly's article in the RECORD:

PAYING THE HIGH PRICE OF A PRESIDENT IN AN ISOLATION BOOTH

(By Fred W. Friendly)

Journalists and other defenders of a free press are fond of quoting from Mill, Milton, Madison, Holmes, Brandeis, and Hamilton in his plea for Zenger. These ringing pronouncements have their obvious truths, but it might well be that better shelter can be found in the rather earthy retort a crusty old reporter once growled at a President of the United States.

President Teddy Roosevelt, in a 1906 Gridiron dinner speech, borrowed a term from *Pilgrim's Progress* and created what he intended to be a pejorative phrase—"muckraker"—castigating "the writers who raked the muck of society and never looked up. . . ." The day after that attack, Lincoln Steffens called on Roosevelt in the White House and said, "Well, Mr. President, you have put an end to all those journalistic investigations that made you."

Ironically, the specific investigation that Roosevelt was protesting was an exposé called *Treason of the Senate* which revealed many Senators to be more the agents of big corporations than representatives of the citizens of their states. Eventually, *Treason of the Senate* led to the passage of the Seventeenth Amendment, which called for the popular election of United States Senators rather than by State Legislatures, and this reform was of significant advantage to the programs of Teddy Roosevelt.

Indeed, muckrakers, from Steffens and David Graham Phillips, who wrote *Treason of the Senate*, to Paul Y. Anderson, who helped uncover Teapot Dome, to Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, who investigated Watergate, have continuously been the targets of attack and suppression in the name of "law and order." William Allen White, an old colleague of Steffens, wrote the classic editor's response to those Americans who, in times of stress, are willing to sacrifice "just a little freedom" for tranquility and order. The editorial, entitled "To an Anxious Friend," was an open letter written by White to a reader of *The Emporia Gazette* who was troubled about Editor White's commitment to "boat rocking" and dissent:

"You tell me that law is above freedom of utterance. And I reply that you can have no wise laws nor free enforcement of wise laws unless there is free expression of the wisdom of the people—and, alas, their folly with it. . . . Violence, indeed, is the child of suppression. Only force and repression have made the wrecks in the world."

The current wreck of the White House can be traced to the very kinds of attempts at suppression that Steffens and White warned against. Journalists like Steffens and White attempted to report and interpret the flow of news; the recent gang of White House zealots have tried to stifle and control it. That they would attempt to obfuscate the public's view of the President is bad enough (others have tried it), but the deadliest sin is that they have provided their leader with a distorted view of reality which may make it impossible for him to govern.

The lesson of Watergate, of the plot to nullify the First Amendment, is not just a chronicle of bugging with honor and sabotage with "lofty motives," it is the anatomy of willful national deception and self-deception. It is not just the public's right to know that has been obstructed—it is the President's need to know that has been sacrificed and squandered.

And when the final chapter of Richard Nixon's "seven crises" is written, it will not be his foes or the devils in the media, but his friends and surrogates and their bizarre schemes, played out under the guise of zealous devotion and patriotism, which killed what he once called his driving dream.

A generation from now when another President permits his hired hands to attempt to intimidate some future journalists, there must be a documented record of the battle that raged between journalists and the White House since Agnew's Des Moines speech of November 13, 1969. That record will indicate when and how even the "silent majority" finally learned who was really trying to fool them; who was peddling all that "elitist gossip and plugola"; who lied—Dan Schorr or the President who accused him of telling "a small lie"; who told the truth—*The Washington Post* or the Attorney General of the United States; who performed the public service—the news media or the agents of the Committee for the Re-election of the President. That Des Moines speech Patrick Buchanan wrote for Vice President Agnew survives as a document in default. All those shrill warnings of media manipulation are bench marks in reverse for the profession they were calculated to discredit and frighten.

In this documentary history—"Nixon's Seventh Crisis"—a vital exhibit will certainly be that remarkable interview that the President gave to Saul Pett of the Associated Press last January, just a few days before his second inaugural. Twice he made it "perfectly clear" that, unlike his predecessors, he insulates himself from television news and newspapers, lest he, to quote the President's own words, "... go up the wall." Time and time again in the interview he proclaimed his lack of emotion. In his own words, "I have a reputation for being the coolest person in the room..." Four times he insisted that he never reads columnists or watches commentators because "I get my news from the news summary the staff prepares every day, and it's great; it gives all sides..." I never watch TV commentators or the news shows when they are about me. That's because I don't want my decisions influenced by personal emotional reactions." In a specific put-down of James Reston, he says: "... All that matters is that it comes out all right. Six months from now nobody will remember what the columnists wrote."

Mr. Nixon must just be wrong about that prophecy. In fact, a couple of weeks before Nixon's landslide victory last fall, James Reston speculated on the price he might have to pay for his Watergate silence:

"The Congressmen... will be back in January, and then the President will have to persuade them that he didn't really know about those dirty tricks in the campaign, and wants and needs their cooperation... but after Vietnam and Watergate, and the election the going is likely to be very rough."

Reston's prophetic warning will seem obvious to future historians searching for clues as to why President Nixon could not have understood that his overwhelming mandate would be replaced by a national mood of shrinking confidence.

Was it possible that the President wasn't aware of what his closest aides most surely knew? For now, we have his promise that he didn't. We also have his word through that remarkable Pett interview that he didn't

know what the columnists and commentators were saying about Watergate and all those other V.D.T.s (very dirty tricks). That high, spiked wall Richard Nixon erected between himself and the news media worked both ways. Even on his own terms it denied him an honest picture of what major newspapers, magazines and broadcast organizations were telling his public. Incredible as it sounds, if President Nixon is accurate in his report that he knew nothing about White House staff involvement until March 21, then many Americans had better intelligence on the crime than did their Chief Executive. If he was shielded as much on other crucial matters as he was on this sordid affair, then the most powerful executive on earth was the victim of an intelligence gap to rival that of those broadcasting presidents during the quiz scandals of 1959. They, too, took the responsibility but not the blame.

If President Nixon denied himself periodic access to serious disclosures on Watergate and all its ramifications, was he also ignorant of all those raids on the media committed by his most trusted aides? The President's public utterances would indicate that he disapproved of any such attempts at intimidation. In 1971, in an interview with Allen Drury, he said what Presidents from George Washington to Lyndon B. Johnson believed: "... I have one of the most hostile and unfair presses that any President has ever had."

But then Mr. Nixon went further: "... I have never called a publisher, never called an editor, never called a reporter on the carpet... That's what makes 'em mad. That's what infuriates 'em. I just don't care..."

Some may doubt the credibility of that seemingly self-disciplined credo, but taking the President at his own word that he "doesn't read the columnists" and never called a publisher, editor, or reporter, then there is a frightening gap between the course of action set by the President and what is carried out by deputies who write on his stationery.

President Nixon may have never called a reporter, but Vice President Agnew, Attorney General Mitchell, H. R. Haldeman, John Ehrlichman, Patrick Buchanan, Herbert Klein, Clay Whitehead, Charles Colson and Kenneth Clawson have jointly or severally attacked Dan Schorr, Dan Rather, David Brinkley, Mike Wallace, Walter Cronkite, Sander Vanocur, Anthony Lewis, Katherine Graham, Jack Anderson, Tom Wicker, Bill Moyers, John Hart, Frank Reynolds, Marvin Kalb, Stuart Loory, and a seemingly endless list of other newsmen. Was the President not aware of these attacks?

Mr. Nixon insists he never called a publisher, but can it be news to him that John Ehrlichman, at a breakfast meeting with the head of the CBS News, tried to destroy Dick Salant's faith in Dan Schorr and Dan Rather, and suggested with a smile that Rather be transferred to an assignment in Texas? Did the President not know of the luncheon where Haldeman complained to editors of *The Los Angeles Times* about their coverage of the President? And was the President unaware that when *Newsday* ran a probing series on President intimate Bebe Rebozo, press secretary Ron Ziegler took retribution by not only dropping that newspaper's White House correspondent from the China trip, but also denying him access to routine information that all White House correspondents normally get?

Could the President, who never tried to intimidate a reporter, have been ignorant of the F.B.I. investigation of Daniel Schorr for a job opening never legitimately intended for him at the Council on Environmental Quality? In the summer of 1971 I was one of those contacted by the F.B.I. then investigating Mr. Schorr. I refused to be interviewed and used the opportunity to write

J. Edgar Hoover in order to open the entire issue of F.B.I. clearance and investigations. I asked him what job, if any, Schorr was being considered for. He replied:

"DEAR MR. FRIENDLY: I have received your letter of November 12 and while I readily understand the interest and concern which prompted you to write, I regret I am unable to furnish the information you are seeking. I can suggest only that you may wish to direct your inquiry to the White House regarding the investigation of Mr. Schorr. I am sorry I cannot be of help in this instance. Sincerely yours,

"J. EDGAR HOOVER."

I remarked at the time that this was the first instance in which a query to a Government official had been bucked upwards. Perhaps Mr. Hoover was trying to tell me something.

If the job offer—never discussed with Schorr—was legitimate, how could a reporter whom the President and four of his closest aides derided and called dishonest be considered for it? What may be a revealing clue came from Patrick Buchanan, the lens through whom Mr. Nixon views the press. Buchanan appeared on *The Dick Cavett Show* March 22, and the record of that evening is probably the most disturbing piece of videotape since his boss's tantrum at the Los Angeles Hilton in November of 1962.

After calling the *Washington Post's* coverage of Watergate "shoddy journalism," Buchanan gave what he considered a "not unreasonable... explanation" of why "they were going to offer Mr. Schorr a job."

"If you've got a guy that's hatcheting you night after night maybe you come and say to yourself, 'Why don't we offer that clown a job, and give him a big, fat paycheck, and get him off so we can get someone else.' That's the only explanation I can give."

That's not hearsay or something Buchanan mumbled to friends late at night in a bar. This was spoken in full view of an audience of millions. Buchanan did add, however, that it was not his decision, and to quote him again, "given Schorr's bigotry and bias against the [Nixon] Administration, the individual that was going to offer Schorr a job made a bonehead play..."

Aside from the arrogance of Buchanan's theory, the chill factor comes from his conception of what is reasonable. The President views the performance of the news media through the distortion of this convex lens, this narrow band filter which distorts and views everything in polarized extremes.

This faulty lens transmits images for which the President and the people pay a heavy price. A classic example involves a minor speech Dan Rather delivered to a junior college in his native state of Texas. The CBS News correspondent referred to President Nixon as "the greatest loner ever to occupy the White House." In the weeks that followed, Rather noticed that his most reliable contacts in the Administration began to dry up on him—repeated phone calls to White House staffers went unanswered. His competition began to receive routine announcements before he did, causing his editors to ask why he was losing out on stories. Finally, in frustration, Rather sought out a friend on the President's staff who showed him a recent copy of Buchanan's dope sheet and asked, "What kind of treatment do you expect after that Houston speech?" A shocked Dan Rather read Buchanan's version: "Rather called President Nixon the greatest loser ever to occupy the White House." When Rather finally caught up with Buchanan, he said he'd put out a correction.

Buchanan's digest is often more of a press agent's scorecard of air time, front-page space, favorable mentions and bad ones than a serious review of what the news media are saying. It is written in a special jargon that

neatly separates foes from friends. Some random samples:

"Brinkley really zapped us on that one."

"Reston, too, acknowledges RN [Nixon] is moving on many programs which needed to be cut—but then he says RN is moving 'too fast,' when if it were a liberal, we'd hear about 'hold leadership.'"

"Mudd gave a typically rhapsodic intro to acknowledged Senate leader in battle with WH [White House]... cited Sam [Ervin] as living proof seniority sometimes work—the right man in right place at right time."

"LA Times piece on Presidential humor gives RN positive treatment... says RN's humor seems to be surfacing more... notes various RN quips such as 'outhouse' question at news conference..."

The Buchanan report, which is really a kind of *Gallagher Report* for the President, would be a joke if it weren't so tragic. Capsulizing and pre-digesting the news in this way is like putting the President on a diet of "uppers and downers"—it robs him and the nation of a sense of proportion and reality.

Even now there is evidence that Mr. Nixon has an unreal vision of how public opinion measures his personal involvement in Watergate and the alleged cover-up. Two weeks ago the Associated Press reported that at a White House dinner, the President told the wife of a Cabinet member, "This is a time of great heartbreak... It always is sad when you find personal friends in trouble."

Other Presidents have been unwilling to recognize that "the political skeleton in the closet" was their own. In *Six Crises*, Richard Nixon, criticizing President Truman's mis-handling of the Alger Hiss case, wrote:

"[Truman's] error was sheer stubbornness in refusing to admit a mistake. He viewed the... case only in its political implications and he chose to handle the crisis which faced his Administration with an outworn political rule of thumb: leave the political skeletons hidden in the closet and keep the door locked. He denied outright the evidence in front of him... Once the F.B.I. was given the green light in its investigation of the Hiss case, it did a magnificent job. The blame for failing to act before that time rests not on the F.B.I., but squarely on those officials of the executive branch [of the Truman Administration] who had full access to F.B.I. reports and who failed or refused to order a full investigation."

Nixon held Truman directly accountable in the handling of the Hiss case—"a disservice to the nation," he called it—but Hiss was not on the President's staff and had virtually no personal contact with him, whereas Haldeman and Ehrlichman were in the Oval Office every day. Mitchell had been his chief law enforcement officer and, at the time of Watergate, his closest political aide.

While Haldeman kept Senators, Congressmen and even Cabinet members away from that Oval Office, while Ziegler kept newsmen at arm's length, while the number of Presidential press conferences reached an all-time low and the use of prime-time television exceeded the total prime-time use of the last three Presidents, the narrow flow of news that was allowed to pass through Buchanan's filter was a key factor in the final isolation of the President.

We must not allow ourselves to be naive about how much the President really knew about Watergate and its cover-up, and how much of it was simply jammed communications from within the White House. In one of Richard Nixon's rare news conferences, on October 5, 1972, he said:

"One thing that has always puzzled me about it is why anybody would have tried to get anything out of Watergate. But... when we talk about a clean breast, let's look at what has happened. The F.B.I. assigned 133 agents to this investigation. It followed

out 1,800 leads. It conducted 1,500 interviews. Incidentally, I conducted the investigation of the Hiss case. I know that is a very unpopular subject to raise in some quarters, but I conducted it. It was successful. The F.B.I. did a magnificent job, but that investigation, involving the security of this country, was basically a Sunday school exercise compared to the amount of effort that was put into this."

The Ervin Committee and Prosecutor Cox will want to examine the records of those 1,500 interviews conducted by those 133 F.B.I. agents. Perhaps the President will, too. Whether those 1,800 leads were legitimate or contrived to fool the President, it is true that all Presidents suffer from various forms of information gaps. Although they have access to all kinds of "for the President's eyes alone" material, they miss much of what reasonably informed citizens see and hear every day. There is something about the rarefied ecology of the White House that limits all Presidents' field of vision: Dwight Eisenhower once stunned me by indicating he had no knowledge of the Edward R. Murrow broadcast about Senator Joseph McCarthy. Reflecting afterward on what he said, I convinced myself that I had misunderstood the General, until 1967, when, after he read a book I had written, President Eisenhower sent me a long letter in which he said it again:

"Regarding McCarthy, I must remind you that in those days I rarely had time to turn on television. Consequently, I did not know very much of what was going on between the television companies and McCarthy... I did not know some of the Murrow broadcasts that were critical of the Wisconsin Senator and was not even aware that I had allies in my determination to defeat a man whom I thought was doing a great disservice to America, by lies, innuendo and false accusations."

Such Presidential "information vacuums" as Eisenhower called them, and the resultant isolation are part of Mr. Nixon's problem. But the final lesson of the current national humiliation, and one that most politicians, including the President, have pointed out, is the obscene cost of our elections.

Peeling away the acts of eavesdropping and sabotage in the Watergate and related cases exposes the corrupt core—money. The Republicans had money to burn, and thus had the temptation to indulge themselves in overkill ventures like Watergate. One way to use the excess money could have been to assist senatorial and congressional candidates in their campaigns, thereby strengthening the Republican Party. Watergate points to a need for reforming the ways we raise and spend political money.

The Citizens' Research Foundation in Princeton, which studies such matters, estimates that above \$50 million was spent on the Nixon campaign. (The McGovern campaign spent \$28 million.) Much of the Nixon funding came from such sources as Vesco, I.T.T., the dairy lobby, Texas Oil, and the Teamsters Union, none of which could probably justify such massive expenditures without the expectation of privileged treatment in return.

Once we agree that such crude contributions be forbidden, we get down to the tough question of how to finance campaigns. Here the broadcast industry, so self-righteous about all the corruption, is part of the problem. This vital and favored industry, which in 1972 sold \$59.6 million worth of air time to politicians campaigning at all levels, must no longer be allowed to sell that expensive commodity to candidates who usually can't afford to buy unless they are willing to accept fat-cat contributions that may mortgage their independence.

We are the only major nation on earth that permits air time to be sold to political parties and office seekers. The paradox is that

we allow these stations to sell air time to the same politicians upon whom they may ultimately be dependent for their licenses—licenses that allow them to control that air time in the first place—and the public ultimately foots the bill.

Some distinguished commissions, notably a Twentieth Century Fund Commission including Newton Minow, Dean Burch and Alexander Heard, recommended in 1969 that Presidential candidates of the major parties be provided free "Voters' Time" during prime hours on all networks simultaneously and that the Federal Government pay the cost of that air time based in special favored rates. Provision would be made to give so-called third and fourth parties access to some free television time.

If this reform was right for 1972, the events of the last ten months add prescience to that proposal. Even the President, in his proposals for a Congressional Commission, suggests looking into finances for air time. My own suggestions for the election of 1976, and perhaps even '74, call for air time for candidates' speeches and debates, to be provided without cost by the broadcast industry. The national candidates would get network time. Governors, Senators and Congressmen would get time from as many regional and local stations as would be required to reach their constituencies.

The duration of the campaign must be dramatically shortened. In an age of television, radio and jet travel, four months of campaigning, to say nothing of five months of primaries, is an exorbitant bore. Spot announcements, which are really a license for the permissible lie with no opportunity for reply, should be banned, as they are in most countries, and as they are by WGN-TV, Chicago, and a few other enlightened stations.

Based on 1972 television expenditures in all elections, including primaries, the cost of TV air time is \$37.2 million. That sounds like a lot of money, but if you project it against 704 commercial television stations with a total annual estimated gross of \$3.2 billion, it comes to slightly more than 1 per cent of gross revenues.

If you spread that over a four-year period and allow for off-year Senate, House and state elections, it still comes to only half of one per cent per year. Even if you include municipal elections, that's still well under 1 per cent of the gross revenue for one of the most profitable semi-monopolies in this nation to help solve a dilemma that has brought us to the edge of national disgrace. It would be a small price to pay for these privileged licenses. Even the cost figures of less than 1 per cent of gross revenue is lower than it seems. As recommended in the "Voters' Time" proposal, the broadcasters' cost of time provided to candidates could be deducted from their taxable income. It goes without saying that by the next election, public broadcasting will be able to provide a vital electronic platform. But there, too, we need a plan.

The state of siege which has preoccupied journalism for the past three years has been broken, as it always has been, not by protestation, but by performance. For the journalist, however, the severest challenge is yet to be.

President Nixon may lose his power struggle with the Congress. He could be impeached or censured, or more likely he could retreat to inactive isolation, or be stricken with the kind of malaise that so often seeks out leaders who have been humiliated and have lost the will but not the responsibility to govern.

Whether the President manages to ride out this crisis or succumbs to it, the next three years may put this nation to the crucible as it has not been tested since Reconstruction. For if relations are now strained between Congress and the Executive over the bombing of Cambodia, how does the decision-making process take place when other international

incidents like Lebanon-Israel, India-Pakistan, or the flight from the dollar, flare up and require instant response?

What safeguards exist should a beleaguered President be tempted to escalate an international incident in a rash attempt to divert public attention from the muck at home? What happens to all our thorny domestic problems when the President and his new surrogates are preoccupied with their own survival? Who adjudicates in the power struggle that may develop between the White House staff and Vice President Agnew, who may find his constitutional authority and his political future caught in the same twilight zone? Richard Nixon found so untenable eighteen years ago? Should that happen, Spiro Agnew may wish to rethink that Des Moines speech about the value of news analysis.

Dos Passo's "Scary present is now." It is a time for relentless digging, but it is also a time for reason and perspective. It is a time for journalism to rearm its right not by preaching but by demonstrating its need to be; not by shouting "I told you so," but by demonstrating its reason for being. Occasionally there is a news story of such consequence that it serves as a watershed for an entire generation as it discovers for itself what Editor White told his Kansas reader—that "repression [not violence] has made wrecks of the world."

Untangling this current wreck will require all the safeguards and restraints which, in their breach, created Watergate. Grand juries don't determine guilt; hearsay isn't convicting evidence, and eight-column headlines and cover-story caricatures can scream the very kind of editorial conclusion that the prudent news story tries to avoid. Guilt by innuendo, by unevaluated leaks, by contrived editing, can be just as reckless as McCarthyism or bugging, or falsification of documents. Oversimplification and rumor, or out-of-context excerpting, can be just as dangerous in the hands of a crusading editor or producer as it is in the hands of a Buchanan or a Colson.

Indeed, this is a time of rights—theirs as much as ours, of reporter's obligation as much as reporter's privilege. A recent conversation between two young prosecutors in the United States Attorney's office, each anxious to write the indictment of former Attorney General John Mitchell, says it all:

"I'd work two years for nothing if I could take Mitchell before the Grand Jury," says one. The other answers, "I'd give two years pay just to warn the S.O.B. of his rights."

NO FOOD STAMPS FOR STRIKERS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, employers have coined a catchy slogan namely "No Food Stamps for Strikers" with which they hope to delude their listeners into believing that the Federal Government is conferring some extra-special benefit on workers who go on strike. Like all catchy slogans this one may have some attractiveness when first heard but on further analysis it shows up as the tip of an iceberg of misrepresentation.

First, as the language of the amendment reads it would prohibit the distribution of food stamps to all strikers. What about the worker who, realizing the futility of his frequent complaints to his employer about unsafe or hazardous working conditions, is forced to use the ultimate weapon of a strike to dramatize

to his employer the validity of his complaints? What about the worker who in the face of repeated unfair labor practices committed by his employer, is forced to avoid further harassment by his employer only by going on strike? What about the worker who votes against the strike but must follow the decision of the majority who approved the strike?

How can anyone honestly contend that workers who are forced to go on strike under these circumstances should be denied food stamps for their families when the families of convicted felons as well as 25,600 Cuban refugees receive such Federal assistance?

In previous debate in this House I have heard proponents of this amendment suggest that a felon is not voluntarily incarcerated. But it must be realized that the felon did initially commit a voluntary act, albeit an illegal one. The Cuban refugees made a voluntary decision to avoid further oppression by the Castro government by fleeing to the United States.

I submit that the only test is whether the families of strikers qualify under the standards for all recipients of food stamps; namely, the fact that the family does not have liquid assets of over \$1,500.

Second, employers would have us believe that all strikers receive food stamps. Yet the Thieblot-Cowin study so often referred to by the proponents of the amendment, analyzed strikes where only about 30 percent of the strikers received food stamps. In any case, however, this overlooks the fact that the principal beneficiaries of food stamps are the families of the strikers.

Third, employers would have us believe that the issuance of food stamps to strikers has caused both an increase in the number of strikes as well as an increase in the duration of strikes. To support this contention they cite statistics to show that the number of strikes has doubled from 1960 to 1970.

I suggest that the matter is not that simple. An analysis of the statistics compiled by the Department of Labor for the period 1950 to 1971 shows a mixed pattern of an overall increase in the number of strikes. As a matter of interest, there were 4,843 strikes in 1950 and 5,138 in 1971. But in 1952 there were 5,117 strikes or only 21 less strikes than in 1971:

1950	4,843
1951	4,737
1952	5,117
1953	5,091
1954	3,468
1955	4,320
1956	3,825
1957	3,673
1958	3,694
1959	3,708
1960	3,333
1961	3,367
1962	3,614
1963	3,362
1964	3,655
1965	3,963
1966	4,405
1967	4,595
1968	5,045
1969	5,700
1970	5,716
1971	5,138

In analyzing the increase in the number of strikes, it certainly is necessary to

take into account the increase in union membership during the period. The Department of Labor statistics are:

1951	16,750,000
1961	17,328,000
1970	20,700,000

These statistics show that whereas there was an increase in union membership of 578,000 in the decade of the 1950's, the increase for the 1960's amounted to 3,372,000. Certainly the tremendous increase in union membership in the 1960's would mean an increase in the number of strikes. This is particularly true when it is realized that the trade union movement is entering heretofore unorganized industries or companies, where a strike is not an unusual activity.

The records of the National Labor Relations Board indicate a steadily increasing number of unfair labor practice charges filed against employers during the period of 1950 to 1972. In 1950, there were 4,472 such charges, in 1960, 7,723, and in 1972, 17,736. With respect to section 8(a)5 of the act, the section which requires employers to bargain collectively with representatives of their employees, there were 1,309 charges filed in 1950, 1,753 in 1960, 4,489 in 1970, and 6,023 in 1972. Whereas the total of all unfair labor practice charges filed against employers increased 72 percent in the 1950's and 76 percent in the 1960's or at almost the same rate; when we focus our attention on section 8(a)5 charges, the picture is much different. While the increase in this type of charge in the 1950's was 33.9 percent, in the period of the 1960's the percentage increase was 156 percent. This would certainly establish an increased proclivity on the part of management in the 1960's to refuse to bargain with representatives of their employees. The only alternative for workers in this situation is to use the ultimate weapon of a strike. I include the following:

Year	Unfair labor practice charges filed against employers	Refusal to bargain charges filed sec. 8(a)5
1950	4,472	1,309
1951	4,164	1,235
1952	4,306	1,226
1953	4,409	1,347
1954	4,373	1,212
1955	4,362	1,213
1956	3,522	838
1957	3,655	827
1958	6,068	1,039
1959	8,266	1,311
1960	7,723	1,753
1961	8,136	1,676
1962	9,231	2,294
1963	9,550	2,584
1964	10,695	3,088
1965	10,931	3,815
1966	10,902	3,811
1967	11,259	3,819
1968	11,892	4,097
1969	12,022	3,967
1970	13,601	4,489
1971	15,467	5,018
1972	17,736	6,023

With respect to the duration of strikes it appears once again that the figures do not support the contention that food stamps have increased the length of strikes. The BLS statistics for the period 1956-72 establish a rather erratic pattern with the highest annual average length of strikes being 36.7 days in 1959 and the average of 15.3 days for 1972

comparing favorably with 17.1 days for 1963 the year before the inception of the food stamp program:

	Days
1956	17.4
1957	11.9
1958	11.6
1959	36.7
1960	14.5
1961	11.2
1962	15.2
1963	17.1
1964	13.9
1965	15.0
1966	12.9
1967	14.7
1968	18.5
1969	17.3
1970	20.1
1971	14.5
1972	15.3

Furthermore, the average length of strikes for the 8-year period prior to the passage of the Food Stamp Act in 1964 was 16.95 days, whereas the average for the 8-year period subsequent to 1964 was 16.04 days.

While there appears to have been more strikes in excess of 30 days in 1971 than in 1960, the fact remains that in 1960, 23.1 percent of the workers on strike were involved in strikes over 30 days, whereas in 1971 the percentage was smaller, namely 22.1 percent.

The supporters of this amendment have made frequent reference to the Thieblot-Cowin study, which was completely financed by a fund donated by 4 industrial foundations and 13 companies, but which masqueraded under the aegis of the Wharton School of Finance of the University of Pennsylvania. Clearly the funding of this study casts great doubt on its objectivity. When the infinitesimal percentage of strikes analyzed—0.13 percent—by the study are compared to the statistics that I have recited, it is clear there is no evidence to support the study's conclusion that food stamps have contributed to an increase in strikes and their duration.

There are many who contend that in issuing food stamps to strikers the Federal Government is involving itself in the collective-bargaining process, implying that otherwise the Federal Government remains neutral in the management-worker relationship.

I submit that this is a grand illusion. The Federal Government has been involved in the collective-bargaining process for many years. Just for example, the Wagner Act and the Norris-Laguardia Act are instances where the Federal Government intervened on behalf of the worker. The Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts are instances of Federal Government intervention on behalf of management. With particular reference to strikes the Federal Government has on many occasions obtained injunctive relief to curtail strikes.

For the fiscal year 1972, the NLRB on 257 occasions filed petitions with Federal courts seeking to enjoin strike activity. Additionally, on other occasions the Federal Government has enjoined strikes in matters of national emergency.

There are various ways by which the Federal Government intervenes on behalf of management to minimize the effect of the strike. If a company is performing work pursuant to a Government

contract it has the advantage of a "force majeure" clause which excuses delay in completion of the contract due to a strike. It may well be that a company has the benefit of a "price-escalation" clause which allows the company to collect additional costs resulting from a wage increase to its employees.

I submit that if any of my colleagues are really interested in removing the Federal Government from the collective-bargaining process there are many other statutes that they must be prepared to amend. But to pass this amendment and deprive the families of workers of food is not the way to do it. At this time to reverse a process which has been going on since 1964 would certainly not improve the management-worker relationship, but instead would go far to exacerbate the relationship.

When employers object to strikers receiving food stamps what they really want is to have the Federal Government penalize strikers for engaging in lawful activity. Even worse is the fact that this is an insidious attempt by employers to enmesh the families of strikers in the collective-bargaining process on the side of management, yes on the side of management, so that the decision to strike would not depend on the merits of the strikers requests but rather on the ability of the strikers families to resist hunger and starvation.

Congress through the Taft-Hartley Act outlawed the use of the secondary boycott by a union, yet management would have this Congress legitimize the use of a secondary boycott by employers, namely the use of the neutral members of the strikers families to bring pressure on the worker to force him to buckle under to the demands of management.

The constitutionality of the proposed amendment would appear very doubtful in the light of the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *United States Department of Agriculture et al. v. Jacinto Moreno et al.* (—U.S.—) decided on June 25, 1973. In that case the Supreme Court considered the 1971 amendment to the Food Stamp Act of 1964 which excluded from participation in the food stamp program any household containing an individual who is unrelated to any other household member. This amendment was intended to prohibit food stamp assistance to communal "families" of unrelated individuals. The Supreme Court held that the classification established by the 1971 amendment was "wholly without any rational basis" and accordingly the amendment was invalid under the due process clause of the fifth amendment. The following language of the Court is indeed pertinent to the amendment now before the House:

The challenged classification clearly cannot be sustained by reference to this congressional purpose. For if the constitutional conception of "equal protection of the laws" means anything, it must at the very least mean that a bare congressional desire to harm a politically unpopular group cannot constitute a legitimate governmental interest.

I submit that if the U.S. Supreme Court holds that the Federal Government cannot deprive a politically unpop-

ular group, namely members of a commune from receiving food stamps, it certainly would hold that the Federal Government cannot deprive workers who are exercising their lawful right to strike from receiving food stamps.

THE STOCKPILE PROBLEM

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, almost every day we see and hear statements warning of the perils that attend our reliance upon Mideast petroleum. The fact that our dependency on these sources has risen to approximately one-third of our consumption is indeed alarming and the volatile character of the areas wherein the oil deposits are located makes it even more so.

Apparently not having learned to fully appreciate the far-reaching implications of this for parallel situations, the administration has expressed a desire to sell stockpiles of strategic materials. The response of the Congress to these proposals must be carefully constructed with proper consideration given to all aspects of the problem. A price-controlling expediency for the present cannot be allowed to jeopardize the Nation's future well-being.

One possible predicate for a reasoned response to the sell-minded administration has recently been formulated by the American Mining Congress. I specifically call attention to that organization's June 1973 publication entitled "The Stockpile Problem." Selected comments from that publication are presented here for the purpose, not of trumpeting the position of a special-interest group, but rather to draw attention to this problem and thereby help avoid the hazard of watching the oil problem with a fixation that allows a condition with equally dire consequences to be generated by an expediency-minded administration.

The comments follow:

THE STOCKPILE PROBLEM

Of the materials now in the stockpile, three-quarters by value represents purchases outside the United States. Only one-fourth was acquired in this country. This nation is the largest producer and consumer of industrial raw materials in the world, but it is self-sufficient in the supply of only two of the metals and minerals classified as strategic and critical—magnesium and molybdenum.

Industry in Japan and Germany, backed by their governments, has negotiated long-term contracts to procure the bulk of the growing production of minerals in the developing countries. This means that the U.S. consumer will not be able to draw on those sources—except through the purchase of refined metal or fabricated goods from Japan and Germany.

Even in cases involving recent price rises of commodities in which U.S. dependence on import sources is less pronounced, successful use of stockpiles as a measure to control price inflation is questionable.

During the Viet Nam War, the Johnson Administration authorized substantial releases of copper (over 400,000 tons) ostensibly for world needs but also in an unsuccessful attempt to stem rapidly rising copper prices. But while President Johnson's

famous "jawboning" techniques achieved a rollback in domestic producers' copper prices from 38 cents a pound to 36 cents a pound in late 1965, the stockpile releases were wholly unable to halt the increases in merchant, commodity market and scrap copper prices. Moreover, a prolonged strike in the copper industry and continued booming demand for copper soon pushed the domestic price of copper up, reaching 60 cents a pound by 1970, while the rise of imported copper climbed much higher.

The Administration proposes to liquidate the present copper stockpile of 250,000 tons. Once this is gone, not only will there be no copper in the stockpile but the U.S. Mint will have to enter the market to buy the copper needed to supply the country's essential coinage requirements. The copper stockpile represents about 4% of the volume of Free World production. To try to control the price of a basic international commodity like copper over the long term by disposing of 4% of one year's production is like trying to bail out a sinking lifeboat with a teaspoon.

The present Administration apparently believes that the stockpiles no longer have strategic value. Even if this assumption is correct (and there are serious grounds for questioning the assumption), from an economic point of view this does not appear to be the best time to liquidate these stockpiles. A rising tide of nationalism is evident throughout the world, particularly on the part of those countries whose economies are heavily dependent on commodity exports.

Inflationary trends and the devaluation of the dollar have pushed prices for most stockpile materials well above the original cost of acquisition. Since inflation is expected to persist, these prices are likely to move significantly higher still. Yet the real value of these reserves cannot be measured in terms of dollars but rather in terms of key assets that cannot readily be duplicated in times of national emergency—military or economic. These assets should be preserved for such emergencies.

HONOR POLICE HEROES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the policeman has long been a symbol of the law to the American people. Through generations, both the personal and family safety of our citizens have been entrusted to the police.

Today, the average police officer must do even more. He finds himself being a mixture of lawman, lawyer, defender of society and social worker—a literally impossible task for any one person.

The policeman or woman may find themselves being asked for help as a friend, counselor, doctor, or minister. Above all, however, he or she represents the law, and apprehends criminals—and too often sacrifices their lives in our protection.

Yet, in spite of everything, the humanitarian side of a police official is ever present, often unnoticed and certainly never sufficiently acknowledged. The police need the constant and ungrudging cooperation, support and respect of the public. Without our law enforcement officers anarchy would reign.

In 1971 and again in 1972 the Conservative Party of New York State

called for a statewide observance of Police Memorial Day. Last year the Gunning-Knorr-Jerabek concurrent resolution to honor police heroes was passed in the New York State Legislature which memorialized the Governor to proclaim June 1 as "Police Memorial Day." Again this year the Conservative Party of New York State called for a similar statewide commemoration in honor of our law enforcement officers and a resolution was again introduced in the legislature.

Conservative Party State Chairman Dan Mahoney called upon all citizens to honor police heroes on Friday, June 1, by flying flags at half-mast and by driving their cars with headlights on during daylight hours. "Honor police heroes" buttons and bumper stickers were also made available.

Through the concerted efforts of the citizens of New York State and of Conservative Party leaders at all levels, this day of tribute to our law enforcement officers was again an overwhelming success. Dan Mahoney and the Conservative Party are to be commended for their efforts on behalf of our police, who all too seldom receive adequate recognition.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to pay tribute to the law enforcement officers of western New York who have done so much to make our area a better and safer place to live. I include for the RECORD, letters I have received from Thomas R. Blair, commissioner of police for the city of Buffalo, and from Herbert E. Zimmerman, chief of police of the town of Amherst, Erie County, N.Y., which cite outstanding meritorious services performed by local police officers:

MAY 24, 1973.

Congressman JACK KEMP,
Congress of the United States,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEMP: Your secretary called to request that we provide you with the names of Buffalo Police Officers who had performed outstanding and meritorious service during the past year, explaining that you would enter them in the Congressional Record.

The following officers of the Buffalo Police Department were cited for outstanding, meritorious service during the year 1972:

Lieutenant Stephen G. Qualey
Patrolman George A. Mitchell
Lieutenant Maurice J. Kennedy
Patrolman William R. Yeates
Lieutenant Rocco R. Navarro
Patrolman Edward Mitchell, Jr.
Patrolman Raymond P. Morath
Patrolman Leslie A. Davis
Patrolman Michael J. O'Keefe
Patrolman James J. Mourgas

We deeply appreciate your continuing interest in the welfare of police officers everywhere.

If we may be of further service, please call on us.

Sincerely,

THOMAS R. BLAIR,
Commissioner of Police.

MAY 24, 1973.

Congressman JACK KEMP,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEMP: In recognition of National Police Day, June 1, I would like to state that on February 23, 1973, Detectives Peter Manzella and Arthur Janssen, Patrolmen Robert Brown and John Griffin apprehended David Gotthelf who had kidnapped

two women and then released them. Gotthelf approached the officers with a loaded shotgun. The officers were unable to use their own weapons because the area was located in a busy shopping mall with many store patrons in the immediate vicinity, and would have resulted in injury to innocent bystanders. The officers disarmed the subject without firing a shot even though exposing themselves to great personal risk.

I would also like to cite the arrest of Steve Tartt who was apprehended by this department on May 21, 1973. An estimated street value of 2½ to 3½ million dollars worth of heroin and cocaine was recovered in an apartment leased by Tartt. This arrest was the result of an intensive investigation and surveillance headed by Det. Sgt. William Bambach along with Detectives Arthur Hohensee and Richard Czechowicz.

We trust that this information will be of interest to you.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT E. ZIMMERMAN,
Chief of Police.

FRIVOLOUS AND UNNECESSARY VOTES IN THE HOUSE

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, ever since the 93d Congress convened in January, there has been a noticeable increase in the number of times we have been called upon to vote compared with a similar period during the 92d Congress. These votes have consumed a great deal of time and often seemed to be frivolous and unnecessary.

The Democratic Study Group, which does outstanding research, recently issued a special report containing documentary evidence of unnecessary votes in the House and abuse of House rules. The DSG report also suggests several changes which could reduce the number of unnecessary votes.

It is clear that a rule adopted by the House in 1896 to save time is now being used to delay and impede legislative business rather than to expedite and enhance that business. Regardless of our party affiliation, let us all resolve to refrain from dilatory or obstructionist tactics, and to conduct the public's business as efficiently and expeditiously as possible. The American people deserve no less.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Democratic Study Group special report in the RECORD at this time for the information and consideration of my colleagues:

SUPPLEMENT TO DSG SPECIAL REPORT RECORD
TELLER VOTES IN THE 93d CONGRESS, JULY 16, 1973

This is a supplement to DSG Special Report dated July 10, 1973, on Record Teller Votes in the 93rd Congress.

Since issuance of the original report, additional evidence has been developed of unnecessary and dilatory votes in the House as opposed to record teller votes in Committee of the Whole.

In addition, there is clear evidence of abuse of a House rule which enables a single Member to require a record vote in the House.

The House Rules Committee is considering proposals to increase the number of Members required to obtain a record teller vote from 20 to 44. The original DSG report showed that such an increase is unjustified because the increase in record teller votes during the

first half of 1973 was due entirely to a sharp increase in legislative activity, not abuse of the teller vote procedure.

FRIVOLOUS AND UNNECESSARY VOTES

The most objective measure of whether recording a vote is frivolous or unnecessary is the closeness of the vote, whether there was truly a major division between the majority and a significant minority or whether a small minority forced a vote on a hopeless question.

By this standard, there is a dramatic difference between record teller votes on amendments in Committee of the Whole and votes taken in the House. For example, 60% of the votes in the House (92 of 155) involved lopsided margins in excess of 200 votes compared with only 11% of all record teller votes in Committee of the Whole (8 of 72).

Similarly, on 43% of the House votes (67 of 155) less than 50 Members supported the losing sides. By comparison, this occurred with only one of the 72 record teller votes.

The conclusion is obvious: There are numerous frivolous and unnecessary votes in the House itself and few in the Committee of the Whole.

ABUSE OF HOUSE VOTE RULE

There are two categories of record votes in the House itself: Those which are taken on demand of 44 or more Members and those which are taken on demand of only one Member who objects to a vote on grounds that a quorum is not present. House Rule XV, Paragraph 4, provides that when such objection is made after a voice vote in the House, there shall be an automatic Yea-Nay vote on the question. (This rule does not apply in Committee of the Whole.)

Thus, during the first six months of 1973, over half of all votes taken in the House (78 of 155) were required by a single Member under Rule XV. Of the remaining 77 House votes, 73 were taken on demand of 44 or more Members and four were required by the constitution (3 veto overrides and election of the Speaker). Thus, there were more record votes in the House on demand of one Member than there were in Committee of the Whole where 20 Members are required to obtain a record teller vote on an amendment.

Comparative analysis clearly indicates abuse of the procedure under which a single

Member may require a vote of the entire House.

For example, on 63% of the votes required by a single Member (49 of 78) less than 50 Members supported the losing side compared with 25% of the votes taken on demand of 44 or more (18 of 73) and only 1.3% of the record teller votes (1 of 72).

Similarly, 80% of the votes required by a single Member (62 of 78) involved margins in excess of 200 compared with 40% of the votes taken on demand of 44 or more (29 of 73) and only 11% of the record teller votes (8 of 72).

In short, two-thirds of the House votes with margins in excess of 200 and three-fourths of the House votes where less than 50 Members supported the losing side were votes required by a single Member under Rule XV.

Harder evidence of abuse of Rule XV can be seen in the fact that on 40% of the votes required by a single Member (31 of 78), the Member requiring the record vote (by objecting that a quorum was not present on the voice vote) was recorded as voting the same way the voice vote had gone.

In other words, a record vote was unnecessary insofar as attaining the end result favored by the Member demanding the vote. He or she had already won on the voice vote.

By comparison, only 5% of the House votes taken on demand of 44 or more Members (4 of 73) and only 3% of the record teller votes in Committee of the Whole (2 of 72) involved instances where the Member demanding the record vote had already won on the voice or division vote.

SOURCE OF DEMANDS FOR QUORUM CALLS AND RECORD VOTES

During the first six months of 1973, Republicans were responsible for 73% of all quorum calls (70 of 96), 75% of all record votes in the House (114 of 155), but only 57% of the record teller votes in Committee of the Whole (41 of 72).

With respect to House votes required by a single Member under Rule XV, Republicans were responsible for 84% (65 of 78).

Republicans also were responsible for:

78% of the votes involving margins in excess of 200 (78 of 100);

79% of the votes where less than 50 Members supported the losing side (54 of 68); and

89% of the votes where the Member demanding the vote had already won on the voice vote (33 of 37).

See Attachment No. 2 for a list of Members who demanded quorum calls and votes during the first half of 1973 and a breakdown by type vote and party.

POSSIBLE REMEDIES

Increasing the number of Members required to obtain a record teller vote in Committee of the Whole would have absolutely no impact whatsoever on the real problem—unnecessary votes in the House. In fact, there is concern that increasing the requirement for record teller votes will only aggravate the overall problem by increasing the number of quorum calls. (See original report)

Following, however, are three suggestions which could reduce the number of unnecessary votes in the House and in Committee of the Whole:

(1) Amend House Rule XV to eliminate the automatic Yea-Nay vote when a single Member objects that a quorum was not present on a voice vote. While this would require a quorum call if objection were made, it would also require that the demand for a record vote be made after the quorum call and supported by one-fifth of those present. House Rule XV was adopted in 1896 as a means of saving time. However, with the new electronic voting system more time would be saved over the long run by returning to the pre-1896 practice.

(2) Give the leadership authority to shorten the time for votes from 15 minutes to 5 minutes on certain days or during certain hours when several votes are anticipated. This will force Members to stay on floor or risk missing votes, and will therefore, expedite business by avoiding quorum calls and requiring one-fifth of those present to obtain a record vote. (This would assume that the requirement for a record teller vote would also be changed from one-fifth of a quorum to one-fifth of those present, but not less than 20.)

(3) Publicize the names of Members demanding Record Votes and Quorum Calls such as is done by Attachment No. 2. This would focus attention on those who are engaging in dilatory tactics or requiring unnecessary votes for political purposes.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1

UNNECESSARY AND DILATORY VOTES DURING 1ST HALF OF 1973

	Record teller votes taken on demand of 20 members		House votes taken on demand of 44 or more		House votes taken on demand of 1 member		All House votes	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	72		73		78		155	
Votes on which less than 50 members voted on losing side	1	1.3	18	25	49	63	67	43
Votes on which margin between winning and losing sides exceeded 200	8	11	29	40	62	80	92	60
Instances where member demanding record vote had already won on division or voice vote	2	3	4	5	31	40	35	23

¹ This figure also includes 4 votes required by the Constitution: 3 veto overrides and election of the Speaker.

² These are votes where the Member demanding the record vote was recorded as voting the same way as the voice vote had gone. In effect, instances where a record vote was unnecessary insofar as attaining the outcome favored by the Member demanding the record vote.

ATTACHMENT NO. 2

MEMBERS DEMANDING QUORUM CALLS AND VOTES DURING FIRST HALF 1973

[Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of votes in that category where the Member demanding the record vote was recorded as voting the same way as the voice vote had gone. In effect, instances where a record vote was unnecessary insofar as attaining the outcome favored by that Member.]

Member	Total	Record votes in House			Record teller votes on demand of 20	Member	Total	Record votes in House			Record teller votes on demand of 20
		Quorum calls	On demand of 1	On demand of 44				Quorum calls	On demand of 1	On demand of 44	
Gross	41 (2)	18	14 (1)	5	4 (1)	Clawson, Del	1	1			
Ford, G	25 (4)		4 (2)	17 (2)	4	Cohen	1	1			
Wydler	15 (7)	6	8 (7)		1	Derwinski	1		1		
Scherle	11 (3)	5	3 (3)	3		Du Pont	1 (1)		1 (1)		
Wylie	10 (1)	4	4 (1)	1	1	Dickinson	1	1			
Hunt	6		1		1	Harvey	1	1			
Quie	6	1		1	4	Hogan	1				1
Anderson, J	5		1	3	1	Harsha	1			1	
Dellenback	5 (4)		3 (3)	2 (1)		Kuykendall	1				
Erlenborn	5 (1)		1 (1)	1	3	Landgrebe	1	1			

ATTACHMENT NO. 2

MEMBERS DEMANDING QUORUM CALLS AND VOTES DURING FIRST HALF 1973—Continued

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of votes in that category where the Member demanding the record vote was recorded as voting the same way as the voice vote had gone. In effect, instances where a record vote was unnecessary insofar as attaining the outcome favored by that Member.

Member	Total	Record votes in House			Record teller votes on demand of 20
		Quorum calls	On demand of 1	On demand of 44	
Davis, M. ¹	5	(1)	3	2	(1)
Hays ¹	5		2	1	1
Mathis ¹	5	(1)	3	2	(1)
Dennis ¹	4		2		2
Hosmer ¹	4			3	1
Symms ¹	4	(1)	3	1	(1)
Wilson, C. ¹ (California)	4	(1)	2	2	(1)
Cederberg ¹	3	(2)	1	2	(2)
Conte ¹	3	(2)	1	1	(1)
Findley ¹	3		1		2
Hillis ¹	3		2	1	
Minshall ¹	3		2		1
Steiger (Wisconsin)	3			1	1
Teague (California)	3		1		2
Young (Florida)	3	(1)	2	1	(1)
Gialimo ¹	3		1		1
Montgomery ¹	3		3		
Reuss ¹	3			2	1
Roncallo ¹	3		2		1
Roybal ¹	3				3
Ashbrook ¹	2		1	1	
Baker ¹	2		1		1
Blackburn ¹	2		2		
Cleveland ¹	2		1	1	
Davis (Wisconsin)	2	(1)	1	1	(1)
Grover ¹	2		1	1	
Kemp ¹	2			1	1
Latta ¹	2			1	1
Michel ¹	2			1	1
McKinney ¹	2		1	1	
Roncallo ¹	2	(1)			2
Rousselot ¹	2		1	1	
Sebelius ¹	2	(1)		2	(1)
Saylor ¹	2			2	
Snyder ¹	2			2	
Abzug ¹	2			1	1
Alexander ¹	2	(1)		2	(1)
Flowers ¹	2		1		1
Burton ¹	2				2
Conyers ¹	2				2
Green, E. ¹	2				2
Long, C. ¹	2			1	1
Mink ¹	2		1		1
Mills ¹	2			2	
Perkins ¹	2			1	1
Rodino ¹	2			1	1
Rogers ¹	2		1		1
Stratton ¹	2			1	1
Yates ¹	2			1	1
Arenas ¹	1		1		
Brozman ¹	1				1
Broyhill (Virginia)	1			1	
Crane ¹	1				1
Collins ¹	1			1	

Member	Total	Quorum calls	On demand of 1	On demand of 44	Record teller votes on demand of 20	
Lujan ¹	1				1	
Mizell ¹	1				1	
McEwen ¹	1					
Mailiard ¹	1			1		
Mayne ¹	1	(1)	1	(1)		
McClory ¹	1		1			
Myers ¹	1		1			
Railsback ¹	1				1	
Ruppe ¹	1		1			
Robison ¹	1		1			
Steelman ¹	1				1	
Talcott ¹	1			1		
Vander Jagt ¹	1				1	
Widnall ¹	1			1		
Wiggins ¹	1		1			
Addabbo ¹	1				1	
Anderson, G. ¹	1				1	
Annunzio ¹	1		1			
Andrews ¹	1		1			
Brooks ¹	1				1	
Donohue ¹	1			1		
Daniels ¹	1			1		
Delaney ¹	1		1			
Eilberg ¹	1				1	
Evin ¹	1			1		
Farver ¹	1		1			
Flood ¹	1			1		
Gonzalez ¹	1				1	
Grasso ¹	1		1			
Hanna ¹	1				1	
Holifield ¹	1			1		
Ichord ¹	1				1	
Jones ¹ (Alabama)	1			1		
Leggett ¹	1		1			
Moss ¹	1			1		
Patman ¹	1				1	
Pepper ¹	1				1	
Podell ¹	1				1	
Pike ¹	1			1		
Rangel ¹	1		1			
Roberts ¹	1		1			
St Germain ¹	1				1	
Stanton ¹	1				1	
Seiberling ¹	1				1	
Smith ¹	1		1			
Waggonner ¹	1			1		
Young ¹ (Texas)	1			1		
Subtotal: Democrats	94	(4)	26	13	(4)	
Republicans	225	(33)	70	65	(27)	
Total	319	(37)	96	78	(31)	
				73	(4)	
					72	(2)

¹ Democrats.

ST. STANISLAUS, MOTHER PARISH OF WESTERN NEW YORK POLONIA

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I was very proud and pleased to have been invited to participate June 3, along with distinguished guests and several hundred of western New York's Polish-American community, in the 100th anniversary celebration for St. Stanislaus Church of Buffalo, N.Y.

St. Stanislaus has grown from the humble beginning of 365 people gathered on a farm at Fillmore and Peckham in Buffalo, N.Y., to its present status as the spiritual heart of today's Polish-American community of over 350,000. As Rev. Daniel J. Myszkowski has described the history of St. Stanislaus Parish:

It was on June 8, 1873, that St. Stanislaus Parish was first organized. Following his ordination on June 7, Father John Pitass was appointed pastor over the 82 families that had recently migrated from Poland to Buffalo, New York. It wasn't long before a church was built. Joseph Berk donated several lots on Peckham and Wilson Streets and it was here, on January 25, 1874, that the

first church was dedicated. As more and more immigrants flocked to the area, a much larger church was needed, and so in 1886, the present church was dedicated. To accommodate the growing number of children, a much larger school was completed in 1890. Recognizing the hard work of Fr. Pitass, Bishop Ryan named him Dean of all the Polish-speaking churches in the Diocese, on May 20, 1894.

Upon the death of Dean Pitass in December, 1913, his nephew—the Rev. Dr. Alexander Pitass—took over. Following in his uncle's footsteps, Fr. Alexander proved to be an able administrator and a powerful force in the Polish community. In 1917, he built a much larger convent for the many nuns then teaching at the parish school, and in 1920, he purchased the big, red building that stood diagonally across the street from the church and converted it into the Parish Social Hall. On May 25, 1925, he received the title by which he was to be always remembered: Monsignor Pitass.

A celebrated mass of thanksgiving was held June 3 at St. Stanislaus with the Most Reverend Edward D. Head, bishop of the diocese of Buffalo, leading the noon service. Among his assisting prelates was Bishop Stanislaus Rubin of Rome, Italy, representing Stefan Cardinal Wyszyński, archbishop of Gniezno-Warsaw.

The centennial banquet program for St. Stanislaus included a rendition of

the Polish National Anthem, *Jeszcze Polska Zgineła*, by the St. Stanislaus choir; the invocation by the Most Reverend Bernard McLaughlin, D.D., auxiliary bishop of Buffalo; a welcome address by Frank Wardynski, the centennial chairman; Stan Jasinski, president of WUTV, channel 29, as toastmaster; an address by the Honorable Ann T. Mikoll, State supreme court justice; choral selections by the Czarnik quartet, Peter Gorecki, director; the principal address by the Most Reverend Ladislaus Rubin of Rome, Italy, representing Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński; remarks by the Reverend Monsignor Peter J. Adamski, P.A., pastor, St. Stanislaus Parish; and by the Most Reverend Edward D. Head, D.D., bishop of Buffalo; and the benediction by the Most Reverend Pius Benincasa, D.D., auxiliary bishop of Buffalo.

I would once again like to express my very warm wishes to the Reverend Monsignor Peter J. Adamski, P.A., and to everyone at St. Stanislaus on the 100th anniversary of the Mother Parish of our Polonia.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this time the address made by the Honorable Ann T. Mikoll, State supreme court justice, at the centennial banquet of St. Stanislaus held June 3 at the Statler Hilton Hotel, Buffalo, N.Y.:

With the death of Msgr. Pitass on July 30, 1944, the Rev. Stanislaus Kulpinski was named administrator until July 2, 1945, when the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Peter J. Adamski was installed as the third pastor. Under Msgr. Adamski's guidance, the parish continued to grow and flourish. In November of 1945, he made arrangements to have the Sunday noon Mass broadcast over the radio for the benefit of the shut-ins who couldn't get to church, and for all of Polonia as well. It proved to be a huge success and is still being heard via Station WXRL.

Ever conscious of the need for higher education, Msgr. Adamski established two high schools in 1946, which eventually became Bishop Colton, for girls, and Bishop Ryan, for boys. In 1960, the new Social Center was opened, replacing the old Parish Social Hall which had out-served its purpose. A popular innovation proved to be the "Sunshine Club" which Msgr. Adamski organized for the Senior Citizens.

The small Polish community of yesterday has grown over these 100 years into some 350,000 Polish-Americans on the Niagara Frontier. And just as St. Stanislaus Parish served as its center in the past, it still remains the heart of Polonia today!

"OUR PARISH"

I stand here on behalf of my fellow parishioners, in their stead, looking into their hearts and minds, and my own as well, to capture the echo of our thoughts, and the pulse of our emotions as we reflect on this historical occasion.

The Priests, Nuns, you and I, the laypeople of St. Stanislaus—we are all one family. The vastness of this room, the splendor of the setting, the distinction of our guests add to this evening a special aura, but this remains essentially a family occasion, full of special sentiment and reminiscences of times and dates past, and beloved people who are now gone.

For all of us, this anniversary evokes recollections of those who meant the most personally to each one of us—parents and grandparents—our historical links to today's jubilee. I see, as no doubt you do as well, the beloved faces of my own good parents who worshiped here for over 50 years, and recall vividly the personal solace and source of strength this Church and their faith offered them. Their exemplary lives, as did the lives of other parishioners, bore witness to the influence, vigor and success St. Stanislaus Parish enjoyed with its people.

This past week I reread the history of our Parish prepared by a fine historian, Mieczyslaw Haiman, on the occasion of the 50th Jubilee. Again, as always, my heart leaped with pleasure as the story of our people unfolded—their trials, their tribulations, their strengths and their weaknesses—he portrayed them well. Our forebears were strong men and women, no faltering soul would dare the rigors of travel across the Atlantic to an uncertain reception as they did decades ago if they had not great courage and stamina. They were modest and self-effacing people, unsparing of themselves in industry, full of reverence for God and life, devoted to their priests, great family people, loving and warm, hospitable, of irrepressible gaiety, immaculate householders, great cooks, good drinkers too, fine dancers, lovers of music—full of personal pride, dignity and honesty. It was this kind of strong national character they brought to America, and it was from this combination of qualities that St. Stanislaus grew, prospered, and made the old east side of Buffalo what it was, and set unalterably the Polish-American character.

We certainly take pride in the Gothic beauty of our splendid church, the Community Center, our fine school and other buildings, but the essence of St. Stanislaus transcends the brick and mortar and resides in its people.

The three priests whose lives were dedicated to the spiritual leadership of this

parish are heroic figures: Father Jan Pitass, Msgr. Dr. Alexander Pitass, and our revered Rt. Rev. Pete Adamski, Apostolic Prothonotary, they epitomize the success a good priest can accomplish. The Buffalo community is aware of our regard for our pastor, and the reason for this devotion to our spiritual father is patently clear. His concerned stewardship gave impetus to active parish and civic life. He conceived and executed the beautiful Community Center, and a Catholic high school facility to serve his people. The loveliness of his character, his generous nature, and beneficence to his people took care of our many needs.

Few charities lack him as a patron. Perhaps his most forceful quality has been his unrelenting challenge to Polish-Americans to strive to equal the monumental achievements of our forebears in the only way to improvement as he saw it, through a good education. He has been our good father, and a good father to the needy in Poland as well. His annual drive for the blind is characteristic of his many social concerns. Today we pay him special tribute as our Pater Familias—number one in our St. Stanislaus family. Dear Father Adamski, we love you.

I still see before me the handsome, imposing face of Msgr. Dr. Alexander Pitass. It was from his hands I received baptism, communion, my diploma, and much counsel. His eloquent voice is stilled now, but lives in my mind's eye. He was a stirring sermonizer. His character set the tone and style of life in the formative years of many of the adults in this room. Of the old school, firm as a leader, well met in his priestly vocation, he was happy in the service of God and his parishioners. A fine administrator of his parish, he was as well the civic leader of Polonia. From the quarters of his parish house came much of the wisdom and leadership that directed Polish-Americans in all phases of life. We remember him with love, regard and gratitude.

The founder of this parish is now a historical figure of legendary proportions. He was bigger than life. To read a compendium of his accomplishments is to be in awe. A man of iron will, great drive—seemingly indestructible, as a spiritual leader, under difficult circumstances, he breathed life into this parish. He built two church buildings (one of which housed an upper and lower church), a school, a meeting hall, rectory, nunnery. These accomplishments would be sufficient reason to admire him. But this was only one facet of his brilliant life. A fantastic visionary, a great organizer, his modest rectory, reflective of his personal abhorrence of ostentation, was the brain center of Polonia. Here was conceived the idea of the Polish Union of America, the Polish Seminary, the Association for Care of Immigrants, the Polish Catholic Congress, which fought for our ethnic identity, and brought to us Rome's sympathetic attention, and finally, recognition of our devotion to our church, the elevation of two Polish-Americans to bishoprics.

He was motivated by a desire to find a place in the sun for his beloved Poles in America. Through his leadership, St. Stanislaus Parish was copiously generous to our persecuted brethren in Poland. He founded a Polish newspaper that flourished for 33 years—23 under him and 10 years under Msgr. Alexander Pitass. Poles were avid newspaper readers. Absent other media, the newspaper was the highlight of the day. From 1885, and for a period of 38 years, 34 Polish newspapers appeared in Buffalo—imagine that—34 newspapers, but none exceeded the quality and vigor of his creation "Polak w Ameryce".

And, finally, the education of his people—he brought the Felician Sisters to St. Stanislaus, and through their monumental efforts, most Polish-Americans received their primary and secondary education. Today we

boast a college run by the Felicians—beautiful Villa Maria.

And yet this was not enough—he inspired, financially launched, and led the formation of innumerable clubs and societies—cultural, civic, political, religious—every aspect of man's needs were taken care of by his inspired creativity. What a giant of a man. We are thrice blessed: Jan Pitass, Alexander Pitass, Peter Adamski—what a triumvirate.

How many of you were educated by the Felicians? Ah, here was the third secret ingredient that made St. Stanislaus achieve nobly. Many of their names are lost from memory by their self-imposed anonymity. We remember our parishioner, the outstanding Mother General of Felicians all over the world—Mother Alexander Kucharska, and all those other nuns who cared for us, loved us, and prepared us for life. To each of you individually we present a bouquet of love and admiration. You are the heroic women who made St. Stanislaus what it is.

Many a priest served our parish well as assistants to our pastors. How many here tonight spent some of their priestly career at St. Stanislaus? To these good priests who gave to each of us a part of their lives—accept our deep gratitude. You are still our family, and we love you in a special way though you are now apart from us.

What a splendid family—Priests, Nuns, Laypeople of St. Stanislaus—congratulations. This is our day. May God keep us in His care, direct our steps to a perfection of Christian virtue, forgive us our trespasses, and may He bless this great land of America which gave Polish-Americans a home under our red, white and blue banner with its guarantees of freedom and liberty. St. Stanislaus—I salute you.

CONGRESSMAN PAUL W. CRONIN'S THOUGHTFUL ANALYSIS ON THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the question of our Nation's energy needs is fast becoming one of the key issues of the decade. This issue has particular relevance to New England, where the people are presently encountering shortages of gasoline and face the possibility of shortages of home heating oil this winter.

It is obvious to those of us who have studied the energy crisis that our hopes to meet our energy needs depend on our ability to achieve an overview of the problem. President Nixon's proposal to create a Department of Energy and Natural Resources is a step in the right direction. But, we also need more effective energy machinery here in Congress.

Legislation to create a Joint Committee on Energy has been introduced by my colleague from neighboring Massachusetts, PAUL CRONIN, and I am proud to cosponsor this important measure. Congressman CRONIN has written a very thought-provoking analysis of the need for reform of the congressional energy machinery in the form of a letter to the editor of the Washington Post, which appeared on July 8, 1973.

I include Congressman CRONIN's letter in the RECORD, and hope that we can join together to meet the energy challenge of the 1970's:

LEGISLATIVE DUPLICATION
(By Hon. PAUL W. CRONIN)

Joseph Kraft makes a resourceful case in his June 14 column ("A Vacuum in the Energy and Power Structure") concerning the lack of accountability with regard to energy-related matters. He states, quite accurately, that "a cardinal feature of the . . . energy crisis is that there is no public body responsible for the sharpest problems connected with oil and gas."

In the course of some related research, I have discovered that the same is true from a legislative standpoint. There are presently 38 committees and subcommittees out of a total of 54 that have some jurisdiction over energy legislation. So far this year, 414 separate energy bills have been introduced in the Congress. These were referred to 26 different committees. As a member of two subcommittees that deal with energy-related problems, I have frequently heard the same testimony from the same individuals testifying before the two different subcommittees on which I serve.

This needless duplication of effort is part of the problem. That is why I have introduced legislation to create a Joint Committee on Energy. Composed of both senators and representatives, this major body would have sole jurisdiction over energy legislation. Accountability is an essential element in our effort to solve the energy crisis. We need it in the Congress.

STEEL INDUSTRY SUFFERS FROM
EXPORT OF FERROUS SCRAP

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of an international steel shortage with the result that our domestic demand for steel and iron products coupled with an unprecedented demand for export is driving consumption of ferrous scrap metal toward an all-time high.

In the supplemental views of the committee report on H.R. 3547, Mr. ASHLEY and Mrs. SULLIVAN point out the essential national interest in the output of the steel and foundry industry that in turn rely on scrap iron or steel for their raw material. They go on to state:

It is our view that the situation in recent months with respect to the uncontrolled export of ferrous scrap and the prospective imposition of export controls is one in which the policy criteria set forth in the 1969 Act are met, and that the imposition of export restraints in recent months has been warranted.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of Commerce, after long delay has now reversed himself and has invoked the Export Administration Act of 1969. However, not to embargo shipments of iron and steel scrap, but merely to license exports and to cut off more orders for future shipments. I am concerned that his action at this late date may have no real impact on the problem. Further, I believe, we cannot continually

go through these crises of short supply and severe inflationary pressure without finally driving out of business many of the small and medium-sized steel mills and foundries. Three times in the last decade, 1969, 1970, and 1972, we experienced severe strain on available supplies of scrap metal as a result of combined high domestic demand and uncontrolled record exports. And here we are in 1973 hearing about the ominous prospect of facing possible shutdowns or slowdowns of mills and foundries as a result of the outward flow of scrap metal.

I am deeply disturbed about the possible impact on employment in our area where steel and iron foundries are prevalent. According to Department of Commerce figures, the current expected domestic and export purchases of scrap will reach 54.4 million tons in 1973, or 18 percent higher than has ever been generated in the history of the country. The 6-month total of exports is 67 percent higher than the whole total of 1972, yet we are continuing to ship ferrous scrap at this very moment.

I am concerned about the need to maintain adequate supplies for our national security needs. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am constantly reminded of the importance of this basic industry to our national defense efforts.

I am gravely concerned about the impact the current situation is having on our overall economy. As a basic industry, the steel industry is important because of the multitude of commodities it produces or generates.

As I mentioned, the steel industry is an important segment of the local economy of the 23d District. Many families work in local steel mills and foundries. Their economic well-being and security depend upon a healthy industry.

Thus it is of great import that the working man and the industry have the opportunity of prospering and growing. To provide this security there must exist a means whereby adequate supplies are available at reasonable prices.

Perhaps it is time to consider imposing automatic restraints on the export of certain vital basic resources whenever heavy domestic demand coupled with abnormal foreign demand threatens both serious inflationary impact and a lack of availability of the basic resource.

PITTSBURGH FBI OFFICE WELCOMES PHILIP R. SHERIDAN

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to welcome to western Pennsylvania the new Special Agent in Charge of the Pittsburgh Office of the Federal

Bureau of Investigation—Mr. Philip R. Sheridan.

A veteran of 22 years with the Bureau, Mr. Sheridan comes to us from the Norfolk, Va., office where he had been serving as SAC. He replaces Mr. Ian D. MacLennan, now retired, at the helm of the Pittsburgh office.

Mr. Sheridan should have no difficulty in settling in Pittsburgh. He is a native Pennsylvanian, born in Clearfield County. He enlisted in the Pennsylvania National Guard in January, 1941, and when World War II broke out, Mr. Sheridan found himself on a 32-month tour of duty in the South Pacific. He was discharged from the service in 1949 as an officer in the 27th Infantry Division.

Returning to civilian life, Mr. Sheridan decided to further his education and he was graduated from George Washington University. Two years later he received his bachelor of law degree from the same institution and also embarked on a new career as an agent for the FBI.

After a brief tour of duty at Springfield, Ill., Mr. Sheridan was assigned to the FBI's largest field office in New York City. In 1961 he was transferred to the special investigative division at the FBI headquarters here in Washington. Later he was named assistant SAC at field offices in Tampa, Fla., and Sacramento, Calif. In early 1969 he was moved to Los Angeles, Calif., where he served until October, 1971, when he returned to the Bureau's headquarters as a field inspector. He held that post until his assignment to Norfolk, Va.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of western Pennsylvania, I welcome Mr. Sheridan back home and wish him the best of success in his new undertaking.

JAMES V. SMITH MEMORIAL

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Jim Smith's tragic and untimely death has diminished us all. He brought to his tenure in this Body a creative intellect, an enormous capacity for hard work on behalf of his constituents and the entire Nation. As Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, he demonstrated that he understood the land and its people. He understood that the people whom he served represented some of the best that this great Nation has produced. He stood for the respected principles of decency, honor, integrity, and love of country.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that Jim Smith was my friend, and the friend of all Americans. I want to express my deepest sympathy to his family at this time.

FRATERNAL ORDER OF THE EAGLES
OBSERVES DIAMOND JUBILEE

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the diamond jubilee of one of the Nation's most dedicated organizations, the Fraternal Order of the Eagles. At the end of this month Eagles from every State of the Union, the Canadian Provinces, and Mexico will gather in Seattle for the anniversary convention and celebration.

During three-quarters of a century of service, the Eagles have been active in community programs ranging from sponsorship of youth activities to funding of medical research to organization of senior citizens' groups.

The Eagles were early and staunch supporters of progressive legislation such as social security and workmen's compensation. The Eagles worked hard against age discrimination in hiring and for mothers' pensions and general pension reform.

Millions of Americans who now benefit by these programs owe a debt of gratitude to the Eagles, who believed in the system, worked with it, and helped bring about genuine reform.

The Eagles of my district can be particularly proud at this time, since a past grand worthy president, W. A. "Red" McCawley, hails from Belleville, Ill. Mr. McCawley served with distinction as president and is still active in Eagles leadership.

After 75 years of service and involvement, the Eagles have lost none of their spirit of initiative. Among the current concerns of their ever-growing memberships are the Max Baer Heart Fund, the Jimmy Durante Fund for Crippled Children, and the Golden Eagles, a program which involves senior citizens in community activities.

Mr. Speaker, without organizations like the Eagles this Nation could not have achieved the general prosperity it now enjoys. We can be assured that the Eagles will join us in our continuing efforts to bring respectable economic security to every American, especially to older Americans who rely on pensions.

In 1968, I was honored to address the Eagles' national convention in Houston. At that time we spoke of several problems of the day, including Vietnam, the urban crisis, and the economy. The Eagles responded to these challenges as they have responded for the past 75 years—with responsibility, dedication, and idealism. I am certain that it was in no small part because of the determination of a million Eagles that we can now say these problems have been solved or at least lessened in scope.

May the Fraternal Order of the Eagles soar ever higher in the pursuit of the principles for which they have always worked so hard.

CXIX—1592—Part 20

WORDS FOR THE PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, these days you can hardly open a newspaper or turn on a television or radio without being hit in the face by Watergate. Even worse, too many times the President has been virtually prejudged on the basis of hearsay and innuendo—hardly the American way.

Thus, it was a refreshing change to read an editorial written by Mr. Bill Kennedy, editor of the Southwest Times Record of Fort Smith, Ark., and brought to my attention by my friend, Mr. E. S. Stephens of Fort Smith. I commend this article to my colleagues and would like to insert in the RECORD at this point:

WORDS FOR THE PRESIDENT

Today, we want to say a few words for the President of the United States. In this 11th hour of Watergate when it is so easy to follow the crowd, it is well to remember this man's accomplishments and that an innuendo and veiled accusation do not a fact make.

Alexander Hamilton warned this nation in its infancy that it needed to have not only safeguards to prevent the government oppressing the people, but also to guard against public abuse of its elected leaders.

The right to criticize our leaders is essential to a free society. But it does not imply any inalienable right to vilify, particularly on dubious and hearsay evidence.

American political leaders are not kings or lords. But neither are they public doormats, and the American people should not allow them to become so.

Now the hounds are out in full pack, like sharks with the first taste of blood. Get the President is the cry of the day. At whatever cost and by whatever means, get the President.

This impression flows daily from the Senate hearings. But there is no solid evidence that the President did any wrong. No one has yet discredited his assertion that he was unaware of the bugging and coverup beforehand. In fact, some have substantiated that assertion.

It is well to remember that the continuing scandal is a ready-made springboard for some lightweight politicians who would use it to further their own presidential ambitions.

We see no reason why the President would have risked this scandal to know what Democratic Chairman Larry O'Brien was talking about on the phone.

And to our knowledge during his 27 years in the public eye, Mr. Nixon has never been caught in a flat lie. From his first days in the House, then the U.S. Senate, as Vice President and now as President, his life has been an open book.

Do we know as much about the past and motives of those who are attacking him? We do know that a man as forceful and determined as Mr. Nixon is bound to build up a goodly supply of dedicated enemies in those 27 years—all the way back to the time of the Alger Hiss case.

In our view, President Nixon has been steadfast in implementing and carrying out the promises he made to the American people when he was seeking the high office.

He inherited a war, rising crime, riots, civil disobedience, inflation and he has made

much progress in these areas. Of his own initiative has created a climate for world peace.

Watergate will pass, but the Presidency as an American institution will go on. The man who occupies that office is our President, the President of all the people. He speaks for us to the whole world, and his troubles are our troubles.

We have only one President at a time. Any man who occupies that office which has been aptly described as "splendid misery" deserves better than this man is now getting.

THE ERIE COUNTY CAMPAIGN
EXPENDITURES ACT

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the daily proceedings of the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Practices has demonstrated to us all the urgent need for reform in our campaign practices and methods of campaign funding. It appears that far too many elections have become synonymous with exorbitant expenditures and gross conflicts of interest. Although the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 was a step forward, far more needs to be done on all levels of American government.

One very notable effort is being made toward campaign reform that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. Frustrated by the reluctance of New York State officials to initiate statewide changes in the campaign and election laws, the Democratic majority of the Erie County legislature has created a bill that seeks to place an effective limitation upon the amount of money that can be spent by a candidate in a local campaign. It is legislation deserving of the attention of all localities, and for this reason, I submit the proposal into the RECORD:

THE ERIE COUNTY CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES
ACT

A PROPOSAL

The proposed legislation would build upon existing Section 455 of the Election Law. That section imposes a limitation on amounts expended by a candidate in any election to 10¢ per voter (based upon votes for governor in the last gubernatorial election for affiliated voters of the candidate's party for a primary), with a minimum of \$2,500 for a primary and \$5,000 for a general or special election, plus a limitation on amounts expended in the election of an individual candidate by all committees taking part solely in his election of an additional 19¢ per voter (with the same minimums as for candidates). The proposed legislation adopts those standards but adds a limitation additionally of amounts which may be spent by committees taking part in the election of more than one candidate of an additional 30¢ per voter for County Executive and 10¢ per voter for other county offices (with the same minimums as for candidates). The major defect in the New York state legislation is the absence of any limitation on amounts spent by committees taking part in the election of more than one individual candidate. This apparently allows complete circumvention of the limits set forth in Section 455.

The legislation goes further than Section 455, however, by limiting expenditures for use of communications media to 60% of the maximum spending limit available *in toto*. The 60% limit on expenditures for communications media is that adopted in the recently enacted Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (P.L. 92-225).

ACCESS TO COLORADO RIVER IN GRAND CANYON

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, last November, the National Park Service announced plans to reduce the number of passengers allowed to take raft trips on the Colorado River through the Grand Canyon and to phase out the use of motors on boats traversing those waters. These restrictions were announced without the benefit of environmental studies to determine the visitor-carrying capacity of the river portion of the Grand Canyon or the effects of motor noise or emission levels on the canyon.

Any discussion of the use of the Grand Canyon necessarily must balance two important concerns: First, the protection of the beautiful natural state of the canyon, and, second the desire to permit the optimum number of people to enjoy a quality experience in the canyon. The Congress has charged the National Park Service with this responsibility to provide for the growing number of people attracted to the Grand Canyon with appropriate precautions to maintain the existing environment and not unreasonably commercialize the area or destroy the natural beauty and wildlife. However, without adequate factual studies to support them, any restrictions imposed by the Park Service to discharge their congressional mandate must be considered at face value, arbitrary and presumptuous.

At the time of the announcement of the passenger allocation cutback and the motor phaseout, outfitters providing passenger service on the Colorado River attempted to obtain from the Park Service information relating to the restrictions. When repeated attempts at obtaining justification failed, I requested a meeting in January for the outfitters in Washington with Department of Interior officials. I also wrote the Department detailing the outfitters' concerns. Moreover, I met in my office with Park Service officials seeking the rationale underlying the restrictions. And finally in hearings held June 21 on S. 1296 before the Senate Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, I questioned National Park Service Director Ronald Walker at some length to determine whether proper consideration of this matter had been given.

Mr. President, my exhaustive and repeated inquiries have forced the conclusion that the Department has acted precipitously and with no factual support to date in their arbitrary imposition of new restrictions on the Colorado River.

In the June 21 hearings on S. 1296 to expand the boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Park, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, Senator GOLDWATER testified as follows:

Mr. Chairman, in order to answer one remaining criticism that may be leveled against the bill because of misunderstanding, I would like to state emphatically that nothing, and I repeat nothing, in this bill will have any effect on the river trips or motors or anything pertaining to transportation on the Colorado River. . . The bill does not incorporate any current or proposed rules with respect to transportation on the river, either specifically or by implication, and, in fact, the river is expressly excluded from the Grand Canyon Wilderness Area by a statement on the map which accompanies the bill.

Nevertheless, the Park Service testified in favor of bringing the river under the wilderness provisions of the bill.

The following dialog between Director Walker and myself at the hearing illustrates the difference in our respective positions.

Mr. WALKER. Senator, when I first was appointed Director of the National Park Service this subject came out, the thing that hit me was that there had been no study. I asked what impact the motor was having on the river itself, and no one really knew. I think this is the thrust that the National Park Service is attempting to go into. I would hate to be in a position five years from now when that study is done, to find out there are serious ecology problems with the river. I am glad we addressed ourselves to it, if in fact there is damage being done, then we will be in a position by the time this study is completed, we will have at least done something for it.

Senator MOSS. You have said there is no evidence of ecological damage of which you are aware now on the river and yet administratively you have started to turn the numbers down and you have already set a phase out period for the motors on the river before you have any evidence of ecological damage.

My point is, why don't you just maintain the status quo and complete your study. Then, based on what the study shows determine whether you must come down in numbers and whether indeed it is feasible to eliminate all motors on the river.

Mr. WALKER. The point I am trying to make is that the National Park Service itself has not made any studies of that nature.

Mr. President, in admitting that no studies were undertaken before imposition of the cutbacks, the Director of the Park Service would have us believe that the purposes of the restrictions is to phase out the motors and cut back on passengers in the event studies taken over the next 5 years might show damage is now being done. I say preserve the status quo until there is solid evidence in existence, on the basis of thorough study, of environmental damage being done in the canyon.

It is an undisputed fact that the greatest impact upon the canyon floor is the constant fluctuation in the Colorado River caused by the varying amount of water permitted to pass through Glen Canyon Dam.

The impact of river travelers is not easy to measure. There exist few facts at present to explain what damage if any is being created.

With respect to carrying capacities, other rivers considered wilderness areas are carrying as many or more passengers

as is the Grand Canyon, giving the participants an opportunity to share the wilderness while at the same time maintaining the natural beauty of the areas. On the Snake River in Wyoming, more than 60,000 people per year enjoy the trip from Jackson Lake to Moose Junction in the Grand Teton National Park. In Dinosaur National Monument, 14,145 people in 711 groups completed the 4 day trip in 1971. Both of the above are smaller rivers and the areas are more accessible, yet through good management and careful use, they remain wilderness areas available for the enjoyment of numbers of people.

Before this rash action of the Park Service should be allowed to stand, there are numerous questions for which we need factual answers. These questions all have at heart the problem of access to the Grand Canyon.

For example, what is the basis for ignoring the experience and testimony of the commercial outfitters that a safe trip for the average Grand Canyon passenger can only be conducted with the larger boats? Moreover, what consideration has the National Park Service given to conclusions stated in a report from Arizona State University—Technical Report No. 10: "Colorado River Trips Within the Grand Canyon National Park and Monuments; Socio-Economic Analysis," which reveals that 94.16 percent of past users responding to the study traveled by motorized craft, that 94 percent rated their trip enjoyment as very good to super and that 92 percent stated that a trip down the Colorado River is a wilderness experience and that 60 percent felt that motors were essential to a safe trip through the canyon? What effect will elimination of motors have on the quality and length of trips? Past users have stated that the most limiting factor on their decision to take river trips is the amount of time required to take the trip. Outfitters have stated that elimination of motors will increase from 30 percent to 100 percent the time required to take the Colorado River trip and that passengers will be required to be on the water for longer periods each day, thus decreasing the time for side trips, exploration, and contemplation of scenic areas.

Moreover, what effect will elimination of motors have on the cost of a Colorado River trip? Because of increased insurance costs, additional time and equipment required, and additional boatmen required, the outfitters estimate the cost of a Colorado River trip to the public will double if motors are eliminated. For example, insurance premiums are based on the number of rafts on the river. A motor-powered trip carrying 40 passengers—maximum size trip—can easily accommodate the passengers and boatmen on two rafts. An oar-powered trip could require at least 5 rafts or more than the same number of passengers. In addition, while two boatmen can safely handle the motor-powered rafts, the oar-powered rafts will require a minimum of five and possibly 10 boatmen. These costs of doing business are necessarily borne by the passengers.

A most important concern is the effect the elimination of motors will have on the

number of boats on the river and the human impact on the river environs. For each motor-powered raft eliminated from the river two to three oar-powered boats might need to be substituted to carry the passengers, with a corresponding increase in the number of boatmen. Where 40 persons can presently complete a 190-mile trip through the canyon in 5 days on a motorized trip, camping on four beaches and consuming 200 passenger user days, the same trip for 0 persons will take 8 to 10 days on an oar-powered trip and these persons will camp on seven to nine beaches and use up 400 passenger user days with less time off the river to explore and enjoy its environs. The net result is that one-half as many passengers travelling on two to three times as many boats will have the same environmental impact as twice that number of passengers traveling by motor-powered craft.

Furthermore, what effect will elimination of motors have on the sanitation and trash removal programs sponsored by the outfitters? At present, outfitters carry chemical toilets and haul out all trash from beaches and camps. The National Park Service acknowledges this action has contributed to marked improvement in the appearance of the canyon since 1970. If motors are eliminated, the equipment proven best for sanitation—chemical toilets with macerators—and the equipment for cooking—butane tanks—and trash disposal will be extremely difficult to carry by oar-powered craft.

And finally, of vital concern to me is what impact the river restrictions might have on family groups and older Americans who presently choose to travel by larger rafts. I fear the elimination of motors will limit the canyon experience to the young person who can withstand the physical and psychological rigors of small boat travel.

I have received hundreds of letters from all over the country protesting the Department's decision. One letter summed up the concern of many elderly citizens as follows:

ALBANY, N.Y.,
June 16, 1973.

HON. FRANK MOSS,
Senate Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: There is a growing movement gaining momentum, throughout the land, to take away from the many (to whom our parks belong) and restrict usage only to those physically capable. I, personally, do not agree with this "elitist" attitude.

I, personally, am physically able. I am an avid skier, hiker and mountain climber. I am also a National Ski Patrolman, Red Cross First Aid Instructor and am active in many outdoor groups. I am fifty-one years of age.

The reason I am alarmed is because I note restrictions appearing on park use. In particular, (1) Restrictions on Grand Canyon River use in that previous motorized larger rafts are now being prohibited. This "in effect" restricts Canyon Colorado River use to those physically able; (2) Restrictions on access to Rocky Mountain trail regions. There are restrictions, as well, on types of camping permitted and locations. This would prohibit and restrict many areas of our parks so that those "on wheels" could not experience what our park system is set up to preserve; (3) Restrictions on age in that only the younger, more mobile people are able to participate

and enjoy; (4) Restrictions against the disabled, infirm and old-age retired.

When you limit a given area or experience only to those who can row a raft; hike a given distance; climb a mountain; survive extreme elements; take a risk; or through having wealth or position, then, you have taken away from others (taxpayers and citizens) their so-called "equal rights".

You, who are not always in a position to help "all the people" are being asked now to do what you can to help keep our parks for the use of all of us and hold off encroachment by these elitist, so called "environmentalist groups" who have large lobbies.

Thank you for your courtesy in reading my protest.

Concerned citizen,

HARVEY R. ALFORD.

As difficult as it may be to obtain the balance between access to our national parks and protection of them, it presently is clear that thousands of individuals enjoy and are receiving a meaningful experience in the Grand Canyon without obvious damage to the environment. The public should not be made to suffer the loss of access to this great area of natural beauty without substantial proof of actual damage. I call upon the Department of the Interior to preserve a choice of propulsion methods and grant passenger spaces at the 1972 levels until an adequate study can be completed.

Mr. President, a joint resolution of the 40th Legislature of the State of Utah, a resolution of the Utah Recreation and Park Association, and a resolution of the Western States Boating Administrators Association all call upon the National Park Service to rescind the passenger cutback and reconsider the means of accommodating passengers on the Colorado River in such a way that the ultimate enjoyment of the park can be achieved with minimum ecological imbalance. I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE STATE LEGISLATURE OF UTAH

A joint resolution of the 40th Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the National Park Service, the Superintendent of Grand Canyon National Park, the Superintendent of Canyonlands National Park, the Superintendent of Dinosaur National Monument, and the Congress of the United States to protect and promote proper tourism and preservation of the natural wonders of our waterways in the national parks and monuments.

Be it resolved by the Legislative of the State of Utah:

Whereas, the majority of the river-running companies of Southern Utah are a decided asset to the environment and the economy of the State of Utah; and

Whereas, the river-running companies headquartered in the Kane County area are aiding the local economy by hiring over 70 people; and

Whereas, Kane and Garfield Counties are economically depressed areas with over 14% unemployed; and

Whereas, there is apparent bureaucratic red-tape and discrimination against these river-runners to the extent that they may be forced out of total operation; and

Whereas, these companies are totally com-

mitted to a clean, humanly sterile environment in the wilderness areas they visit, leaving behind them absolutely nothing but their footprints; and

Whereas, these companies are being forced to submit to severe reductions in patrons; and

Whereas, some concessionaires who have never functioned at all in the past and who do not have any equipment, any supplies, or any intention of river-running, have been given an equal quota of only 320 patrons with other serious businessmen; and

Whereas, the river-runners had an extremely short notification of the cut-back in the number of patrons allowed to travel with each company; and

Whereas, many river-runners will not be able financially to correspond with patrons who have already booked trips with them for the coming season to tell them that they cannot find a place for them in their boats; and

Whereas, the Kane County area merchants have begun to gear their operations to accommodate the influx of patrons for their river-running companies.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the legislature of the State of Utah that we call upon the National Park Service, the Secretary of the Interior and the Superintendents of Grand Canyon National Park, Canyonlands National Park and Dinosaur National Monument to rescind the cut-back on such a blanket restriction, and to reconsider the proper means of accommodating our traveling public in such a way that the ultimate enjoyment of the parks can be achieved with the minimum amount of ecological imbalance, if any.

Be it further resolved, that the legislature of the State of Utah call upon the Congressional delegation from the State of Utah to work avidly for the implementation of this resolution.

Be it finally resolved, that the secretary of the State of Utah, be and is hereby directed, to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the National Park Service, the Superintendent of Grand Canyon National Park, the Superintendent of Canyonlands National Park, the Superintendent of Dinosaur National Monument, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Utah in the United States Congress.

RESOLUTION

The Utah Recreation and Parks Association recognizes recreation as a universal right and stresses that the splendor of nature should not be prohibitive to anyone because of age, physical condition, social status or financial position. This association therefore officially declares its opposition to the proposed removal of outboard motors currently being used on rafts floating through the Grand Canyon on the Colorado River. The following reasons have moved us to oppose such a proposal:

1. Removal of motors would greatly enhance the danger to life since control is a vital factor while maneuvering through extremely dangerous rapids.

2. Removal of motors would necessarily prohibit the aged, the handicapped and the young from viewing some of nature's most magnificent creations. Only the most physically fit would therefore be permitted such splendor.

3. Since removal of motors would limit the numbers floating the river, passenger costs would increase to a point where all but the most affluent would be eliminated from such a quality experience.

The Utah Recreation and Parks Association, which is represented by federal, state, municipal, educational, commercial and therapeutic agencies, respectfully submit this

resolution for your most serious consideration.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the National Park Service has announced plans to drastically reduce the number of persons allowed to take raft trips on the Colorado River flowing through the Grand Canyon in Arizona and Cataract Canyon in Utah, partially by phasing out the use of motors on boats transverse these waters by 1977; and

Whereas, the proposed restrictions are reputed to be of a design by over zealous conservationists to have Congress set aside the Colorado River in the Grand Canyon and Cataract Canyon as a wilderness preserve subject to wilderness management standards; and

Whereas, the Western States Boating Administrators Association, taking cognizance of the history of boating on this waterway, finds no evidence that the use of motor powered boats is harming the environment and challenges the National Park Service to demonstrate scientifically wherein they are introducing levels of air, water or noise pollution incompatible with the environment of the Canyons; and

Whereas, at this time in the Grand Canyon car-powered use amounts to only 10 percent of all river use and motorized craft are preferred by most outfitters and private boat operators for safety reasons and the use of motors is definitely a major factor in the phenomenal safety record on the river; and

Whereas, this Association, dedicated as it is to boating safety, is gravely concerned that the arbitrary removal of motors from boats on the swift moving waters of the Colorado will jeopardize the safety and well being of persons on organized raft trips or private boating adventures; and

Whereas, this Association is wary that if the effort to restrict use of motors in Grand Canyon and Cataract Canyon is allowed to go unchallenged, without concrete evidence that there is any problem, it may set a dangerous precedent for the National Park Service in establishing unwarranted restrictions against boating wherever wilderness advocates exert pressure;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Western States Boating Administrators Association in convention assembled at the Grand Canyon, Arizona this 3rd day of May, 1973, does hereby protest any effort on the part of the National Park Service to eliminate use of motors, and objects to a reduction of numbers of persons who may wish to take river float trips through the Grand Canyon and Cataract Canyon, since the Association strongly feels that the proposed actions would accommodate wilderness advocates at the expense of boating safety; and

Be it further resolved, that if the National Park Service means to base its proposed restrictions on pollution considerations this Association asks that they prove without qualification wherein the present level of raft trips and motor powered boats are serious pollution problems requiring restrictions; and

Be it further resolved, that the National Park Service should involve the appropriate state boating agencies in any further considerations of motor restrictions or any other matters related to boating safety; and

Be it further resolved, that the president of this Association be and he is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior, the Superintendents of Grand Canyon and Canyonlands National Parks, every member of Arizona's and Utah's congressional delegation in Washington, D.C., the Colorado River Outfitters Association, and the Western River Guides Association.

SKYLAB PROVES MAN'S FLEXIBILITY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Japan Times of June 28, 1973, points out the value of the first Skylab flight and the potential that our first national space station has in its next two missions as a foundation contributing to the future of our national space program.

I commend this editorial to the reading of my colleagues and the general public:

[From the Japan Times, June 28, 1973]

SKYLAB PROVES MAN'S FLEXIBILITY

The three American astronauts in the first Skylab mission established a long list of impressive records but above all proved that men can not only survive but think and work effectively during prolonged space voyages.

Their achievement makes possible the second Skylab mission. Three more astronauts are scheduled to rendezvous with Skylab July 27 to begin 56 days of occupancy—twice the time spent aloft by the first crew. And the first and two forthcoming missions will represent a big step toward the day when men will be able to visit Mars and the other planets.

American astronauts Charles Conrad, Dr. Joseph Kerwin and Paul Weitz orbited for 28 days, breaking the old record set by the ill-fated Soviet Soyuz crew which remained in space for 23 days and 18 hours. The Soviet spacemen were killed in preparing to descend to earth.

The Americans manned the largest and heaviest spacecraft ever launched. Skylab is 40 meters long and weighs 100 tons. They made 391 orbits around the earth traveling 1,700,000 kilometers—both new records for manned orbiting space flights. And for the first time in space history, they carried out repair work outside an orbiting craft.

For Skylab commander Conrad, the space flight that ended last week was a personal achievement. He now has spent more time in space than any other man—49 days, one hour and eight minutes during four missions. And although Conrad is 43 and older than the other two astronauts, he experienced less trouble in readjusting to the earth's gravity after the crew splashed down in the Pacific Ocean in their Apollo spaceship.

For 24 hours after the astronauts came back, there was concern about their physical condition and some doubts if man could withstand the rigors of weightlessness for such a long period of time. All the astronauts were wobbly on their feet and suffered from dizziness and nausea due to ear and circulatory difficulties in readjusting from zero gravity to the earth's gravity.

However, after 12 hours of sleep, doctors pronounced that all three had made a rapid recovery, and they were given permission to fly to the Western White House at San Clemente to meet visiting Soviet Communist Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev and President Richard Nixon.

Conrad never had any doubts. Immediately after the splashdown, he declared the mission a success and stated that he and the other two Skylab crew members had proved that men could live and work in extended periods of weightlessness. The doctors later concurred.

But the "fix-it" crew of Skylab did much more than prove men could adjust to weightlessness for four weeks. Through their risky repair work on a solar panel, they saved the entire Skylab project from failure. In Hous-

ton, Skylab Director Kenneth Kleinknecht made this interesting observation: "We demonstrated that man, whether he be on the ground or in the air, is the most flexible, adaptive, non-specialized machine in existence today."

We can all draw encouragement from the fact that we are still better than machines and that there is the need, if not the necessity for manned space flights. Only men with tools saved Skylab from disaster.

Although testing the endurance of man in prolonged weightlessness was one objective of the Skylab program, there were others of great scientific importance. The Skylab crew brought back to earth 30,000 photographs of the sun which were the clearest yet taken, 14,000 photographs of the earth's resources and nine miles of magnetic tape which recorded other earth data.

One of the most spectacular observations was made only a few days before the mission ended. The Skylab crew was able to photograph a massive solar flare from the sun measuring 40,233 kilometers in width. Excited scientists were convinced that these photos would help explain this phenomenon which periodically disrupts radio communication on earth and causes magnetic storms that cause power blackouts.

The accomplishments of the first Skylab mission were many and significant not only for the future of space travel but in increasing man's knowledge of the sun and his own earth. We look forward to the even longer missions of Skylab and to the knowledge which will be obtained for the benefit of all of us on earth.

REV. L. H. MESSERSMITH RETIRES

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest influences for good in Illinois' 13th Congressional District is the presence of Rev. and Mrs. L. H. Messersmith. Lauren Messersmith has been the resident minister at the Millburn Congregational Church since 1942, following his graduation from Chicago Theological Seminary.

Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity on many occasions to visit Rev. Messersmith's church in Millburn to hear him preach and to benefit from his less formal communications to members of his congregation and many others.

Lauren Messersmith is a straightforward man whose example of unspectacular, but solid Christian living has been an inspiration to all with whom he has come in contact.

Mr. Speaker, assisted by his devoted wife, Marguerite, who has been a first-grade teacher at the Woodland School in Gages Lake, Rev. Messersmith has been more than a Christian minister—he has been a spiritual and community leader in Northwest Lake County. Indeed, the influence of Rev. and Mrs. Messersmith has reached far beyond the immediate area where they serve.

Mr. Speaker, without recounting the many community and civic honors which have been accorded to them, may I state simply that Lauren Marguerite Messersmith have reached into the hearts of the citizens of Illinois' 13th Congressional

District, and have brought forth the best that is in all of us.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Messersmiths will do some extensive traveling together, before settling down in a home in Leisure Village at Fox Lake. I am sure that I speak in behalf of all of my constituents who are acquainted with them when I extend to Rev. and Mrs. L. H. Messersmith our appreciation for their lives of Christian service, and for their unselfish devotion to the interests of all of us who reside in the areas where they have served. We join in extending to them our best wishes for good health and happiness together in the years ahead.

REMEMBER CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this month our great Nation celebrated the 197th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence—Independence from oppression and tyranny. This week, by an act of Congress, the President has proclaimed for the 15th year the observance of Captive Nations Week—nations still captives of oppression and tyranny.

Proclamations and speeches will not free the captive peoples in Communist-dominated countries, and it seems that 15 years of observances have produced very little in the way of results. Yet the hopes of the people in Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, and other subjugated nations remain high, and word of valiant struggles for freedom filters through the Iron Curtain. And certainly the time has never seemed better for positive action to be taken.

Recent summit talks between President Nixon and Soviet Party Leader Brezhnev have been hailed as a thawing of the cold war. Detente has begun. The forthcoming European Security Conference in Helsinki and the talks in Geneva offer an ideal vehicle for improving the situation for captive nations. The United States should insist on placing certain of these matters on the agenda, and should never lose sight of the emptiness of Soviet promises and commitments and the reality of Soviet imperialism and brutality.

We do not seek to impose our own Constitution on any other nation, but there are basic human rights to freedom and dignity that are intrinsic to any nation. These rights have been denied to the captive nations, and no honorable agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union can be concluded without decisive steps toward restoration of them.

Let us not forget that true peaceful coexistence is only possible when all pacts are honored and all people respected. Although East-West relations have never seemed more promising, let us not forget that not all share the joys of liberty. As we observe Captive Nations

Week, let us not forget the people who live Captive Nations Week each week of each year. Let the need for this observance be abolished.

HOWARD PHILLIPS REPRIEVED

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, now that Howard Phillips has been edged out of his job as the Director of the OEO, by, I might add, a concerted effort by liberals of both parties, it is the duty of each and everyone of us in this body to carry on the job he so diligently and efficiently pursued.

Phillips is gone, but the abuses in Government continue. Here, for your consideration, is the story of Harry Jay Katz, self-styled bon-vivant, world traveler, man-about-town, and as deceitful as one could ever hope to be.

The article is from the July 7, issue of Human Events:

HEW GIVES GRANT TO HIGH LIVER

Taxpayers smarting under a \$268-billion federal budget might want to ponder the story of Harry Jay Katz. For Katz and other glib-tongued "grantsmen" are one reason that federal spending long ago galloped out of control.

Katz, 32-year-old son of a wealthy Camden, N.J., family, tried and failed several years ago to open a Playboy Club in Philadelphia. Poiled in the marketplace, Katz turned to Uncle Sam. And there he did not fail.

From mid-1971 to mid-1972, Katz received \$57,000 in federal funds for something called the Bicentennial Language Incentive Program (BLIP). The program was supposed to make Camden's inner-city students bilingual so they could work at the 1976 Bicentennial celebration in Philadelphia and the Olympic Games in Montreal.

Katz spent BLIP's \$57,000. Not one student was ever trained. Nor, indeed, was the program ever set in motion. But as the Philadelphia *Bulletin* disclosed last week, Katz himself was very much in motion.

The wheeling-dealing entrepreneur used the federal funds to rent limousines, charter airplanes to the West Coast and Canada, send flowers to friends and tour Disney World several times. New Jersey state investigators probed his expenditures and concluded:

"There is no tangible evidence available that indicates that such activities are either directly or indirectly related to the student body of the Camden School District or any New Jersey school district."

In running BLIP, Katz ran up huge taxpayer phone bills, calling such "inner-city" trouble spots as Tel Aviv, Rio de Janeiro and the florist at the Los Angeles Hilton. He spent as much as \$214 a day on chartered limousines and thousands of dollars setting up elaborate press conferences to trumpet his program.

On one occasion Katz spent \$796 for a round-trip air ticket to Los Angeles—supposedly for himself and James M. Milligan, a staff assistant. But Milligan insists that he never made the trip. "I'd have jumped at the chance," he told the *Bulletin*.

On one of Katz' trips to Montreal, he met Nancy McIntyre, a 27-year-old executive director of Inter-Ed, a local language training program. "He impressed me as a salesperson who never seemed to get it all together," Miss McIntyre says.

But after he left Montreal, Katz made sure that Miss McIntyre would not forget him. "He sent me a picture of himself wearing a peace symbol and nothing else," she told the *Bulletin*.

And that, taxpayers, is where at least some of your money is going.

NEW YORK DAILY NEWS ON PHASE IV: "PUNT AND PRAY"

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the administration has unveiled its plans for phase IV and it seems their answer to inflation is a recession, no doubt the least desirable method one can think of for controlling an inflationary economy.

The New York Daily News has written a perceptive editorial analyzing the effects phase IV is likely to have on our economy. I would like to share it with my colleagues and I insert it at this point in the Record.

[From the New York Daily News, July 20, 1973]

PHASE IV: PUNT AND PRAY

The "explanations" offered by Secretary of the Treasury George Shultz on Wednesday for the next round of wage and price controls add up to an admission by the administration that efforts to manipulate the economy from Washington have failed.

Except for beef, the freeze on food prices has been lifted. And with that lid removed, it is generally conceded that grocery bills will leap up again.

That's bad news for consumers. But they and administration officials were faced with a choice of poisons: a thaw that would trigger immediate food hikes, or a prolonged curb leading to shortages, scarce buying, hoarding, black marketeering and—in the long run—rationing.

President Nixon and his advisers chose the first course as the least damaging, economically and politically. They are counting on natural forces—a slowdown in the business boom and bumper crops of wheat, corn and feed grains—to put a damper on inflation by year's end.

The White House also has put renewed emphasis—underlined by Secretary Shultz in his Phase 4 briefing—on balancing the federal budget so as to end the flood of printing-press money that is driving the cost of living higher and higher. The secretary called it a return to—

The old-time religion—of fiscal responsibility by the government after an era of reckless spending and futile attempts to "fine tune" the economy with clumsy bureaucratic hands.

The economic stresses the nation is now enduring are the result of blundering Big Brotherish attempts to fiddle with the in-built mechanisms that jolt a free economy out of recessions and inflationary highs.

In trying to mastermind a painless path through or around normal business cycles—via rigging of the tax structure, subsidies and handouts, "full employment" budgets, and finally wage and price controls—the government has only worsened the situation.

Let's learn from the hard experience and, from this time forward, turn our backs resolutely on the quacks and crackpots peddling magic nostrums for eternal economic bliss. The price of their government-administered patent remedies is exorbitant.

FREE FEDERAL PARKING

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, an article in this morning's Washington Post states that the Environmental Protection Agency is considering action to require employees of that agency to pay for their parking privileges.

EPA is ostensibly considering this action in an effort to provide some leadership in reducing the number of automobiles which come into the District of Columbia each day, and to accomplish this through the encouragement of carpools.

Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1973, I introduced a bill to require all civilian employees of the Federal Government to pay for the privilege of parking. This bill would also require the allocation of existing parking spaces on the basis of carpools.

We hear more every day about some of the drastic measures which are being considered to reduce the amount of air pollution in our urban areas. We hear of plans to restrict the level of on-street parking, plans to ban all automobiles from certain cities during certain times of the day, plans to restrict the number of deliveries permitted to downtown retailers during normal working hours, and a host of other plans which, if enacted, will mean a whole new way of life for the American people.

The bill which I have introduced in this area, H.R. 6569, calls for no such drastic action. This bill only says that the American taxpayer should no longer be required to subsidize parking arrangements for Federal employees, and that elimination of this unnecessary fringe benefit will help bring about a cleaner environment through a reduction in traffic congestion in urban areas.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is only a matter of time before Congress views the inevitability of the need for this legislation. I urge my colleagues in the House Committee on Public Works to consider this bill at the earliest practicable date, and I call to the attention of all my colleagues the article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

UNITED STATES EYES OUT IN PARKING BY WORKERS

(By Kirk Scharfenberg)

The Environmental Protection Agency is drafting regulations to discourage federal workers from commuting to Washington by car by eliminating government-owned parking spaces or increasing their price, according to reliable sources.

Officials here said they expect the regulations to be announced next week, but an aide in EPA cautioned that the plan has not yet received final approval from the agency.

The EPA decision will be a key indicator of the federal government's commitment to regulate its own pollution, a District of Columbia official said.

According to city statistics, there are at least 28,000 government-controlled parking spaces in the city. Some are free. Many rent for only \$5 a month. The average commercial rate in downtown Washington for a parking space is about \$3 a day.

It was not clear yesterday whether EPA was also considering moving against the thousands of government parking spaces in the suburbs. The Pentagon, alone, has about 10,000 spaces.

According to local officials working on the clean air program as well as aides within EPA, the EPA plan would require that federal agencies either charge market rates for their parking spaces or eliminate a number of them.

The general goal would be to reduce automobile commuting by at least 15 per cent. About 380,000 commuters enter the District daily by car.

An EPA aide said the precise method by which EPA would propose to reduce the number of federal parking spaces—or increase their cost—has not been determined.

However, several sources said that there have been "delicate negotiations" between EPA and the Office of Management and Budget over the issue. OMB, representing the White House, could order federal agencies to make changes.

In April 1972, OMB circulated a proposal that all subsidized parking be eliminated, but it was never implemented.

Clean-air plans for the Washington area, submitted to EPA by the District, Maryland and Virginia, call for a reduction of parking spaces, including those controlled by the federal government.

However, there has been doubt over whether the local jurisdictions could compel federal action, and EPA reportedly believes it would be more appropriate for the federal government to regulate itself.

"The whole thing," said one EPA aide, "is full of administrative nightmares. Somebody is going to get hurt. Somebody will lose his parking space. It's been a very long week. If they had beds here at EPA..."

EPA is scheduled to announce its decision on the clean-air plans submitted by Maryland, Virginia and the District on Tuesday.

The public could then comment until Aug. 15 when the EPA plan would become official.

EPA is expected to accept generally the plans submitted by the three jurisdictions which call for the purchase of 750 new buses, a ban on free on-street parking, a possible \$2-a-day surcharge on parking in commercial lots, and restrictions on the development of new parking facilities.

The aim of the plan is to meet federal clean-air standards by 1977. In addition to the question of federal government parking, EPA is also reviewing the local government proposal of limiting airplane taxiing at area airports. EPA has announced a test of such limitations will be made at National Airport but is said to oppose permanent restrictions.

In a related development, the Citizens Association of Georgetown announced yesterday its intention to file suit in 60 days challenging two proposed developments on the Georgetown waterfront on the grounds that they would increase air pollution there by attracting cars.

Challenged by the association are developments proposed by Georgetown-Inland Corp. and the Maloney Concrete Co. The Clean Air Act of 1970 requires that 60 days notice be given.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1973

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Captive Nations Week 1973. It is no longer news to anyone that

the age of détente is now upon us. The President's trips to China and to the Soviet Union have rung up the Iron and Bamboo Curtains on a new act in the international drama.

The ties of international trade are binding our Nation closer together with those who were former adversaries. We are undoubtedly coming closer together and the prospects of lasting peace are to be applauded.

However, I would like to utter a word of caution before we are all swept away by the euphoria of rapprochement. There are still a billion people in bondage to the nations with which we, of late, have been talking, trading, and generally lessening tensions.

The Western democracies in general and the United States in particular have always held out the promise of deliverance to these peoples. It is my fervent hope that in the headlong rush into new markets we will not make a travesty of their hopes and our promises.

In our pursuit of peace among nations, let us not forget the aspirations of the captive nations for freedom as well as for peace. Let us bear in mind their yearning for the right to self-determination.

FOOD SHORTAGE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I hereby insert into the RECORD an editorial broadcast July 11 and 12 on station WMAQ-TV, channel 5, Chicago. I commend this editorial by Dillon Smith as a very practical commentary on the possible food shortage.

In the process of inserting this editorial, I take the opportunity to emphasize my belief that the effectiveness of the administration's economic controls leaves much to be desired. We need less, not more, governmental tinkering with farm economics since the cost to the consumer of agricultural products are so directly affected by the laws of supply and demand.

This editorial, I believe, contains excellent advice to the listening public of Chicago's channel 5.

The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL

Grocery stores in the Chicago area are starting to run short of food. This could become a serious situation. If people panic, it surely will be serious.

It may seem almost hard to believe, but right now there is a scarcity of chicken of all things. We've never had a chicken shortage before so maybe it would be helpful to explain how this has come about.

The current price freeze on food means that wholesalers and grocery stores have not been allowed to increase their prices on chicken. But the freeze doesn't cover raw agricultural products including the food grains that are used to feed chickens. They have gone up in price, partially due to the scarcity that resulted from the massive sale of wheat last year to the Soviet Union.

The end result is that it costs more to raise a chicken and get it to market than you can

sell it for, so a lot of folks in the chicken business are sitting on the sidelines for the time being.

Chicken is not the only product in short supply. We're also facing a scarcity of beef and produce departments may run short of some fruits and vegetables because spring rains and frosts killed off many crops.

Okay, now what can be done about this? The current Phase Three-and-a-half price freeze has been a disaster. Fortunately, President Nixon and his economic advisors seem to recognize that and they are trying to scrap this program just as rapidly as they can.

That is necessary because this price freeze has contributed to the shortage of food. But lifting the freeze will permit food prices to go up. That is hardly a pleasant prospect but it is significantly better than not having any food to buy.

The big concern right now is how consumers will react to this situation. If people panic, if they become scared that they won't have enough food to feed their families, they might start hoarding food.

That is absolutely the worst thing that could happen. Widespread panic buying of food would certainly precipitate a grave shortage that could result in federal rationing of food. If we want to avoid that, we must realize that if we start hoarding food, there's not going to be enough left to go around.

DALE GARST AND CLEAN ENVIRONMENT

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the importance of effective sanitation practices in cleaning up the environment in American cities cannot be overly emphasized. The success in cleaning up our cities rests largely upon dedicated men and women who are committed to getting the job done, but get little recognition.

Mr. Dale Garst, of Wichita, Kans., is one of those professional sanitation experts who has achieved the objective of making a large community a truly clean city. Mr. Garst, with whom I have been acquainted for many years, is retiring as director of the Wichita Sanitation Division after nearly 30 years service. Long before today's ecological emphasis and concern, Dale Garst was in the forefront working for sound sanitation practices. His leadership has been outstanding, and he will be truly missed in the forefront of this effort. I am proud to salute him on the occasion of his retirement and wish him well. He is deserving of our appreciation and congratulations.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Beacon which discusses the contributions of Mr. Garst to a clean environment:

ACHIEVED HIS GOAL

A career devoted to keeping Wichita clean comes to an end today.

Dale Garst, who has been director of the city's sanitation division for 23 years, is retiring, ending nearly three decades in the sanitation business.

The Wichita native first started working for the city in 1944 when he became a health department sanitarian. The following year he was named superintendent of the health de-

partment's trash collection division and in 1950 became head of the city's refuse department, at the time the city first got into the trash collection business.

He has continued in that post through several administrative changes in city government and even a three-month "leave" to try working for a business concern.

He has seen vast changes in the methods of trash collection and disposal in those 29 years and helped Wichita attain many improvements in sanitation practices.

He once said his only desire was to see Wichita be a clean city. That he achieved this goal is a tribute to his determination and leadership in his field.

PROHIBITING FOOD STAMPS FOR STRIKERS: AN ACTION LACKING BOTH WISDOM AND FAIRNESS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the passage by the House yesterday of the amendment to prohibit food stamps for workers on strike was an action lacking both wisdom and fairness. Two concerns persuade me of this view. I have misgivings about a collective bargaining system whose balance can now be lost because one side to a dispute may face hunger in defending its legitimate interests. And my reservations are intensified by the prospect of innocent children depending for adequate nourishment on one side's forsaking its negotiating position.

The integrity of the collective bargaining process would have been strengthened, not diminished, by allowing working people and their families to receive food stamps if they qualified in other respects. Many union families would not have so qualified, but the stamps would have insured that members at the lower tip of the income spectrum could participate in strike activity. As for the responsibility of Government, it continues to lie in making certain that collective bargaining is truly an adversary process between two capable parties. It is my opinion that cutting off food stamps will greatly interfere with this process.

This conviction prompts my second objection. We all agree, I am sure, that children in this country, and, for that matter, around the world, must have access to sufficient food regardless of the acts of their parents. We have also established that in the United States there are indeed thousands of children without wholesome diets who are suffering physical and mental harm from which they will never recover. It is troubling enough that Congress has thus far failed to pass the programs to save these youngsters; certainly we should have refrained from anything which might add to their numbers. Now, however, we have adopted a proposal to deny food stamps to the offspring of parents who possess fewer resources than the typical union family and who join their more fortunate coworkers in perfectly legal actions.

If decent food and the option to strike

are both basic rights, then we have no business forcing poor workers to choose one or the other, and we should have defeated this amendment.

BICYCLE SAFETY

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues here in Congress the tireless, unselfish, and civic-minded campaign a hard-working public official and constituent of mine is conducting for the cause of bicycle safety. I am referring to the Traffic Safety Commissioner of the town of Randolph, Mass., Mr. Bernard Davidson. I would be doing Mr. Davidson a great disservice were I only to mention his efforts on behalf of bicycle safety. Mr. Davidson has worked diligently to promote automobile traffic safety in his office of Traffic Safety Commissioner and has joined in many cooperative efforts in this field on the municipal and State levels. Mr. Davidson has also worked with my staff in seeking many overall improvements in the traffic situation in Randolph. I can only laud Mr. Davidson for these efforts and congratulate him for his foresight in recognizing the need for educating the public in bicycle safety. As we all know this healthy pastime is enjoying an unparalleled renewal of popularity and the necessity to reiterate long established basic responsibilities of safe bicycling through spirited public information campaigns is paramount. I am pleased to assist Mr. Davidson in this important effort and am sure that every Member will encourage similar projects in their districts throughout the Nation.

Mr. Davidson exemplifies the hard-working officials on the local level of government who are valuable assets to their communities and it is my every wish that this relevant bicycle safety project will prove beneficial for bicyclists everywhere.

Mr. Davidson has a firm belief, and rightfully so, that if we teach courtesy and safety to every bicyclist these good habits will surface later when behind the wheel of an automobile. The cooperative interaction of safe and careful driving with elementary courtesy which could easily be taught to young people riding bicycles should become a logical step from the sidewalk to the highway, and this simple precaution might help to reduce the carnage on America's roadways. Following is the text of a joint resolution I am introducing authorizing the President to declare a National Traffic Safety Week which hopefully will remind every American of his responsibility to drive in a safe and courteous manner:

H.J. RES. 676

Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the third week beginning on a Sunday in November of each year as "National Traffic Safety Week"

Whereas, statistics indicate a constant increase in the number of deaths and injuries resulting from the operation of motor vehicles; and

Whereas, deaths and injuries resulting from the operation of motor vehicles should be eliminated or minimized; and

Whereas, motor vehicle accidents can be avoided by a concerted effort by elected officials, law enforcement agencies, motorists, and pedestrians to replace indifference and carelessness with vigilance, alertness, and courtesy at all times; and

Whereas, there is a need to demonstrate a deep concern for the tragic waste of human life due to traffic accidents by setting aside a period devoting special attention to the safety and protection of motorists and pedestrians;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week beginning on a Sunday in November of each year as "National Traffic Safety Week", and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

CHARLES BERNSTEIN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear the case of Mr. Charles Bernstein.

Mr. Bernstein was imprisoned for almost 8 years for a crime that subsequently developed he did not commit, and for which he was granted a full and unconditional pardon by the President of the United States.

Since his release from prison, Mr. Bernstein has surmounted the almost unbearable hardships attached to his years in prison. He has made substantial contributions to our society, including distinguished service during World War II.

It is appropriate, in my view, to now allow Mr. Bernstein the opportunity for final vindication.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9462

A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles Bernstein, of Washington, District of Columbia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2513 of title 28, United States Code, and notwithstanding any statute of limitations pertaining to suits against the United States, or any lapse of time, or bars of laches, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim of Charles Bernstein, of Washington, District of Columbia, for damages sustained by him as the result of his arrest, arraignment, trial, and conviction, in 1933 and his subsequent imprisonment until 1940, for murder in the first degree, an offense for which he was

granted a full and unconditional pardon by the President of the United States.

Sec. 2. Suit upon any such claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States. Except as otherwise provided herein, proceedings for the determination of such claim, and review and payment of any judgment or judgments thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code. Notwithstanding, however, the limitations imposed by section 2513 of title 28 of the United States Code shall not apply to or restrict the jurisdiction conferred upon the United States Court of Claims by this bill.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the events of the past several months in the sphere of international relations, particularly between the Russians and ourselves, have served to create a new aura of conciliation among the major nations of the world. Our quickening sense of "community" is mitigated, however, by the fact that there are many countries today which do not have the freedom to participate in this new world entente. I refer to those Soviet occupied nations of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, and any other nation which is similarly oppressed.

This week marks the 15th observance of Captive Nations Week, a week reserved each year both for recognition of the contribution to America made by those citizens originally from "Captive Nations," and for renewing our pledge to work for a world in which there are no people under any form of subjugation.

Those countries which now enjoy the natural right of self-determination can take hope in the cause of these Baltic and Eastern European peoples by looking to their individual and collective histories as nations. During the past 75 years, the peoples of this area have suffered some of the worst disasters ever to plague mankind. They have provided the battleground for two devastating wars. Their people have been the victims of aggression from many quarters. Yet, these same people have displayed an ethnic and national pride strong enough to withstand the catastrophic events to which they have been subjected.

Hopefully, these nations will soon be allowed to realize their potential as independent contributors to the cause of world prosperity. Congress has extended this hope from our nation by adopting House Concurrent Resolution 416, which calls for the freedom of the Baltic States.

Let us hope, in the name of all humanity, that our entreaties for a free and peaceful world are heeded.

BLESSED IS THAT NATION

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, on the Sunday before the Fourth of July, the pastor of First Lutheran Church of Mifflinburg, Pa., delivered a sermon which has since been widely circulated in the central Pennsylvania area.

I have been requested by one of my constituents to review the remarks of Rev. D. Paul L. Reaser and, if appropriate, to share them with my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I do agree that this message is one of insight and of value to those of us who are privileged to serve in the Congress of the United States, and it is my pleasure to share it with my colleagues:

BLESSED IS THAT NATION

On this Sunday before Independence Day, I want to review with you certain elements in our early life as a nation, to help us and our children see clearly the foundation upon which our Republic was built.

In the Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, he made this entry on Sept. 6, 1741: "In Halle, on Sept. 6, I was invited to a meal by Rev. Dr. Francke. Before we sat down, the Rev. Doctor offered me a call to the Lutheran people in the province of Pennsylvania adding that I could accept it on trial for a few years. The poor folk there had been petitioning urgently for this for several years. Because for my part I knew well that I am the servant of my Lord, I could not answer otherwise than that it was all one to me if it was the Lord's will, because a servant depends upon the will of his Lord. . . . Accordingly I resolved in God's name to accept the call to Pennsylvania. . . ."

Today in our meditations I hope that all of us will recognize that this trust in God, this dependence upon His guidance, is the most common element in the early history of America's life. They firmly believed the scripture which declares, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord" (Ps. 33: 12).

Our Pilgrim Fathers, by the light of the smoking lamp on the Mayflower, before leaving their boat at Plymouth, inserted these words in the Mayflower Compact: "We whose names are underwritten have undertaken for the glory of God to establish . . . the first colony for the advancement of the Christian faith". Over the top of that contract were written these words, "In the Name of God, Amen".

Ten years later, in 1630, other Pilgrims sailed in the New England Federation Compact, "We all have come into these parts of America with one and the same end, namely to advance the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ." To them, along with all their human faults and frailties, this new land would be a new and noble experiment to demonstrate what would happen to any people who cared and dared to follow Jesus Christ in the many areas of human society and government.

Whether we think of the Puritans of New England, or the Anglicans of Virginia, or the Irish and Scotch and the Germans of Pennsylvania, the Dutch, or the hardy Scandinavians, a living trust in God was common to them all.

Apart from this dynamic faith in God, if you erase that from the documents and dec-

larations of this nation in her infancy and youth, American history has little meaning. One of our Harvard Univ. Historians, after inquiring into the origins and early development of our nation concluded, "No one who has delved deeply in the origin and history of the colonies can . . . deny that the dynamic force in settling New England was English Puritanism desiring to realize itself. The leaders proposed to make over a portion of the earth in the spirit of Christian philosophy: a new church and state, family and school, ethic and conduct . . . A new city of God was their aim."

In the earlier years, the life of the colonies was closely attached to the Motherland, and all colonies were subject to the English throne and English law. In 1660 oppression began when the mother country passed and attempted to enforce the despised Navigation Act. 100 years later, George III, at 22 years of age, dull, uneducated, intolerant and finally insane, came to the throne. He accepted the common European idea that a colony existed only to enrich the mother country. Oppression followed oppression, insult heaped upon insult, injustice added to injustice, until the feeling of Americans erupted like a volcano, causing Patrick Henry to exclaim, "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains or slavery?" Thousands of pioneer Americans felt the same way.

The first Continental Congress was called in 1774—32 years after Muhlenberg had started his ministry among the Lutheran churches here. That first Congress prepared and sent a petition to the King of England which he refused to receive. A second Congress was called in 1775, and in 1776 the Declaration of Independence was declared. That document united the colonies as nothing else could have done. It encouraged people to endure hardship and privation for the cause of freedom. From that day to the present hour, that document has been the inspiration and hope for many oppressed peoples and nations of the world.

The 56 signers of the Declaration represented all branches of Society. Most of them were well educated. Their average age was 46 years. Rev. John Witherspoon was the only clergyman to sign, and nine of the signers were graduates of the college over which he presided.

As so many steps in America's life, the signing of the Declaration of Independence was a spiritual event. It expressed the deepest feeling and conviction of the people and their leaders. You cannot understand America any other way. At the heart of our radiation is a spiritual reality. "We the people . . ." wrote one of the Founding Fathers, "are as a city set upon a hill, in the open view of all the earth, the eyes of the world are upon us, because we profess to be a people in covenant with God".

When trouble came to them, these hardy people searched their conscience using the 10 commandments as a basis for self-examination, which today would be a good practice for our leaders and our people in this clever, affluent 20th century. A century before Independence, in 1679, after such examination, a group of colonist leaders issued a document giving the following reason for trouble and disagreement among the people of the Massachusetts Bay Colony:

1. "Visible decay of Godliness among professing Christians.
2. Personal pride in the hearts of the people.
3. Church fellowship and worship neglected.
4. Profanation of the Word of God.
5. There is much Sabbath breaking."

I believe you would agree that all these conclusions are evident in our contemporary society.

In 1835 an historian wrote a book on American democracy enumerating the rea-

sons why he thought this democracy was a success. The American pioneer, he wrote, was a man who had taken up his residence in the wilderness equipped with a Bible, an ax, and a newspaper. The ax he must eventually lay down; the newspaper could give him at best only passing news of daily events; but the Bible—God's Word to man—was God's promise and guide for eternity.

A chapter later in America's life, we come to the missionaries and revivalists, who operated on the edge of civilization, and without whom an independent church which could stand upon its feet and look the state in the eye would never have succeeded. Jonathan Edwards with his doctrine of the sovereignty of God lifted the church above mere social environment and gave the soul a sense of its significance before God. Jonathan Edwards, John Wesley, George Whitefield, Charles Finney—all belong in this group. We recall how Whitefield stood on the steps of Independence Hall in Phila., preaching to a vast crowd while Ben Franklin measured the distance which Whitefield's voice could carry. Peter Cartwright, who introduced Methodism and decent living to the frontier; John Mason Peck another missionary who was responsible for keeping Illinois a free state; Jason Lee who went as a missionary to the Indians; Starr King, whose eloquence prevented California from leaving the union; and many others who preached the Good News of the Gospel and who played important roles in shaping this new nation should be remembered by this generation. In our day, Dr. Billy Graham is a worthy successor to those great evangelists who have been instrumental in sharpening the conscience of their day.

Why do we speak of all this history? Because it is imperative that we should know the ideals and hopes of those who have given us the foundation and source of such blessings as we enjoy. The American Republic has been one of heaven's experiments in democratic government on earth.

A friend of James Russell Lowell, outstanding American poet during the 19th century, asked him, "How long do you think the American Republic will endure?" Lowell replied, "So long as the ideas of its founding fathers continue to be dominant".

There are some who would jump off the ship of state declaring some other form of government is better; and there are some who in like manner would jump off the ship which we call the church, saying, "We don't need the church any longer; that's for kids and elderly ladies".

Well, let me tell you a story. A certain prisoner was being taken by ship to be tried by the highest authority of his government. The small ship was caught in a terrible storm. The sailors wanted to desert the ship. But this prisoner said to the commander and the crew of the ship, "Cheer up. None of us will lose our lives even though the ship will go down. For last night an angel of God whom I serve stood beside me and said, 'Don't be afraid, Paul . . . for God has granted your request and will save the lives of all those sailing with you.' So take courage! For I believe God. It will be just as He said. But we will be shipwrecked on an island."

Before long the ship hit a sand-bar, the bow of the ship stuck fast, while the stern was beaten by the waves and began to break apart. The commander ordered all who could swim to shore, and others were told to hang on to broken pieces of the ship until they should get help. Everyone of the 276 persons aboard safely got to shore.

If they had jumped overboard into the swollen sea they would surely have perished. But hanging on to even pieces of the ship brought them finally to safety.

That true story in Acts Chapter 27 is also a parable for today. Don't jump off the ship in the midst of storm and stress. You may

not think the ship as it is, is worth saving. But clinging just to the pieces may bring all to safety.

Let us not forget that God has the world in His hands. God has the ship of state in His hands: He has a concern for His children. God also established the church and holds it too in His hands. In the midst of stress and storm of the day, hold on, trust in God, He will see us through safely.

"Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord".

LABOR VIEWS THE ECONOMY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a lack of confidence in the Nixon administration economic policy has been expressed and published by the central labor council of Alameda County, Calif., in the East Bay Labor Journal. According to this editorial, the President's phases I through III have done virtually nothing to allay the fear of unemployment by the average wage earner, primarily because the goal of our present economic program has not been full employment. I agree that full employment should be one of our most important economic goals, and hope that during phase IV the President will take adequate steps to restore the confidence of the average worker in our economic system.

I feel that the opinion voiced by the East Bay Labor Journal expresses the views of a majority of American workmen and workingwomen and for that reason, I wish to enter this excellent editorial into the Record for my colleagues' interest and information.

KEY TO THE PUZZLE

If you haven't noticed that we are supposed to be in the middle of an economic "boom," that's because you work for a living. Right in the middle of figures showing record prices and profits and sales and interest and credit and production and other things that mean "boom" to the economists, there you are, the wage earner, a figure that points the other way. "Real wages," or what we can buy for the money we earn, has slipped backward for five straight months.

Or maybe you are one out of the five out of a hundred that has made it clear that you want a job and can't find one and are officially one of the unemployed. (If you didn't make it clear, because you don't know what to do with the kids, or are young and just getting started, or old and discouraged, you don't count.) Official or unofficial, it doesn't feel like "boom" to you, either.

As a matter of fact, it doesn't really feel like boom to many economists who have begun to predict a recession soon. Then jobs will be harder to find and to keep; more of us will be in real trouble and many others will be afraid.

Black workers will be afraid of losing jobs to white workers, and the other way around. Old workers will fear the competition of young workers and men will resent the pressure of women for equal job opportunities. Craftsmen will resist changes that will put them out of work and fight harder with other crafts to hang onto their jurisdictions. They will also resist any attempt to limit growth, which means construction, which means jobs.

All this is predictable because it exists all the time; it just gets worse when we can't actually make a decent living. Experience with boom and bust is deep in our bones, and many construction workers go through it every year.

The fear that goes with it—the chronic fear of unemployment—does more to pollute the social atmosphere than anything else.

We recommend this fact as a touchstone for Congressmen who will soon be forced to deal with runaway inflation and other symptoms that no longer respond to the usual medicines. The language of economics can be intimidating—and “inoperative” when it turns out not to be true. But we can no longer afford to “leave it to the experts.” As Watergate indicates, the experts are often paid by those who have a selfish interest in misleading us.

If Congressmen will ask what is happening to people, and why, and is it fair, they can hardly avoid the conclusion that full employment should be the goal of every economic program. When every American who wants to work knows that he or she can count on getting a job, a lot of other problems will soon be cut down to size.

WASHINGTON POST-NEW YORK
TIMES: YOU'RE NOT ALONE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, as you and my colleagues are well aware, I am not a “Johnny-come-lately” in my criticism of the news media, particularly as to their handling of the Watergate investigations. When I feel that the media has been unjust and unfair, I shall continue to speak out.

I thought I had seen it all until last night. The most irresponsible, most damaging, most prejudicial television news story yet produced was aired on the WTOP, channel 9 newscast at 11 p.m.

The story supposedly was to demonstrate a new type of “lie detector” manufactured by a company called Dektor located in Springfield, Va.

And now the clincher. How did they demonstrate the machine? You guessed it! They turned the TV on during Mr. Frederick LaRue's testimony before the Ervin Committee and proceeded to analyze it as to truthfulness. Need I tell you their conclusion? For the whole world to hear, or that part of the world that was tuned into the WTOP news, they concluded that Mr. LaRue's testimony indicated a great deal of stress and he apparently was being less than honest with the committee.

Mr. Speaker, there is not one of us here today who does not suffer the burden of strain daily. Are we to assume that the witnesses before the Watergate committee should not, and if they do, it is because they are apparently guilty?

This is a clear case of eavesdropping, Mr. Speaker, the same kind of activity that the media has been so critical of in regard to the Watergate investigation. It is also another example of irresponsible journalism, and trial by the media.

As long as this type of activity goes on

there is more reason to terminate the Watergate hearings than there is to continue them.

IAN D. MACLENNAN RETIRES FROM FBI

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding record of a man who has won the admiration and respect of the people of western Pennsylvania and law enforcement officers throughout the Nation.

After 32 years with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Ian D. MacLennan has retired, ending his illustrious career as the special agent in charge of the Pittsburgh Office of the FBI. His retirement leaves a void in the Bureau's ranks which will be most difficult to fill, for Mr. MacLennan exemplifies the very highest standards of the FBI. His dedication and efficiency as a law enforcement officer brought him commendations from his superiors; his warm, genuine friendliness brought him a host of friends, in and out of his profession.

He joined the Bureau in August 1941, and during World War II served as an undercover agent in South America. Over the years he has been assigned to field offices in New Orleans, New York, Cincinnati, in addition to numerous tours of duty at the FBI Headquarters here in Washington. During his tours in Washington, Mr. MacLennan served as chief of the Bureau's Fraud and Accounting Section and, subsequently, became an executive assistant to Mr. Don Parsons, then J. Edgar Hoover's top investigative aide in charge of all FBI operations.

Mr. MacLennan came to Pittsburgh as the SAC in 1962, and under his leadership the office received national attention for the arrest of a man nicknamed “the commuter bandit” by the local news media. The “commuter bandit” held up 16 banks in various parts of the area over a 5-year period before FBI agents, led by Mac, apprehended him. Mac and his agents also played major roles in the investigation of the slaying of the Joseph “Jock” Yablonski family, the union leader whose murder shocked the country.

On July 27, approximately 100 graduates of the National FBI Academy will pay tribute to “Mac” at a testimonial dinner in the Youghiogheny Country Club near McKeesport, Pa. Among those on hand to honor him will be Thomas D. Mansfield, publisher and editor of the Daily News in McKeesport; Walter T. Lofstrom, the city's former chief of police; Special Agent James Treher; Detective Captain John Rybar of McKeesport; Police Chief William Brkovich of Versailles Borough; Police Chief Jack W. Rudolph of Pleasant Hills; John B. Stack, assistant director of administration at the Allegheny County Police Academy; Detective Sgt. Thomas J. Tri-

dico of the Pennsylvania State Police; and Police Chief Daniel Gross of Sharon, Pa., president of the FBI National Academy Associates of Western Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege to have been invited to join these men in honoring Mr. MacLennan, for I hold him in the highest esteem. He is a man among men and one of the finest I have ever known.

ECOLOGICAL ENTHUSIASM

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, almost every one wants cleaner air, cleaner water, and less noise in this country. Reflecting the public will, the Congress enacts laws to help bring this about.

But, we must be careful not to try to go too far too rapidly at the expense of individual livelihood. Moderation, restraint, and balance is needed here as well as in every legislative field. This is particularly important to keep in mind as our growing energy crunch impacts on the ecology.

A recent column by William Buckley appearing in the Washington Star-News is of interest in this connection. The article follows:

THE PARALYSIS IN DRUG DEVELOPMENT

(By William F. Buckley Jr.)

A professor at the University of California charged last week almost parenthetically that 10,000 deaths from malaria in Ceylon in 1968 can be attributed to the late Rachel Carson, whose book “The Silent Spring” brought on the crisis of ecology, to be distinguished from the ecology crisis.

The latter is what we all know about. The former is what happens when one's concerns for the ecology become fanatical. When this happens, for instance, you find yourself saying that it is better to prohibit the use of DDT, because the chemical fallout may poison our grandchildren's clams, than to kill the mosquitoes who may give malaria to our grandchildren's grandparents like tomorrow. The need for balance in the ecological wars is very great.

As also in the related world of drugs. We are, one gathers, very soon to hear that the big scare of a few years ago about cyclamates was exaggerated. It isn't known—or, more accurately, I do not know—whether this means that further research has discredited the research that discredited cyclamates. Or whether a balanced application of the cost/benefit ratio, as the scientists call it, establishes that whereas for everyone who drinks 50 cyclamated Tabs per day and runs the risk of contracting cancer, there are 10,000 who take less than 50 cyclamated drinks per day who are scheduled to die from whatever it is that avoirdupois does to you, which might not have happened if you drank Tabs rather than Cokes.

Prof. Stephen de Felice wrote last year a book called “Drug Discovery—the Pending Crisis”, in which he records his dismay over the paralysis in drug development caused largely by the Kefauver-Harris Bill that came in 10 years ago after the thalidomide crisis. It was then that a few deformed children were born, as the result of the use of that drug. What followed, Dr. de Felice says, in his writings and speeches, was something akin to hysteria.

Moreover, the intellectual basis of the laws that transformed the Federal Drug Administration into an agency for suppressing scientific discovery, is incoherent. Much more is known about the deleterious effects of alcohol, say, or tobacco, than was ever suspected about cyclamates. "The effort now required to evaluate a new investigational drug in man would eliminate the Pasteurs, Jenners, Ehrlichs, and Domagks from our drug discovery system," says Dr. de Felice, pointing out that for all the explosions in drug discovery during the 1940s and '50s, which should have resulted in exponential progress during the '60s, very little of radical therapeutic nature was in fact discovered during the '60s.

Prof. Milton Friedman recently called attention to a cost analysis of the FDA's program done by Prof. Sam Peltzman of UCLA, in which the professor attempted by ingenious means to put a dollar value on the net result of the harsh anti-innovative legislation. He began by conceding all over the place that the human tragedy of a deformed child cannot be measured in dollar terms. But it can be measured in terms of a child who was scheduled to die an awful death, but was cured by drugs.

It is his assumption—which by the way Dr. de Felice challenges as being too optimistic—that the FDA cannot stop progress for very long, that brilliant new drugs will flow in from other quarters of the world. But he insists that there is at least a two year time lag directly traceable to the FDA's fanaticism.

MURDER BY HANDGUN: A CASE FOR GUN CONTROL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that a 43-year-old man had been shot and killed and was found lying near a tennis court at a Boston public housing project. All that was known about him was his name, his age, and his address.

We have now learned more about the man, Marion B. Shirley, and the increased knowledge makes his death the sadder, because he is no longer a faceless person, but a man with a history and a personality.

According to a report in the Boston Globe, Shirley was the fiscal coordinator for a federally funded rehabilitation program at the Tufts New England Medical Center. He had excellent relations with his fellow workers at the hospital, a spokesman for the university said.

Shirley's life had been filled with tragedy: His wife Barbara, had recently died of cancer, and his 22-year-old son had also died.

We still do not know who shot Marion Shirley, or why. But we know that a handgun was the murder weapon, and that the availability of guns made his murder very easy to accomplish.

As long as there are 90 million guns in civilian hands, no one of us is safe. At any moment, for any reason, we or the people we love could be the victims of a murder. The argument that we need guns to protect ourselves from guns, or that we must commit violence to protect

ourselves from violence, leads only to an endless cycle of destruction. The passage of strong gun control legislation is needed to begin to break that chain of violence. And only then will we be able to walk the streets of our country without fear.

THE TERRIBLE TOILET

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called to the attention of my colleagues an article of very far-ranging consequences written by Harold H. Leich and published last Sunday in the Washington Post. The first half of the article was published yesterday and the second half is hereby brought to the attention of my colleagues and the public:

THE TERRIBLE TOILET

(By Harold H. Leich)

Thus modern technology, through various incinerating and composting devices, is already solving the problem of a waterless method of human waste disposal. Maybe each one will find an appropriate niche in the sewerless society of the future—or perhaps some device not yet invented will be the answer.

But even with elimination of the traditional flush toilet, the need will not be reduced for sanitary sewers to carry away waste water from the bathtub, washing machine, and sink.

It does seem odd that the major disposal problem, human body wastes with their heavy burden of pathogenic organisms, is already solved but that relatively inoffensive wash water must still be drained away from each house through an expensive sewer system. So one challenge is left, and here the Lindstroms have come up with a further answer: They have invented a basement unit that cleanses wash water to the point where it can be safely used for lawn sprinkling and car washing. Any surplus is piped into the storm drain with no ecological damage, or it can be used to irrigate farms and forests.

THE ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVE

And so the outlines of a sewerless society are taking shape. In cities and towns of the future, houses would have incinerating or composting systems to dispose of body wastes. In apartment houses, office buildings, and factories, a large self-contained unit would dispose of all human wastes, without the need for a sewer connection. All other domestic waste water would be filtered and cleansed to the point where it could be used for sprinkling or other non-drinking uses, or led away into a storm drain. In certain areas it could be used to bolster a declining water table or to feed recreational lakes.

In any case, no sanitary sewers or central sewage treatment plants would be needed anywhere. (Relatively small plants would still be needed in metropolitan centers to clean off-street storm water of its burden of oil, dirt, and trash.) Of course, industrial wastes and agricultural drainage would still present serious problems to our society, greater in amount than all present municipal wastes. But corrective action is now under way to abate these pollution sources. New legislation will require industry to meet a high standard of water quality. The Soil Conservation Service is encouraging the use of animal-waste lagoons on large farms, and

Bionomic is designing modular units to burn animal wastes on the farm and at the processing plant.

But the economics of a sewerless society, based on the cost of household recycling or waste disposal systems such as the "Des-trollet," would probably be more costly than community sewerage and wastewater treatment and disposal systems, argues one authority.

Dr. Daniel A. Okun, head of the Department of Environmental Science and Engineering at the University of North Carolina, elaborates on the case for community treatment:

"... the major problem with water pollution originates in our large urban areas where the density of population militates against solutions household by household. The trend for the future for housing in the United States will be ... toward high rise, multi-family dwellings. Any study will indicate that sewerage these buildings and providing community solutions for treating the wastewaters is bound to be far more economical than household by household solutions."

So the argument is between the concentration of sewage from thousands of homes for central treatment versus a "point of origin" approach in which each house or larger building disposes of its own wastes without a sewer connection. A cost-benefit analysis of this technical subject would be helpful. The advantages of mass production may favor concentrated sewage disposal, and yet ... it is costing one family \$1,400 to connect their vacation home to the sewer of a shore resort. In other places a sewer connection may cost from \$400 to \$1,700 a house. In Ontario, 300 buyers of lots near a ski resort have learned they cannot build chalets unless they spend \$3,000 each to install sewers, since the soil will not accommodate septic tanks. New sewers in the Maryland suburbs of Washington will replace inadequate septic tanks of 1,200 homes at an estimated cost of \$5.5 million, or about \$4,400 a house, and this does not include any costs for a treatment plant.

SEWERLESS ADVANTAGES

Such capital sums would go a long way to pay for the new technology that entirely eliminates the need for sanitary sewers and treatment plants. (The cost of a Multrum system, including the water purifier, is about \$2,000 but mass production should lower this substantially.) So the new technology may not cost more after all. But even if it doubled the cost of traditional methods, the advantages of a sewerless society would far outweigh the added costs:

A major contribution to public health by keeping any trace of human wastes (and their bacteria and viruses) out of the water supply.

Stopping contamination of ground water by septic tanks or leaky sewer lines.

Reduced eutrophication of lakes and estuaries.

Better water quality for outdoor recreation.

A reduction of about 45 per cent in consumption of purified water, leading to great savings in building reservoirs, conduits, and filtration plants and reducing the adverse effects of future droughts. (In an arid land like Israel where water is desperately short, this would be equivalent to discovering a large new fresh-water lake.)

Release of large amounts of desirable land now tied up for treatment plants. (The expanded Blue Plains plant at Washington will cover more than 400 acres of flat, strategically located land.)

Eliminating the expense of a major underground piping system, with continued savings by stopping repeated digging up of streets.

Opening up tracts of land for building houses and factories where extension of sewer lines is not feasible. As these new de-

vices become better known and prove themselves in large-scale trials, the next step is an obvious one. A long transition period will be needed to put them into wide use. First they would be installed in new vacation homes and in the "new towns" that are planned in many areas, eliminating the need for sanitary sewers and treatment plants. They would also be used to bring modern sanitation to existing towns and rural districts which never acquired traditional sewer systems. Next they would prove useful in our expanding suburbs, to avoid ever-increasing loads on present treatment plants. Finally, over many decades, they would penetrate the older areas and displace present flush toilets, maybe block by block, using public funds in whole or in part.

(One consequence of eliminating sewer lines will need careful attention by land-planning agencies. Approval of a sewer into a proposed development has given such agencies a firm control over zoning. Measures will be needed to strengthen the hand of planning agencies in order to prevent haphazard building.)

In the meantime, what about the billions already programmed in this country for sewers and treatment plants? Since converting to the sewerless society will be a task for the decades, we must build new treatment plants for many years to come, even though this new construction is only an interim measure.

A society that spent billions for space travel and its related disposal problems surely can afford a few millions for intensified research into waterless methods of human waste disposal.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the week of July 15-21 has been designated Captive Nations Week. The 15th annual observance of this week provides a fitting opportunity for us to reaffirm our political and moral commitments to the millions of individuals whose liberty and independence has been repressed in the captive nations of central and eastern Europe and within Cuba.

Too often we take for granted the freedoms we enjoy as Americans and overlook the plight of our neighbors in captive nations. As we freely pursue our human rights, let us not forget the multitudes of people who remain shackled under Communist repression by frequent and continued violations of their human rights.

Nearly three decades have passed without Communist governments honoring their promises of free elections and other basic rights to the peoples of captive nations. Individuals' freedoms of expression and movement have also long been curtailed by these governments.

The 1970 revolts in the Baltic port cities of Poland, the recent widespread demonstrations in Lithuania, and the loud protestations from Jews responding to the denial of emigration privileges from the U.S.S.R. serve as a constant reminder to us of the strong desire for independence by the overwhelming majority of people in the captive na-

tions. From these mass expressions of discontent and frustration with the curtailment of their natural rights, the message clearly emerges that the peoples of captive nations vigorously oppose Communist repression and tyranny. Hopefully Mr. Speaker, the spirit of these people will hasten the day when man's liberty and independence will be proclaimed and practiced openly and freely throughout the world.

During this 15th observance of Captive Nations Week, let us rededicate ourselves—not only during this week, but throughout the year—to mankind's quest for individual freedom and justice. Only by persistent and dedicated efforts by all Americans and free people throughout the world can the establishment of a new era of peace and liberty become a reality.

WHO'S TO PAY FOR PROJECTS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since 1968 this body has been awaiting the final report of the National Water Commission. Recently that report came forth. I sincerely hope my colleagues in the House carefully read that report because it recommends sweeping changes in the policies set forth by the Congresses for the past 100 years. I have little faith in the economic and tactical recommendations set forth by the Commission. I sincerely believe that if the Commission's recommendations are adopted this country will never recover from the repercussions.

I recommend to Members of the House and the general public an editorial that appeared in the *Bryan, Tex., Eagle*, July 12, 1973. The editor asks a very important question and points out some very real problems.

The article follows:

WHO'S TO PAY FOR PROJECTS?

In September 1968 Congress established a seven-member National Water Commission and charged it with reviewing U.S. water development and use policies, and to file a report on its findings.

The report has now been delivered to Congress. Its 232 specific recommendations are now the subject of a hearing in the Senate, conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs. That hearing, and any legislation resulting from it, could have far-reaching effects in Texas.

Of particular significance is the commission's recommendation regarding the cost-sharing of water projects. It would strengthen the federal role in combining water resource planning and land use planning, a move that seems desirable. But its recommendations regarding shifting around of costs could shake up water development projects particularly the construction of new dams and reservoirs.

The commission urges that identifiable beneficiaries of water programs and projects be required to pay the full cost of developments which give them economic benefits. If accepted, that recommendation would force a drastic shift of the cost burden. Now the federal government may bear from 50 to 100 per cent of the cost; using the commission's guide, many flood control, navigation

and irrigation projects would be funded almost exclusively from local sources, private or governmental.

The impact of such a policy on projects can't be calculated precisely; after all, no guidelines or even proposed legislation are available. But even if accepted in a modified form, the commission recommendation would doubtless mean a much greater proportion of the project's cost for Texas interests and taxpayers.

Along the same line, the commission recommends that "sound economic principles" must be employed to encourage better use of water resources. It considers consumer willingness to pay as the most reliable economic indicator of proper water use. In other words, if consumers are not willing to pay more for water, they don't really need additional supplies—and higher costs might make existing water supplies sufficient by reducing use.

Those are only a few of the controversial points raised by the commission, and now undergoing congressional scrutiny. But the sampling should be enough to indicate the importance and magnitude of the recommendations of the commission now being considered by Congress.

THE ALASKA PIPELINE—TO BUILD OR NOT TO BUILD?

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, as we now know, the Senate has voted to construct the trans-Alaska pipeline. Not only has that body agreed to the necessary amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act granting the right-of-way, but it has also approved an amendment stating that the pipeline meets all the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, in an effort to remove the issue from judicial consideration. I would strongly urge my colleagues in the House not to allow themselves to be stampeded into making any precipitous moves on this measure.

In recent months there has been a building crescendo of voices in America telling us why we do and do not need the proposed oil pipeline through Alaska to the port of Valdez. We have had many telling us why we should or should not build a possible pipeline routed through Canada, bringing oil to the Midwest. From one side, we hear that we are in the midst of an emergency energy crisis, which requires drastic action—even action which would circumvent certain laws—such as the granting of an exemption from the requirements of NEPA.

From the other side, we are told that Alaska's environment will be seriously threatened if the pipeline is built, and that the oil which lies under the North Slope will not help solve the present energy shortage for some time. We are told that this pipeline is a temporary measure, stopgap at best.

It is my hope that in this heated argument, cooler heads will prevail. It is difficult, at best, to objectively base any decision as to which route would be best, if one is forced to rely upon the present factual void in which we find ourselves.

We do know that the North Slope fields contain large quantities of oil,

which sooner or later will be needed by this country. We do know that certain companies have joined and invested large sums of capital in the trans-Alaska route, the construction of which would have an undeniably beneficial effect upon the economies of both Alaska and the Seattle area.

On the other hand, we know that this pipeline, if constructed, would cross some of the most seismically active terrain in the United States. We know that at the end of the pipeline would be a fleet of supertankers to transport the oil through narrow straits and very rough seas. And we therefore know that we must face the possibility of increased oil spills in northwest coastal areas.

This knowledge is helpful to the extent that it contributes to our ability to make a reasonable decision, but there remain several key questions to which we have no firm answers. Has the possibility of a trans-Canada route been fully explored? What is Canada's attitude? Have the various environmental risks of each route been laid out, side by side, and compared so that we know with some certainty which route is superior? Are we certain that the trans-Alaska route will bring needed oil to Americans sooner, so as to make a significant difference? Are we certain that this oil will not be, in part, exported?

Senators WALTER MONDALE and BIRCH BAYH have offered a plan which, although now rejected by the Senate, would go a long way toward giving us the clear-cut answers we need. That proposal has three integral parts:

First. It directs the Secretary of State to immediately begin talks with Canada over a possible Canadian route and to report on his findings to the Congress within 8 months;

Second. It would have the National Academy of Sciences make a comprehensive 11-month review of both proposals, again with a full report to the Congress; and

Third. It provides for Congressional action within 90 days after submission of both reports.

In an editorial on the subject on July 11, 1973, the Baltimore Sun offered an excellent argument in support of this Mondale-Bayh proposal. The Sun pointed out that even if Congress agrees to an amendment of the Mineral Leasing Act granting the needed right-of-way for the Alaska route, the issue would likely be tied up in the courts for some time to come, with cases based on environmental considerations. The primary grounds for such suits would be that the Interior Department did not adequately consider all alternatives as required by NEPA—in this case, the Canadian alternative. As I have mentioned, the Senate amendment has attempted to remove this project from the courts, but the comments have been raised that this amendment will not be successful in accomplishing its goal.

However, were the NAS to conduct a full and comprehensive review of both routes, and were the State Department to carefully explore the attitude of the Canadian Government, the end result would be a much clearer picture of the situation, and a clarification of which route would offer the least potential dam-

age to the environment. This, in turn, would effect the need for lawsuits, thus helping to expedite construction of the best proposal.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to give careful thought to this proposal, and would like to commend to the House an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on July 11 for its consideration.

OIL FROM ALASKA: WHERE OR WHEN?

The real issue in the Alaska pipeline fight, as we see it, is whether the long-term national interest would be better served by transporting the North Slope's oil by pipeline across Alaska and then by tankers from Valdez to the West Coast—or by bringing the oil by pipeline across Canada to the Midwest. Champions of the Alaskan route see it differently. To them the central issue is not where but when the oil starts flowing to the lower 48 states. "Time is critically important," Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton wrote in a letter to the editor which appears on the opposite page today. Time is the single factor making the Alaskan route "clearly preferable," the Senate Interior Committee recently found. Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.), opposing delays of any kind, put it dramatically last Monday: "Will Alaska oil be kept in the ground while the American people are running short? Will the nation be forced to rely indefinitely on oil imports from insecure foreign sources?"

This formulation has a number of flaws. The first is that it is hard to say with certainty that the Alaskan route would be more expeditious because it is impossible to say when either pipeline could be finished. Mr. Morton has often said the trans-Alaska project "is ready to be built as soon as present legal obstacles are cleared away," but those obstacles are hardly the sort which can be easily or quickly brushed aside. In barring construction of the Alaskan pipeline last winter, the Court of Appeals ruled on the "very simple point" that the proposed right-of-way across public lands would be wider than the maximum permitted under present law. That problem would be remedied by the right-of-way bill now before the Senate. But the court expressly reserved judgment on the substantial environmental issues involved in the suit, finding those "not ripe for adjudication at the present time." In other words, if and when the right-of-way laws are modernized, the matter will go right back into the courts and could remain there for some time—unless Congress should be stamped into giving the project an environmental exemption, which would be unwarranted and unwise.

Comparing this prospect with the outlook for a trans-Canadian pipeline amounts to comparing the unpredictable with the unexplored. Because the oil companies and the administration fastened so quickly on the Alaskan route, they have never undertaken an objective assessment of the engineering, environmental, economic and diplomatic factors involved in a Mackenzie Valley undertaking. The greatest single factor, the Canadian government's attitude, is not so much imponderable as it is unprobed. Secretary Morton's description of one key exchange in May 1972 suggests how earnestly Canadian expressions of interest have been entertained. Barely one week after the Canadian energy minister, Donald S. MacDonald, wrote him "a detailed letter" outlining the possible advantages of the Mackenzie Valley way and proposing joint studies, Mr. Morton "forthrightly" replied that the U.S. had decided to go through Alaska instead. Since that official rebuff, the State Department claims to have found "no strong current interest" in a Mackenzie Valley route in Ottawa. This is hardly surprising but it is like complaining about not being invited to dinner—after one has announced that he wouldn't come.

Given all the uncertainties about the courts and the Canadians, it is sheer speculation to claim that the trans-Alaska pipeline could be completed "at least 3 to 5 years and perhaps 7 to 10 years earlier" (State Department) or "2 to 6 years earlier" (Interior Department) or "5-7 years sooner" (Atlantic Richfield). And when the issue of relative time disappears in the fog, there is little left to justify hurtling ahead in Alaska. Indeed, if one discounts the excitement about the "energy crisis"—a crisis which Alaskan oil will not solve—and looks specifically at where that oil could make the most difference, there is every reason to start serious talks with the Canadians in the morning. The trans-Canadian route would, after all, bring North Slope oil directly to the Midwest, a region which is perennially fuel-poor and more dependent on oil from those "insecure foreign sources" than the well-fueled West Coast. This is a consideration which ought to have substantial weight.

So far, the pipeline fight has been a textbook example of how not to resolve such a complex question. This week Sens. Walter Mondale (D-Minn.) and Birch Bayh (D-Ind.) are offering the Senate a way to obtain some real perspective and arrive at a firm decision at a definite time. The Mondale-Bayh amendment would (1) direct the Secretary of State to conduct serious negotiations with the Canadian government and report to Congress within eight months, (2) authorize the National Academy of Sciences to make a comprehensive 11-month review of both pipeline alternatives, and (3) provide for a congressional decision within 90 days after the completion of both studies. This is how the issue should have been handled from the start. As Secretary Morton wrote, "Open-ended delays make for open-ended difficulties." That was not intended as an argument for the Mondale-Bayh amendment, but it is an excellent reason why the amendment should be approved.

THE 14TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1973

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 14th anniversary of Captive Nations Week. We must remember, however, that this is a commemoration and not a celebration, for we are considering the plight of those who do not enjoy the blessings of liberty.

It is necessary on this occasion to question the legitimacy of the Soviet colonial power. We must look at the way that the Soviet Union has deceived nations in the past three decades. Let us not forget the situation existing today in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, East Germany, Estonia, and the Ukraine. These are nations dominated and suppressed. Their people suffer from forced detention and deprivation.

Just 2 weeks ago we honored our own great flag. Our hearts go out to those who do not have the freedom to choose the flag under which they will live. The torture that these nations are subjected to is both cruel and immoral, and the world must continually be reminded of the illegal actions of the Soviet Govern-

ment. No man should be forced to live within the bonds of slavery; therefore, it is our responsibility to offer encouragement and hope. The people of these nations must be given a reason to believe. If their spirit is free, subsequently, physical freedom will be obtained.

We hope that by this one act we prove to those people of the captive nations that they will be remembered. We will continue to support and give confidence to the oppressed victims of tyranny, until they acquire the freedom they so desire.

May God give them the strength to persevere.

PHASE IV, NO SET-ASIDE, GOOD NEWS FOR AGRICULTURE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the implementation of phase IV followed shortly thereafter by the announcement from Secretary Butz that there would be no set-aside of farmland in 1974, major steps were made in the direction of freeing American farmers for the expansion of food production that the United States and the world needs.

For too many months now, we have stifled agricultural production with rigid stringent controls and ceilings. Farmers have responded to these controls by cutting back on production. The controls which were designed to cool the fires of inflation in the long run may serve only to cause increases in food prices and a scarcity of some agricultural products.

To expand agricultural production farmers must have the incentive of making a reasonable profit. With all of the nations of the world clamoring for American farm produce, the promise of profit was there. But rigid domestic controls at home denied this promise.

At the same time, we continued to pursue the outdated farm policies of the 1930's by limiting production in defiance of the mounting world demand for American farm products.

The results, food prices climbed here at home, farmers watched profit margins shrink even though prices were up and our balance-of-payments deficit continued to mount.

Phase IV promises to reverse this trend. By utilizing all of our land, our most valuable resource, farmers can produce enough to insure American consumers adequate and reasonably priced food, satisfy our customers abroad, and help reduce our balance-of-payments problem.

Not all of the hurdles have been cleared, however. Beef prices remain under a ceiling until September 12. This ceiling, too, should be removed immediately. The only hope for better beef prices is increased production. And the only hope for increased production is the prospect of a reasonable profit for beef producers.

There also remains a strong sentiment,

as reflected in the Export Administration Act, to restrict exports to hold prices down at home. This is folly. If we want farmers to produce to their capacity, they must have markets for their products. To keep our customers abroad, we must serve them.

One of the most potent weapons in our arsenal for peace is the magnificent food production capacity of American farmers.

In times of international tension and conflict, nations must seek self-sufficiency or sources of supply close at hand. But in times of peace and international tranquility, countries feel they can safely look further abroad for their food supplies. As Agriculture Secretary Butz has repeatedly stated, we are now in a period when nations are extending their food lines.

Many nations of the world are now reaching out for the bounty of American farms. Russian leaders have promised their people a better diet. And they are looking to the United States for feed grains and protein supplies to accomplish this. The People's Republic of China also is buying substantial quantities of grain and cotton from the United States. At the same time, our longstanding friends in Western Europe and Japan are buying record amounts of U.S. soybeans and other farm produce.

So it is, then, that the announcements Wednesday of phase IV and no set-aside of farmland next year give hope for a brighter future for consumers and farmers alike. The announcement was a first step, and in many ways a small one, toward that future. But it was certainly in the right direction.

AETNA SAVES GAS

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, the United States can alleviate its fuel supply shortage only if individuals and organizations across the country take it upon themselves to devise imaginative and workable ways of conserving our energy resources.

I was pleased to discover, therefore, that the Aetna Insurance Co. of Connecticut has voluntarily implemented an experimental program to encourage its employees to save gasoline by commuting in car pools. Aetna offers guaranteed, preferential parking spots near its office building to employees who share the driving with at least two fellow workers.

By reducing the number of cars traveling to work each day, this "give a friend a lift" program not only conserves gasoline, but also reduces traffic congestion, auto pollution, and highway accidents.

Though Aetna's efforts represent just a small step, it demonstrates that concerned citizens can make necessary contributions to the solution of the national fuel crisis that affects us all. Aetna's car pool program offers encouragement and an example to all Americans.

FOREIGN AID

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve as first counsel to the Joint Congressional watchdog Committee on Foreign Aid in the 80th Congress. This was at the time of the Marshall plan.

Initially there was compelling reason for U.S. financial assistance to reconstruct a devastated Europe after World War II. There was no need to make U.S. foreign aid a permanent facet of U.S. foreign policy.

I have protested against this for years. Similarly I have voted consistently against all foreign aid giveaway programs especially those which bilaterally proposed the granting of U.S. tax dollars to another country without a loan and without anything by way of security or tangible return.

More than 25 percent of this country's huge national debt is due to giving away billions of billions of dollars abroad since World War II. Foreign aid to India over this period has exceeded \$10 billion.

It is significant that, at long last, editorially and otherwise, the waste and error of this concept is being recognized. As the Washington Star observes in today's editorial—

The AID program in India has been a prime example of the extravagance, waste and futility that has been characteristic of too many well-meant American enterprises in foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I include, the editorial from which the above quotation was excerpted, at this point in the RECORD:

AIMING INDIA

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who in another context invented the expression "benign neglect," will preside over the administration of that prescription in his present role as our ambassador to India. At the insistence of the Indian government, he is in the process of closing out the American aid program which has cost \$10 billion over a period of 22 years.

Ironically enough the move is regarded by both governments as a step toward an improvement in Indian-American relations. Probably never in history has \$10 billion bought less in the way of international goodwill. Although the program provided much essential help in the lean years since Indian independence, it has recently become a major source of irritation for the government of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi.

Particularly aggravating has been the accumulation of \$840 million in rupees held by the United States in the reserve bank of India as the result of Indian payments for large imports of American grain over the years. Although the money cannot be spent without the consent of the New Delhi government, the large amount of interest which it earns represents a drain on the Indian economy. Plans for disposing of the huge account are not yet known, but presumably it will be largely written off.

At the same time, Moynihan will turn over to the Indian government a huge, \$6 million complex of apartments and offices in New Delhi, built to accommodate some 260 AID staffers and their families at the height of the program in 1969. Within a year after the completion of the buildings, the AID program was curtailed and the staff rapidly reduced

to the 12 remaining Americans. What the Indians plan to do with the installation is unknown.

What has been obvious for some time, however, is that the AID program in India has been a prime example of the extravagance, waste and futility that has been characteristic of too many well-meant American enterprises in foreign countries. It is high time that American-Indian relations were restored to a more normal basis and that the benign neglect which Indira Gandhi evidently desires be the order of the day.

BAD NEWS FOR HOME BUYERS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on July 5 of this year the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board raised the ceilings on the interest rates that could be paid on savings deposits, both passbook and certificates of deposit—CD's. The change in the ceiling was intended to protect the mortgage market. The theory was and is that the yield on various bonds and notes was so much higher than the interest on savings accounts that funds were going into these money markets rather than into savings accounts, the prime source of mortgage money. The "Fed" feared a repeat of the 1966 and 1969 situations in which the thrift institutions lost deposits resulting in a severe shrinkage of the mortgage market.

As of July 5, 1973, the ceiling on passbook accounts was raised from 5.2 to 5.25 percent for savings and loans and mutual savings banks and from 4.5 to 5 percent for banks. The ceilings for the various certificate of deposits now range from 5.25 to 6.75 percent.

While this move was intended to help the prospective home buyer by slowing the outflow of deposits to higher yield investments, the home buyer is going to find the results a mixed blessing at best. It is virtually certain that the new ceilings will mean higher interest rates charged for mortgage loans. Given the already rising rate on mortgages, this is particularly bad news. One could legitimately ask the "Fed" and the Bank Board, what was the greater problem for the home buyer—the threat of savings outflow or the reality of rising interest rates.

These facts about the savings industry are important to understand. First of all, the majority of the deposits of savings and loan associations are in passbook accounts.

Second, the competition in the industry virtually forces the associations to pay the maximum allowed rate. The third fact that must be recognized is that the existing passbook deposits as of July 5 were loaned out in 25- or 30-year mortgages. The interest on these; that is, the return to the institution, is a fixed rate. Yet, the rate of interest paid by the institution must, therefore, take a considerable loss or compensate with a much higher interest rate on new mortgages.

Given the fact that mortgage rates are already so high—in some States they already are at or close to the legal limit—it is possible that the end result will be the same or worse than what the "Fed" is trying to avoid—namely, the cycle of reduced mortgage market activity, reduced homebuilding, unemployment, and so forth.

The basic theory upon which the July 5 decision rests may not be as sound as it appears at first glance. To say that savings are drawn into bonds or Treasury notes by the higher yield makes good theory, but how true it is? There is saving and there is saving. Is it not reasonable that one form of savings is more susceptible to this outflow than others? One can make the argument that the buyer of a 2-year, \$5,000 certificate of deposit is a sophisticated saver/investor who may very well have been attracted by the 7.5-percent Treasury bill rather than a 6-percent certificate of deposit. In this case, the new ceilings do close the gap somewhat and may make a difference. But the passbook savers, by far the more numerous, are a different sort. Their interest is in the safety and security of a nest egg. I doubt very much that they even consider the Treasury note as an alternative form of savings. There is, I believe, some serious doubt that the passbook ceiling increase does anything appreciable to insure the supply of mortgage money, but does very definitely mean that the cost of a mortgage will increase.

A particularly dangerous and disturbing part of the new regulations was the elimination of the ceiling on the 4-year, \$1,000 minimum certificate of deposit. We have already seen advertisements for returns of 8.25 percent and over on these "wild card" certificates of deposit.

The really high yield of these will most likely be offered by commercial banks for use in making short-term loans. With the high turnover of these loans they can afford to pay those rates. But where will that money come from? It will come from money now in 2-year certificates of deposit at savings and loan associations as they mature in coming months. The funds in savings and loan certificates of deposit provide the basis for mortgage lending. If these funds are attracted to banks for short-term loans, we are left with the situation we were told was being prevented a drain on the supply of mortgage money. The savings and loan associations will be forced to raise their rates to the ceilings in all categories in order to compete at all for money.

The 0.25-percent increase in the savings and loan passbook rate is not enough to attract new funds in significant amounts, nor will it yield much to existing depositors individually. If will, however, add significantly to the cost of funds raised by the thrift institutions without commensurate increases in returns on earnings assets. Thus, since the increase in passbook savings rates will apply to all passbook savings deposits, savings and loan associations will be able to earn higher rates of return from

rising capital market rates only in addition to their portfolio of earning assets.

Since the vast majority of a savings and loan association's earnings assets consist of long term mortgages, which turn over rather slowly—8 to 12 year average—the average rate of return of the savings and loan portfolio is just not responsive to changes in the market rate of interest. Thus, a savings and loan is caught in an earnings squeeze as the market forces them to pay higher rates on deposit liabilities while they have little flexibility in increasing the rate of return on long term assets. The association has no alternative but to charge a higher rate of interest on each new mortgage it makes.

Some people may ask, "With everything else going up, why not mortgage interest rates as well?" Mortgage rates are already at the 8 to 8½ percent levels. I suggest that the public's tolerance level for mortgage interest has been reached. There is going to be a sharp decline in mortgage applications which means a decline in home buying, resulting in a decline in homebuilding. The resulting unemployment could be the beginning of a major depression.

What is needed in order to avert this disaster is first of all to reverse the ceiling changes, at least with respect to the 4-year certificate of deposit. Second, we need to develop new means of getting money into the mortgage market. We can no longer assume that the savings behavior of the general public will provide a mortgage base that is adequate to meet the demand for housing. Efforts aimed only at attracting more money into savings are not a solution to the structural problems of the mortgage market. We need to look into policies for the allocation of the necessary capital toward high priority areas—one of which is housing. Only with effective public policies and incentives for the allocation of capital, can we assure that the expansion of the money supply is not inflationary and also insure that the critical national needs are met. We must face up to the reality of being a nation of scarcity. In both physical resources and capital resources, we are no longer the land of plenty.

Having realized this fact we must begin to rethink our methods and values in the allocation of increasingly scarce resources. A loose freewheeling, price-directed, consumption-oriented economy was fine for a nation with more than enough resources. We did not pay much attention to the waste that resulted. We no longer can afford the luxury of freewheeling, catch-as-catch-can allocation. Since we must now allocate scarcity, the job will require some hard value searching and some clear and tough-minded public policies for resource allocation. This general principle is equally as applicable to the production of food, the production of energy, health care delivery and education as it is to housing.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold oversight hearings on the new ceiling regulations and broaden the subject to include alternative policies that could be adopted to insure the availability of mortgage money.

PHASE IV STORM WARNINGS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the administration announced on July 19 that the freeze on all food producers except beef would be lifted immediately and that retailers would be able to pass on, dollar-for-dollar, increased costs. It was also announced that the basic elements of phase IV will go into effect on August 12 when the price freeze ends. It is too early to determine whether phase IV will succeed or fail, especially in light of the fact that the administration will solicit and accept recommendations from all segments of American society concerning the specific shape phase IV guidelines should take. I have written the President with my general recommendations for phase IV guidelines, and I urge each of my colleagues to do the same. The more practical advice administration officials consider, the greater the chance to avoid problems similar to those that have been encountered in the past.

On July 19, the Boston Globe carried two articles on phase IV. One article, "Economists Say President Blundered on Wage Curb," by Richard Weintraub, points out that the 5.5 percent guideline for wage increases may be economically unsound and socially inequitable for workers. Another article, "Nixon Gambling on Crop Predictions," by Bruce Davidson, points out how fragile the bases of phase IV actually are.

I would like to insert my letter and both articles in the Record at this time for the information of my colleagues:

JULY 16, 1973.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. PRESIDENT: I am writing again with regard to the imminent announcement of Phase IV wage and price controls. Administration officials have neither consulted formally with Members of Congress nor held public hearings to determine the needs of consumers. In fact, the only formal consultants have been with the business community. This approach ignores the valuable input consumers and their Representatives in Congress could make toward designing an effective, equitable Phase IV program.

Therefore, I call on you to schedule a brief series of regional hearings before Phase IV is announced. The Freeze is in effect until August 12, and some delay in announcing Phase IV would be worthwhile if the time were used to solicit and consider the views of consumers representatives in all parts of this country.

In addition, I would think it advisable that the Phase IV program have the following characteristics:

1. Adequate staff and support to implement and administer the program. A great deal of technical expertise was lost after Phase II was terminated and the Cost of Living Council staff was reduced. Before Phase IV is announced, similar staff expertise must be gathered or Phase IV will get off to a bad start that may cripple it indefinitely.

2. Controls on any sector should apply to the entire sector. If food products must be controlled, so must the raw agricultural products at farm stage. It is not only unfair to catch processors in the middle, but such

a situation is self-defeating in the long run. It simply cannot work.

3. Mandatory controls should go into effect with regard to any sector or major company regardless of the initial guidelines if the prices of that sector or industry increase at more than 3 percent on an annual basis (¾ percent per month) in any consecutive three month period.

4. Companies which import raw materials and intermediate goods must be given some leeway in passing on the increased costs due to the increased price of imports, especially when that is caused by fluctuations of the dollar on international monetary markets.

5. Controls should apply not only to prices, but also to wages and salaries, rents, dividends, and interest rates. I would also encourage you to consider the temporary imposition of an excess profits tax to be applied when the profit residual of any controlled company increases unreasonably due to approved price increases.

I hope that you and your advisors would consider each of these proposals seriously. They are not meant to be politically motivated or unreasonably critical. They represent, instead, my effort to cooperate with your Administration in your efforts to control and terminate the drastic inflation which continues to distort our economy.

Yours sincerely,

MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON.

ECONOMISTS SAY PRESIDENT BLUNDERED ON WAGE CURB

(By Richard M. Weintraub)

Several Boston area economists generally agreed last night that President Nixon took a necessary step in freeing food prices as part of his Phase 4 program, but that he could be inviting labor trouble by keeping the 5.5 percent wage guideline.

"The food action is good because of the shortages which have occurred, but I don't believe the other measures will prevent a continuation of inflation at the present rate," Prof. H. S. Houthakker of Harvard said in a telephone interview.

"I wonder how long the 5.5 percent wage guideline—which is something of a fiction anyway—can be maintained because it doesn't allow workers to participate in the increases in productivity," Houthakker said.

"It would be fairer to allow wages to rise by the rate of inflation plus normal output per man hour."

Prof. Edwin Kuh of MIT said he finds the wage policy "very, very strict" in light of general economic conditions.

"Given the tremendous increase in the cost of living in the last six months, to hold wages to 5.5 percent will cause havoc in the labor market and seems quite inequitable," Kuh said. "I don't expect the wage front to hold."

Kuh said that it probably will be into the fall before there is any clear indication of what will happen to the rate of inflation.

"We could judge this program a failure if there is not a significant turn in the rate of inflation by the first of the year," he said.

The economists agreed generally that some action was necessary to try to stabilize the situation but that a program of controls, especially without a massive bureaucracy to enforce it, is at best a temporary solution.

"To a considerable extent, it is still stop-gap," said Prof. James Duesenberry of Harvard. "This general program can't work on a long-term basis . . . This can last only for a few months to bridge a gap."

Duesenberry stated that the severe monetary policies being pursued by the Federal Reserve—sharp increases in interest rates, noticeably—are beginning to have some impact in slowing down the pace of the economy.

Houthakker said, however, that while some monetary tools are being used, the supply

of money is increasing at a rate of about 10 percent and he believes this still will allow for considerable business expansion.

An expert in "agri-business," Prof. Raymond Goldberg of the Harvard Business School, said that the Phase 4 program at least remedied the "serious mistake" of isolating food prices under the previous program.

"You can't isolate a sector without causing damage. This is what happened under Phase 3½ with food and we had it bid away from us with the export market which wasn't controlled," Goldberg said.

Goldberg said there were two options open to the government in solving the problem with food: one is the program adopted, that of passing on dollar-for-dollar costs, and the other would have been to allow raw agricultural prices to be passed on only to processors and distributors out to set up a system of compensation for them financed through tax revenues rather than passing costs on to the consumer.

"Letting the graduated income tax bear the burden, rather than the ultimate consumer, would have been cumbersome and awkward, but it would have provided less pressure on the wage earner. This means there might be pressure on unions and other groups to seek increased wages and this would start the cycle all over again," he said.

Goldberg said, however, "what the administration selected is certainly better than what we had; we have been shutting off incentives" to the farmer to produce.

NIXON GAMBLING ON CROP PREDICTIONS

(By Bruce Davidson)

President Nixon is taking a gamble. He is gambling that forecasts of big increases in farm production are going to turn out to be correct. He is gambling that there won't be corn blight. Or horrible weather. Or soybean fields that can't be harvested. Or an outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease.

He is betting that there will be something like 6 billion bushels of corn grown this year and 1.6 billion bushels of beans. And that cattlemen will move the steers off cheap pasture and into feedlots where they'll fatten faster, if more expensively.

Above all, he is gambling that the jump in prices consumers face this morning will stimulate enough agricultural production so the food spiral we've been in this year will level off at last.

In one sense, he had no choice. Our domestic demand for food has held at record levels at the same time international demand has pushed right through the ceiling. The Soviet Union has gotten a lot of attention for the impact its wheat purchases had on American feed and meat prices. But the Japanese, for example, are huge buyers of American agricultural products and they have just finished two days of telling American official visitors in Tokyo that they want more and that it is irresponsible of the U.S. government to keep them out of our markets with such measures as export controls on soybeans.

The Administration hopes farmers will "plant the front yard," as their saying goes of getting maximum acreage during periods of high prices. In spite of the export controls, it wants maximum sales overseas to help out our chronic balance of payments problems and the severe decline of the dollar.

While there are no certainties the Administration does have some precedent going for it on the supply-price question. It has scrapped lumber ceilings because the price of that important product has declined sharply. Soybeans, which have sold for as much as \$12.90 a bushel on contracts to be delivered this month, have dropped to \$10, and beans to be delivered next spring are below \$7. The Administration would like to see them fall to \$5 a bushel and corn fall to \$1.50 a bushel to stimulate pork and poultry.

try output—but last year beans sold for \$3.30 a bushel and corn for as little as \$1.31.

If the new program for food seems calculated to increase the availability of food while chopping away at prices, the same cannot be said for petroleum. Substantially all the food we consume is produced in this country. But about a third of our petroleum requirements—16 million barrels a day—are met from foreign sources—Venezuela, Canada, Nigeria. And we are on the verge of becoming a major customer of such Mideast oil producers as Iran and Saudi Arabia.

The new scheme of price ceilings will put a tough question to those who have oil to sell: Should they supply this market of long-time and obviously voracious customers even though it may be less profitable? Or should they instead use their supplies to meet rising demand in Europe, Japan and anywhere else no price controls apply?

Obviously the domestic managers of US oil companies, already under suspicion following the Federal Trade Commission charge that the eight largest of them contrived to achieve an illegal monopoly, will be very cautious about their behavior when it comes to filling gas tanks and oil bunkers. But the Saudis and the Iranians do not have any such considerations and may choose other clients.

So oil, like food, has its element of gamble. Suppose the gamble doesn't work. What then?

Critics of the program have already challenged its effectiveness. Arch Booth, chairman of the US Chamber of Commerce, has stamped it a "charade" and says controls will be unsuccessful because they are "government edict rather than government responsibility."

That amounts to a call for new cuts in government spending, the usual policy whenever someone talks about "government responsibility," and Mr. Nixon has already implied as much with his demand that the Federal budget for fiscal 1974, in effect as of July 1, be in balance.

When the budget was first proposed in January it included a \$12.7 billion deficit, acceptable to the Administration because the economy was not functioning at full employment and the shortfall in revenues represented potential taxes from people out of work and businesses operating below capacity.

Now a fight may first loom over the spending cutbacks implied by Mr. Nixon's call for a balanced budget. Given the existing hostility between Congress and the White House, it seems possible they will not easily reach any agreement on that score. The remaining alternative would be a tax increase, in spite of the Administration pledge to avoid any overall rise in rates. Democratic liberals like Harvard economics professor John Kenneth Galbraith have already called for a surtax on those with incomes above \$12,000 or \$15,000 and on corporate profits.

The Administration has adopted other people's ideas before, especially to reduce the level of opposition in Congress. The precedent inspires the thought that persistent inflation under Phase 4 might produce a Galbraith-Nixon tax bill in the late fall—Phase 5 of the war on rising prices.

PASQUALE "PATSY" AMOROSE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to com-

CXIX—1593—Part 20

ment on the recent death of a good friend and former constituent, Mr. Pasquale "Patsy" Amorose, of Lincoln Park, Mich.

Patsy Amorose was a truly outstanding person. Born in Italy 85 years ago, he came to the United States as a young boy in 1901. Married in 1916 in Pennsylvania, he moved to Michigan a few years later.

He and his wife Esther, who celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary in 1966, raised five children to be good Democrats—three sons and two daughters. Mr. Amorose was a member of the Lincoln Park Democratic Club, the 15th and 16th Congressional Democratic Organizations, and the Lincoln Park Italian-American Club.

In 1964, his many years of Democratic Party activity was recognized when he was named alternate Presidential elector for the 15th District, and would have cast one of Michigan's electoral votes for President Johnson if the regular elector had been unable to vote.

I am proud to have been the friend of this lifelong good man, and I want to express my sympathy to his family, along with the consolation of knowing that he lived a full and rewarding life.

MISSING IN ACTION

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, lost in the heat of the legislative season and our concern over phase IV and the precarious economic situation in this country is a cause that ought to be dear to all our hearts—that is the cause of the missing in action, who are still unaccounted for in Southeast Asia. As of today there are 1,259 men in this category. Can you picture the anguish of these families as the last POW's were returned and they sat day after day waiting for news—any news—as they have waited these many years.

Now whose fault is it that no information has been forthcoming? I believe the evidence will show that it is the North Vietnamese, the Vietcong, and the Pathet Lao who are at fault. Their requirement to cooperate on this matter was clearly spelled out in the agreements we made on January 27 and June 13 of this year. Aside from two trips to Hanoi, no progress has been made whatsoever. Our teams have viewed some graves in the Hanoi area, but we have not been permitted to exhume one body or visit one crash site in enemy held territory.

I am today introducing a concurrent resolution designed to try and break loose this log jam. Monday, I will be sending out a "Dear Colleague" asking that everyone join me in this humanitarian effort. These families come from nearly every State in the Union. I strongly feel that the least the Congress can do is to take the resolute stand on any further relations or dealings with our former enemy that my resolution provides for and let them and the American people, particularly the families of

those still unaccounted for, know that we have not forgotten.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the third week of every July is observed as Captive Nations Week. This annual event was authorized by the Congress in July 1959, when it passed the Captive Nations Week resolution which President Eisenhower signed into Public Law 86-90 on July 17, 1959. The text of this resolution follows:

PUBLIC LAW 86-90, PROVIDING FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE THIRD WEEK OF JULY AS "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK" ADOPTED BY THE 86TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN JULY 1959

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Sen-

ate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the President is authorized and requested to issue a Proclamation designating the third week of July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

Pursuant to the resolution, July 15 marked the beginning of Captive Nations Week for 1973, as proclaimed by President Nixon in the following proclamation:

[Proclamation 4229]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1973

(By the President of the United States of America)

A PROCLAMATION

As a nation we seek no imposition of our beliefs. But as human beings, we must always keep alive the hope that our great heritage of freedom will one day be enjoyed throughout the world.

As we make progress toward world peace and security, let us continue to show our sympathies for others who aspire to liberty and self-determination. In support of this sentiment, the Eighty-Sixth Congress on July 17, 1959, by a joint resolution, authorized and requested the President to proclaim the third week in July in each year as Captive Nations Week.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 15, 1973, as Captive Nations Week.

I call upon the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge rededication to the high purpose of individual liberty for all men.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirteenth day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-eighth.

RICHARD NIXON.

Captive Nations Week is a tremendous moral symbol signifying that we Americans will never forget the captive nations or accommodate ourselves to their permanent captivity.

The week solemnly calls to the attention of the free world the continuing captivity of East-Central Europe. At this time, more than 28 years since the end of World War II, the East-Central European victims of post-war Soviet aggression—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania, are still held in political, military, economic, and social bondage, despite the fact that in the same period almost all former colonially-ruled countries and peoples have been granted their independence.

The captive European nations remain deprived of their fundamental rights, particularly the right to self-determination and national independence. They are prevented from choosing freely their governments and the political and economic system under which they want to live. They are still subjected to harsh political and social discrimination, economic exploitation and spiritual as well as religious oppression.

Although in the past few years the harsh Soviet regulations in the captive nations have been relaxed to some degree, I wish to emphasize that there is no alternative for full freedom and independence. The changes have been and are taking place on the surface and strictly within the framework of the regimes and with the only purpose of making the Communist system once more workable and more acceptable.

A free East-Central Europe is, therefore, a worthwhile goal which requires clear commitment and practical actions on the part of the powers having a vital stake in keeping Western Europe secure and moving the borders of freedom eastward.

Mr. Speaker, with this conviction, I believe we should appeal to the governments and the peoples of the free world to affirm and prove their determination to help the captive peoples, by all legitimate means, including action before the United Nations, to recover the full exercise of their right of self-determination by means of free and unfettered elections under international control.

The governments and peoples of the free world should carefully distinguish between their friends, the peoples of East-Central Europe and their enemies, the Communist rulers who keep them in bondage.

We live in an era in which man achieved the technical means to destroy the world. The quest for prevention of global nuclear holocaust is one of the overriding issues of our day. Yet the quest can succeed only if the main danger of a nuclear flareup is realized. This main danger is the existence of a closed society in which a handful of men, who have openly voiced their aim to conquer the entire world and who have never excluded the possibility of a progressive war, wield unlimited power. Hence there is only one way to attain security in our atomic age—by limiting the power of men who could launch the world on the path of its self-destruction. Such limitation is inherent in any democratic system of government, in an open society. Extending the area of freedom is, therefore, a matter of life and death to the free world.

In the eloquent words of Dr. Charles Malik, former president of the United Nations General Assembly:

Only a believing, active, sustained and bold look forward to a free Eastern Europe, a free Russia and a free China is worthy of the magnitude of the gigantic world struggle. A radical distinction must be made between the great peoples of these countries and their Communist governments. Policies should be devised and pursued in conformity with this distinction. The flame of freedom must be kept burning in the souls of the oppressed. The hope of liberation must never be allowed to fade away from their hearts.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the captive European nations will some day witness the only reward they seek—the complete recovery of freedom and independence by the nations that fell prey to Communist dictatorship during and after World War II.

A CRISIS IN NATIONAL MORALS

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues, indeed, all Americans, to have the benefit of a most inspired sermon recently delivered by Dr. Ernest J. Lewis, minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Evanston, Ill., titled "A Crisis in National Morals."

In a highly illuminating way, Dr. Lewis focuses on the moral and theological dilemma posed by the Watergate affair; he correlates the questions there raised to a deeper malaise in our society. His message of hope, in conclusion, offers a heartening commentary on the rights and privileges of the American electorate, in this time of soul searching. He suggests a new rededication of the American spirit, with which to lead us out of this darkness, and an important recommendation to mercy, to love, and to God. I commend to you his very profound thoughts and words:

A CRISIS IN NATIONAL MORALS

"The day will surely come when at God's command Jesus Christ will judge the secret lives of everyone, their inmost thoughts and motives; this is all part of God's great plan which I have already told you about." (Romans 2:16, The Living Bible)

This sermon reminds me of the illustration of a little boy who took out the family great dane for a walk. He was asked by a neighbor, "Where are you taking that dog, son?" The lad replied, "He makes the decisions!" When a little boy takes out a great dane, the boy does not make the decisions. It has been like that with this sermon—trying to tackle what is a grave and sad time in our history, as we experience the bombardment of our senses through print and mass media with the grief of our nation.

There have been not a few times in these past days when I wished I had stayed with my planned schedule of last summer. The title of the sermon scheduled for today was, "God's Ultimate Weapon". His love. But, I in some way feel I am addressing myself to that basic affirmation of God's love in the midst of our struggle.

For those of us who are aware, who read and care deeply for our nation, surely there is quite a mixture of feelings these days. As I tried to do my own homework in preparation for this sermon, it became abundantly clear that one could go down several paths in addressing the moral crisis in our nation. One could, with integrity, relate a long and great record of nobility and strength in the American enterprise. Whatever else is written, it is a matter of historical record that our democracy in these United States forms the best experiment of men on earth governing themselves. And, included in that record is truly a glorious account of men and women who did not compromise their principles or their convictions, but often paid a high price politically for what they believed was right.

Across the whole world, America still stands as one place on the earth where we have at the heart of government a concern for every human being. It is just this concern which makes it impossible to ignore the subject on a day like this. Our whole understanding of government as Christians and as the electorate is that stable government is essential for the carrying out of justice and righteousness under God.

Now one could, also, take a different tact and with equal integrity write quite a sober, contrasting picture. Beginning in the 1700's and since, there is a record of chicanery, bribery, and malfeasance in high office. This, too, is part of our history. And, if one is to do justice to our American history, one must somehow deal with both records and their apparent contradiction.

It is interesting that just this week the statistics came out from the American Year Book of Churches showing that there are in these United States 131,889,642 people who belong to churches. That figure is significant! Over 60% of the American people avow faith in God.

In the current issue of A.D. Magazine, which is the magazine replacing Presbyterian Life, Kathryn G. Bollinger writes a very probing and sensitive poem:

It must be tough work to be an atheist.
They have to ignore miracle,
A literary masterpiece
Written by a tribe of wandering sheep-
herders,
And a mass a people who say they
Know you personally.

Perhaps these atheists are aided in their
devout belief

Because to believe in not believing,
They are allowed to ignore all morality
Except that which they endorse personally.

Funny,
I believe in many things I have not seen.
Even atheists believe in atoms,
Galaxies, light years, and cave men.
How convenient to ignore
Centuries of documented evidence,
Eyewitness accounts,
And present moment miracles.
Atheist . . .
Maybe I will start a new religion.
Maybe I will stop believing in you.

Now

Poof

You are gone.

When one looks at the record today, whether it be an alderman in the City of Chicago or a two-time governor of the State of Illinois, or those who are in closest proximity to the president of the United States, it would appear that increasingly in our land there are persons in high political office who act out what we might call "practical atheism", where no matter what men say with their lips they act out, "Poof, You're gone", with their lives.

There is a deep sense of urgency and, yet, confusion with which I have approached this sermon. The time has now come when even the calloused and the casual can no longer ignore Watergate as simply a political caper, an amateurish burglary on a small scale. The issue has become too urgent and too pronounced to ignore any longer.

It is a staggering, complex intrigue. As one has put it in print, "It is a pattern of spying, lying, bribery, payoffs to derogate the entire political system, and they are unworthy of a great democracy." To care, to feel, to love, it would be impossible to ignore. There is a deep sense of sadness, of grief, of bewilderment, of anger.

I have asked many, many people in the last few days of their own feelings concerning Watergate, and I have to confess that the dominant one which I hear is apathy and cynicism. Granted, there are those who have responded on a level of deep concern—a kind of concern of bewilderment of what to do, but nevertheless a heartfelt grief.

Perhaps, the recent issue of Time magazine puts it as well as can be, with the sense of gloom and sadness which hangs over our capital and in the hearts of many of us:

"The collapse of Haldeman's paper em-

pire has cast its own mythological aura over the scene. One wanders along the White House drive these days disbelieving what one hears and sees. Twice before in the past decade it has happened. In the hours after John Kennedy's assassination, the enormity of the event was too much to absorb. In the wake of Martin Luther King's assassination, when parts of Washington were burned and looted, people stood in a stupor on the White House lawn and saw the smoke drift over them and watched as looters broke windows two blocks away in deserted streets.

"Press Secretary Ron Ziegler goes through his rituals of evasion like some man we never knew. Arrogance has given way to patience. Scorn, contempt, and anger have faded into professions of understanding. He presides in front of his pale blue backdrop every morning with a large, uncomprehending sadness behind his eyes.

"One morning last week, reporters scurried from the White House to the Executive Office Building and stood in sad wonder as the Vice President gave a public testimonial to the President's honesty. Asked another Nixonian original in a whisper, was this the first time in history a Vice President had felt compelled to give such a performance?

"Then photographers eddied around the black limousine parked on the White House drive in front of the West Wing. The camera-men focused on the license plate initialed JJW 2, squeezed off a few frames, then rushed on in search of more public fragments of the shadowy drama. The elegant car belonged to Washington Lawyer John J. Wilson. And suddenly the whole scene overwhelmed one's comprehension. The President of the U.S. and his principal advisers were conferring with a criminal attorney."

Not to feel . . . not to feel deep sadness and grief and concern would be incredibly unreal.

The complex answers and implications of Watergate are yet to be discovered. I have deliberately and scrupulously avoided personalities or allegations. They belong to the courts. Yet, the pattern is essentially clear. It remains for the courts to pursue with justice, and we pray with all our being that they shall, that righteous judgement will be made and appropriate punishments meted out. But, the matter will not end there, nor should it. While the answers are complex and confusing, this issue, it seems to me, must focus and raise some urgent questions—some theological questions—some questions for you and for me as the electorate of these United States to consider.

While we cannot, yet, apparently determine who is responsible, we can ask even a more profound question and that is, "To whom are all men responsible?" The question of evil . . . the nature of man . . . the purpose of government . . . they are just a few of many related questions. And, in no simple, superficial way would I this morning go on a tirade concerning our contemporary evil. I think it not remiss, however, to point out that our culture in its continuing permissiveness, in the "situational ethic" kind of life which we are now living, the image of God as sovereign judge over all the earth is continuing to be blurred. The reality of God as the ultimate arbiter is no longer as clear as it once was. What we see acted out by men in high office is, also, increasingly taking place in the classroom, in our language on the streets, in corporation's life. This all conspires to help produce what we now see so flagrantly in public, political life.

To whom are all men ultimately responsible? This is the prior question. The One who really deals with all the Watergates of our lives. The Book of Genesis states very positively and strongly "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" The judgment and the justice of God are affirmed in God as the Being who oversees all of the affairs of

men on earth and to Whom all men are ultimately accountable.

In the Book of Judges in a very cryptic sentence we read, "There was no King in Israel, so every man did what he thought was right in his own eyes." When we become blurred in our view of God, our focus, our standard, our criteria is, therefore, also blurred. It is little wonder that when young people "turn on" today to Jesus, one of the first things they do is to begin to clean up their moral lives as they begin to recognize value judgments in the new ordering of their lives. In direct proportion to the reality of God in our own consciousness and in that of the leaders of our nation, just to that extent, will there be a high sense of morality and obligation to duty.

The familiar illustration is pertinent here of the town where the local jeweler had a large watch in his store window, which he carefully set each day. Each day, also, a town factory worker blew the factory whistle loudly at noon. One day in conversation, they discovered that the worker blew his whistle by the clock in the window, and the jeweler was setting the clock by the noon whistle. Our values and judgments must be made by a higher criteria than ourselves.

In the first chapter of the Book of Romans, Paul gives a very grim and descriptive picture of the looks of a pagan, self-centered society as it disintegrates. Without any sense of God, without any allegiance to Him, the corruption begins to grow, and with his mind man begins to turn all kinds of things into the objects of his worship. He fashions them with his hands and perverts them in lust. His breaking of human relationships then begins to be a way of life on the earth.

It must be said that those who would hold allegiance to Jesus Christ, who would hold high their sense of commitment to Him, must recognize that we are part of the responsibility of this nation as "God's picked representatives," to bear witness that God alone is judge. There is One who will see even the secrets of our hearts. We are the ones who must affirm that. Not simply with our mouths, but with our lives . . . in how we live and in the little things that make up our life styles and our commitments.

To whom is man ultimately responsible? In the political arena, the highest office in our land now carries responsibilities so complex that there are no words to describe it. They are simply stupendous and incredible. The kinds of chicanery that can go on in high office are well known. It seems almost like a running commentary in our press of our own state, Illinois, of the corruption in high office. But, this fact left by itself does injustice to those who, with integrity, pursue their office with discipline and commitment and go out of their way to maintain a high sense of calling and duty for the common good.

Our current crisis of morals raises another kind of question—not only "Who is ultimate judge?" but what is the contextual situation out of which this kind of evil can grow and be perpetrated?

I suggest to you that part of that responsibility falls heavily upon us as the electorate. In the midst of Paul's judgment as he writes of God as Judge, he offers, also, in a very beautiful way, God's grace. There are three words he uses. As God reminds man of his ultimate allegiance to Him and to the common good of all, Paul reminds us that God's kindness, His forbearance, His patience with human beings is to lead us to a new repentance and life. Those words are beautiful. They are words we need to hear in our hard and crisp and cynical kind of passing off a cliché, "O, that's politics!"

"Kindness", that word was used as "Agathos" when Jesus took a whip in his hand and cleansed the temple. It was a kindness with action, but it was kindness that motivated the action.

There is a different word that is used often in the New Testament. The word is "crestos", which is a mellow word used for good wine. It is a softening. It is the kind of gentleness of a word used when a woman, who was a redeemed prostitute, begins to wash Jesus' feet with perfume and dry them with her hair. He used the word. That is the word used here. God's kindness. Then, God's forbearance. The word is "anoché," which is a word for truce. But, the truce is not to go on forever. Paul reminds us that God gives us these periods when He restrains His power in order that in that period of reflection and re-assessment of our life, we may come to Him. It is a strong and beautiful word. Perhaps, the most beautiful of all in this sequence is the word "patience", "mak-ro-thumia". A word which means restrained power. God having the ability to obliterate in His power. But God, out of His great mercy and His love, goes beyond justice. He acts out in our behalf restraint in order that men might repent.

Paul says, "Don't you know that that is the reason for God's kindness?" "To bring you to repentance to Him. And know this, that my gospel says," Paul relates, "there will be a day when Jesus Christ judges every secret thought of every heart, our inmost thoughts and motives."

I tried to ask myself, "In what way do we play some part in the flagrant drama that is going on today so detailed in the public press?" It is a great responsibility to be free! It is awesome! Perhaps, in one deep, theological sense, almost an impossible one, the implications of freedom are profound. They carry with it a deep obligation to care and to become involved.

I wrote out for myself that if I said nothing else clearly in this sermon on a very complex subject, I wanted to say with all my being and fiber, "This is not a time for withdrawal or apathy or cynicism. This is a time for those who claim to be God's people to become involved in a very positive way to make sure that justice and righteousness prevail." But, way beyond that, to see what part we are given by our very freedom to play in these United States where we form the electorate. By our informed minds, by our balance, by our involvement in politics to change the cliché, which I totally repudiate, that all politics must in fact be somehow disgraceful. Ridiculous!

I even pray, sincerely, that some of you young people here today will see as a great calling for your life to enter the high calling of the political arena, to have the responsibility and the great privilege of being God's servant for the common good of all mankind. I ask, whether, perhaps in very subtle ways, we are not, also, contributors to the laxity wherever political power is expressed?

We have in our own congregation some remarkable people. People who hold high office. People who have held high office. People who hold the highest office in this municipality! I realized a few weeks ago, I myself had not written a letter of encouragement. I asked myself how many letters I should have written over the years, how many times I should have endorsed or supported or even been positively critical of actions of those in office? We are all called upon, as God's people, to be involved. It is a very lonely position to be in a place of power and responsibility. We need constantly to be reminded of that.

There is an illustration, homespun but very real, which comes out of the experience of a man in 1954—Maurice Ewing. He was serving as an oceanographer on an expedition with Columbia University. There, on a two-hundred-foot schooner called Vena, they were caught in a fierce storm. Maurice Ewing, like the rest, was swept overboard. Many were lost. He kept thinking of his family as he clung to debris of the boat. After he was finally rescued, near death, he wrote to his children:

"Dear Bill, Jerry, Hopie, Petie, and especially Maggie—all five of you:

"Yesterday your Daddy was swept into the raging January Atlantic. I nearly drowned. For hours I thrashed about and tried to cling to life. The only thing that kept me going was the knowledge of the love of you children. After awhile, Bill, Jerry, Hopie, and Petie, it was only the voice of little three-year-old Maggie's love which kept coming to me to urge me on until finally I was rescued. Never underestimate the power of your love.

"Your Daddy."

Never underestimate the power of your concern! How lonely a place high responsibility is. It is the very constituencies themselves that put impossible pressures upon those in high office. Oh, the contradictory demands that come! The kind of criticism with which one in high office is constantly bombarded. There needs to be on our part genuinely given the kind of support not only in prayer, but by word and by action to support those who hold high office, that there may be correctives. . . . that there may be an accountability to those of us who bear the vote and the responsibility and privilege of it. . . . but, also, encouragement to be faithful, honest and just to the elected.

In the Bible are many verses that speak of God as the sovereign Lord. John Calvin reminds us that for the good of all mankind, civil magistrates bear rule under the ultimate rule of God, and to the extent that we recognize that we all bear privilege and responsibility, just to that extent will there be honor and integrity in any office or work.

Another homespun illustration. It speaks to what you can do and what I can do and the part we play. Dan Poling had a son. One day the son went through serious surgery. Dan Poling tells the story in later years.

"The boy in those years was permitted to have his father in the operating room. When the boy finally went under the anesthetic, the father was standing there by the operating table. Then, he turned to go. The son had asked him to stay, but he didn't want to get in the way of the doctors and nurses, so he withdrew to another part of the room and waited. When the boy's eyes opened and he came out of the anesthetic, his father was standing there again. And, through cracked lips the boy said, 'Dad, you stayed!'

Years went by. Then, one of the great, heroic stories of WW II. Commemorated in a Chapel in Philadelphia called the Chapel of Four Chaplains, there is recounted, again, the true story of heroism. When the Dorchester was struck midship by torpedoes, four chaplains locked their arms together on board that ship and established a sense of peace and order in the midst of devastation and destruction. A rabbi, a priest, and among them Dan Poling's son. Men made it to the life boat, because in the midst of destruction some men stood steady and loyal and loving and faithful. Those chaplains went down with the ship and paid with their lives. And, Dan Poling in later years was to say, he couldn't help but wonder if maybe with his son it was because at one point in his son's life, when he needed it, Dan stayed steady and was there, faithful in the struggle.

Now I don't know all the implications of that for you and for me, but I do call you to a new allegiance in Jesus Christ to reassess what it means to be part of a democracy. We have the responsibility and the privilege of the electorate. We recognize the complexity and the chicanery that can exist within high office. We, also, recognize the responsibility on your part and mine to do whatever we can in our corner of the world to act out our own honesty in our own corporations, in our family life, in the classroom, where we are. To really become a part of God's answer affirming Him as sovereign Lord of the whole earth, to that end let us so rededicate ourselves in this day of darkness in our land and recommit ourselves to right-

eousness, to mercy, to love, to God in Jesus Christ.

Let us pray—

Almighty God, forgive us for not caring enough. We recognize, as a grand experiment, the heritage of which we are recipients. In this land in which we dwell, in which we are so quickly and so blithely critical, we give Thee deep, heartfelt thanks for our heritage.

We confess and ask forgiveness for all wrong doing and for those moments of weakness, for those awful moments of sin, which have hurt and harmed and cast doubt and grief upon your people.

We pray, O God, within ourselves for a new assessment, a new allegiance, a new involvement, a new kind of responsibility ourselves to the end that we, as a nation and as a people, may be self-consciously and gratefully under Your rule for a common good of all. Through Jesus Christ, Amen.

CHUNNEL

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Anthony Michaelis in the Daily Telegraph, June 22, 1973, pointed out graphically the significance and importance of technology to a nation. This article makes a comparison between the Apollo program and the requirements for an English Channel tunnel. Mr. Michaelis graphically demonstrates why high technology programs are essential to the well being of every major country.

The article follows:

IS THE CHUNNEL JUST ASKING FOR THE MOON?

Whatever history's final verdict on the Apollo space missions—and Skylab, whose first crew are due to splash down today, is but an ingenious use of surplus spare parts—its most important lesson for Britain has hardly yet been recognised. This is what has been called "the management revolution," defined by T. Alexander in *Fortune* magazine as "the techniques for directing thousands of keen minds in a mutually enhancing combination of Government, private industry and university."

With the Channel Tunnel about to start in earnest, after 170 years of fruitless discussion, one may well ask if anything has yet been heard of the Apollo lesson by the civil servants, company executives and geology professors who will be responsible for spending hundreds of millions on the final link between Britain and Europe.

Will the optimistic budget of £366 million for the tunnel be kept with the same accuracy as the £10,000 million budget for the Apollo Moon programme? Will the completion date for the tunnel be as strictly adhered to, as was the Apollo schedule to land three men on the Moon within the decade? And will the tunnel planners set themselves the same 99.9 per cent, probability factor for safety, and the 90 per cent chance of success, laid down five years before the Moon landing took place?

In the past 100 years there have been few British successes in "big technology," in the sense of the effective translation of a brand-new idea into a large-scale engineering project. The radar defense chain and Mulberry Harbour are, of course, war-time exceptions. One must go back to the Crystal Palace of 1851 and the railways of the previous decade to find examples. Concorde could yet qualify.

Just what happened in 1930 when Government and industry were rivals, instead of

collaborators, should always be remembered. Then private industry built the R100 airship and the Government the R101, the latter crashing tragically on its maiden flight with 48 deaths. At least according to one authority, Mr. Nevil Shute, one of the chief industrial designers of the R100, collaboration between the two teams could have averted the disaster.

Undoubtedly the example of the fruitful collaboration between American Government, industry and university is the real payoff from the Apollo project, however important the greatly accelerated growth of transistor and computer development and the priceless Moon rocks prove to be for pure and applied science. Only once before had the same collaboration occurred, in the production of the atomic bomb in 1945, but then secrecy prevented any real lessons from becoming apparent.

To the Apollo project, each of the three partners contributed its own excellence. Industry could give of its own research and manufacturing facilities as well as technical expertise and flexibility in manpower, which the Civil Service could never match economically. The United States Government's role through the Space Authority (NASA) was primarily integrating and directing, and it acted as the point of transfer of management skill and experience from one industrial company to another. Basic knowledge, whether in astronomy, physiology or any other essential subject, came from the accumulated wisdom of the universities.

For the efficient building of the Channel Tunnel, the combination of these three fields of excellence will be sorely needed.

Let us hope it will not need a tunnel disaster—by no means unlikely if previous large tunnelling projects are taken as a guide—to make the collaboration really effective. In the case of Apollo only the tragic capsule fire of 1967 at Cape Kennedy forged the really intimate links between Government and industry. As a result an almost mystical comradeship came into being, with space engineers often not knowing if Government or industry was their boss.

In the drilling of the tunnel, perhaps only slightly less than in the construction of the Saturn rocket, each decision closely impinges on every other. If one part of the rocket weighed only 1 pound more than originally planned, this meant an extra 10 pounds of fuel, and required the weight reduction of other essential equipment. This in turn led to the extremely expensive re-working of already existing parts, delayed schedules and possibly a compromise in reliability.

THE WATCH-DOGS

In the Apollo project, there could never be the luxury of "Wait and see." Can the tunnel project afford it?

The American space programme demanded the most intimate communication system between industrial contractors and NASA representatives and was achieved by a multitude of formal and informal meetings, mountains of documents (often ridiculed as bureaucracy) and the setting up of special Apollo Programme Offices. Their task was to act as watch-dogs on schedules, cost, performance and quality control of all component parts.

These Programme Offices departed from the classical management theory and had to serve two masters: the Apollo programme and the industrial contractors. In case of conflict, decisions were taken by one man at the top, Dr. George Mueller, the Government official at NASA responsible for all manned space operations.

FAME (Forecasts and Appraisals for Management Evaluation) was another new Apollo tool. Consisting of a highly computerised series of hundreds of detailed charts, it was perpetually updated to show the limits beyond which a change made to a single part affected the performance of the whole project.

FAME may well play an indispensable part during the difficult and dangerous drilling operation below the Channel. In a simpler form it could no doubt save British industry much worry and delays.

Take the allocation of contracts to industry, amounting to £9,000 million during the Apollo project. Every board of NASA which allocated a contract worth more than \$5 million (£2 million) had to make a formal presentation of its decision-making process to the Administrator (head) and to his two senior assistants, Mr. James Webb, Administrator during the crucial years 1961-68, has described in his book "Space Age Management—The Large Scale Approach" (McGraw Hill) how this procedure of contractor selection led to "a great deal of stimulation, motivation and innovation throughout the organisation."

On the Apollo project up to 500,000 people worked devotedly for eight years and had the highest possible satisfaction—to see their work come to spectacular fruition. They were carrying out one of NASA's favourite dictums: "Project management is merely the art of doing what you said you would." And this, the very lesson of the management revolution, is not secretly hidden in NASA's locked filing cabinets, but open to all who take the trouble to heed it.

Basic to this NASA philosophy was the experience of Dr. Robert Oppenheimer—who had contributed so much to the other example of "big technology," the atomic bomb: "We know that the only way to avoid error is to detect it and that the only way to detect it is to inquire. We know that in secrecy error undetected will flourish and subvert." And it is this very simple truth which also explains why an American first walked on the Moon and not a Russian.

Let me conclude by referring to the most recent British example of what might have become "big technology," the tracked hovertrain. Stemming from a university idea by Prof. Eric Laithwaite, of Imperial College, it was supported by Government finance but then suddenly cancelled and the bits and pieces handed to industry. Who made the fateful decision to stop this promising research, in which Britain led the world, is shrouded in secrecy in spite of the diligent and persistent probing of the Common Select Committee on Science and Technology.

Perhaps only a Royal Commission can teach Government Departments the big Apollo lesson, and thus give British engineers their chance to prove that they are just as good as the builders of the railways, ships, bridges and canals of the last century.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF LANDING ON MOON

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, today marks one of the most significant events in the history of mankind—the landing of a human being on another planetary body.

It was 4 years ago today—July 20, 1969—that Astronaut Neil Armstrong landed and walked on the Moon, taking "one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

Neil Armstrong's achievement was a personal one, but it was also an achievement of more than 400,000 other Americans throughout the United States and the world. The achievement was also one shared by participants from numerous other countries.

The hardware which was produced

from our national space program and the facilities developed and used to achieve the first lunar landing and all of the successful landings through Apollo 17 was conceived and built by people.

Every portion of this great technological and scientific feat was an achievement of human mind and body.

Nowhere is this better demonstrated than at Cape Kennedy where the launch of all space vehicles for NASA and other agencies is the final moment of truth.

The Apollo program, in retrospect, was more than a great feat.

It was a positive achievement of man which is continuing to improve our quality of life through the technology we have derived.

The people of our space program are not resting on the laurels of this great achievement but are pressing on with the Skylab and the space shuttle to make space an ever-increasing contributor to the well-being of our Nation and the world.

Apollo provided the beginning, the backbone, and the basis for the achievements to come.

So today we are not only saluting Astronaut Neil Armstrong, but those thousands of other Americans from NASA, private industry, and the numerous universities who participated in this great adventure of mankind.

IN SUPPORT OF FISCAL YEAR 1974 FOREIGN AID BILL

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1973

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 30 I joined a bipartisan majority of my House Foreign Affairs Committee colleagues in sponsoring legislation which reforms and restructures the Foreign Assistance Act and our development assistance program. Our proposal has been incorporated in the foreign aid bill which is being reported today. Therefore, I thought this is an appropriate time to insert in the RECORD the wide-ranging editorial support which our measure has received:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 3, 1973]

REFORM PLAN FOR FOREIGN AID

(By William K. Wyant Jr.)

WASHINGTON, June 2.—The House's initiative on foreign assistance reform avoids emotional talk about duty and charity, but it could result in giving the world's neediest millions a greater measure of practical help from the United States.

Put forward Thursday by at least 26 members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, a clear majority, the plan emphasizes steps to increase United States trade with the poorest, least developed countries.

It stresses also assistance from this country that takes the form of American technical expertise, farm commodities, and industrial goods in contrast to large-scale transfers of capital, such as the building of dams and factories.

"Projects would be selected," the House members backing the reform said, "which most directly benefit the poorest majority

of the people . . . and which enable them to participate more directly in the development process."

The focus is on more than 40 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America that have per capita incomes of less than \$200 a year. Per capita income in the United States is more than \$4100.

Three African countries, Burundi, Rwanda, and Upper Volta, have gross national products so small that it works out to only \$60 a person. Two more, Somali and Mali, have \$70. There are ten countries, including Indonesia, Burma and Bangladesh, at the \$80 level.

"We are learning," said the House foreign affairs group headed by Representative Clement J. Zablocki (Dem.), Wisconsin, "that if the poorest . . . can participate in development by having productive work and access to basic education, health care and adequate diets, then increased economic growth and social justice can go hand in hand."

The concept of the proposed foreign assistance reform is credited largely to another Midwestern Democrat, Representative Donald M. Fraser of Minnesota.

Other leaders in the movement include a third Democrat, Representative Dante B. Fascell of Florida, and three Republicans, Representatives Paul Findley of Illinois, Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, and Charles W. Whalen, Jr. of Ohio.

An important innovation, in addition to the shift in emphasis for country-to-country American development money, would be the setting up of a new Export Development Credit Fund that would make it possible for the poorest countries to buy American goods.

It is argued that the proposed fund, at a level of about one billion dollars annually, would create \$90,000 new jobs in the United States while transferring to developing countries things they need for growth.

The House sponsors point out that United States exports to developing countries have been increasing rapidly, by about 48 per cent in the last five years. In 1972 this export volume was more than 16 billion dollars, nearly equal to total United States exports to the recently enlarged European Community and Japan.

Although pointing to the importance of this developing market, the House group called attention to the fact that this nation's exports to the poorest group of developing countries—those with less than \$200 per capita income—has been declining.

The new Export Development Credit Fund would make it possible for American businessmen to compete with those of Europe, Japan and other areas in an expanding market involving more than half the people in the world, the sponsors said.

Money would be lent to the poorest nations on long terms at a rate of only 3 per cent. On one billion in soft loans, the interest subsidy would be \$40,000,000 a year. This would be paid by using receipts from repayments on past foreign assistance loans, now coming in at about \$400,000,000 a year.

"If the United States wants to avoid further losses and perhaps increase its share in this market, there will have to be increased government financing on terms that compete," Zablocki and other sponsors said.

The proposed reform would upgrade the role of the United States assistance director, now John A. Hannah. It would aim at improvement of co-ordination of all federal activities that bear on development—pulling in, for example, trade and financial policy.

In addition, the present title of the agency headed by Hannah, the Agency for International Development, would be jettisoned. The new name would be "The Mutual Development and Co-operation Agency."

Explaining their desire to switch from AID to a name that obviously would be a headline-writer's nightmare, the sponsors said they wanted to "reflect the emerging view that this country has a direct self-interest in the development of the low-income countries because they constitute the over-

whelming, and growing majority of the nations and the people of the world."

What President Richard M. Nixon thinks of the House idea will be learned Tuesday when Secretary of State William P. Rogers goes to Capitol Hill to testify before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which Representative Thomas E. Morgan (Dem.), Pennsylvania, is chairman.

Hannah had some friendly words for the new concept Thursday. Dr. Morgan and the ranking Republican on the committee, William S. Mailliard of California, have thus far held themselves benignly aloof.

The House initiative may do well. Foreign assistance has been in grievous trouble. Congress did not complete action on the program last year. Sponsors said Thursday their proposals are in line with what President Nixon said in his State of the World message May 3.

But the House approach is a new departure because of its insistence that the development money made available by the United States on a bilateral basis—that is, this country to a recipient country—must be spent in ways that directly benefit the poorest people.

This would be at the expense of big projects from which the benefits "trickle down" to the poor over the course of time.

The Overseas Development Council, a non-profit and nongovernment agency founded here in 1969, helped with the proposal at the request of the House group.

James P. Grant, council president, said the House foreign aid plan might be the most significant new departure in foreign aid since 1947 when the House Select Committee under Christian Herter was set up to make recommendations on the Marshall Plan for Europe.

It could provide, Grant said, a new lease on life for the foreign assistance effort.

[From the New York Times, June 5, 1973]

OVERHAULING AID

Committees in both houses of Congress have moved in recent weeks to revise drastically President Nixon's foreign assistance program, which Chairman J. V. Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has already dismissed as "a relic of the past."

It is not that the \$2.9-billion aid request is extravagant in terms either of this country's ability to pay or the needs of the less-developed nations. Even in the improbable event that the portion of the over-all aid budget allocated to economic assistance—\$1.6 billion—were fully funded, it would represent a slippage in this country's already low position among donor nations in aid as a percentage of gross national products.

One basic trouble with the President's aid package is that it remains heavily oriented toward military and related assistance, a hangover from an era of politics that has become increasingly obsolete with the progress of détente, the emergence of a multipolar world and the supposed windup of the Indochina war. Much of the \$1.31 billion requested by the President for military assistance is of doubtful utility either for the United States or for its proposed recipients. Ignoring the President's proposals, the Foreign Relations Committee has approved a Fulbright-drafted military authorization bill which would drastically reduce arms aid next year and would eliminate all military grant assistance over the next four years.

Equally sweeping and notably constructive proposals on the economic side have been advanced by a 22-member majority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Setting aside for the moment the \$600 million earmarked for Southeast Asia, which raises special problems deserving close Congressional scrutiny, the House group has proposed that the remaining \$1 billion in economic assistance be redirected to focus on the most acute problems of the poorest nations: rural development, food and nutri-

tion, population growth and health, education and human resources development.

In addition, the Congressmen would establish a new \$1-billion Export Development Credit Fund for the lowest income countries which would have the dual purpose of aiding development and stimulating United States exports to nations accounting for one-third of the world's population.

Although these and other new House proposals mark a sharp departure from past aid practices and the Administration's program, they represent, in effect, a thoughtful elaboration on recommendations made by a Presidential task force three years ago and move in a direction Mr. Nixon himself advocated in his last State of the World message.

If United States foreign aid is to serve United States interests and the cause of peace in the "radically different world" which was noted in that Presidential message, its purposes and structure should be radically revised along the imaginative lines that the two Congressional committees have begun to chart.

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1973]

A PROMISING AID PROPOSAL IN THE HOUSE

The lengthy travails of American foreign aid have made clear to its supporters the need to make aid at once more effective for its recipients and more attractive to its donors. Pessimists have doubted that these twin goals could either be served adequately, or even combined at all. A bipartisan majority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, however, has now produced a well-considered and promising proposal meant to do both. Introduced by Rep. Clement Zablocki (D-Wis.), the proposal is intended to strengthen and enlarge the overall economic aid program and to do so in a way calculated to enhance the prospects of the program's passage in Congress. The first without the second is, of course, useless.

So, to satisfy those who have rightfully demanded that aid do more to improve the quality of the lives of the poor, the new proposal would take the same \$1 billion which the administration asks for economic assistance and seek to focus the money more sharply on "human-oriented" needs in population control, agriculture, health and the like. Not every development economist agrees that the poorest of the poor can thus be helped but the approach unquestionably has considerable moral and political merit. Big capital-eating projects such as dams would be left, to an even greater extent than they already are, to the international development agencies.

Then, to satisfy those whose main interest in aid is that it expand American exports, an "export development credit fund" would be established to subsidize another \$1 billion a year in easy-term exports to the lowest-income countries. The interest subsidies, costing \$40 million, would be funded from repayments of earlier aid loans; repayments now run at \$400 million. By training aid on "people not projects" and by hitching to the aid wagon those Americans desiring to help their own economy as well as Americans desiring to help the world's poor, the House sponsors hope to surmount the political obstacles to aid which have grown so high in recent years. To convey the relationship of interdependence which the new proposal reflects and advances, the name of the administering agency would be changed from "Agency for International Development" to "Mutual Development and Cooperation Agency."

It is satisfying to report that, in his department's first formal response, Secretary of State William Rogers Tuesday welcomed the House committee's "thoughtful and positive approach" and noted correctly that AID had itself been moving along similar lines. Mr. Rogers also pronounced himself "especially pleased at the committee's reaffirmation of the central role of the Department

of State in over-all guidance of U.S. development policies." Whether the other elements of the government, particularly the White House, will be equally pleased remains to be seen. On that question of bureaucratic politics, a good part of the fate of the House initiative probably hangs. To imagine that any program so multi-dimensional and so worn and frayed as aid can be considered only on its merits is, alas, fantasy.

Nor can the question of congressional politics be ignored. Not every committee of the Congress will rejoice to see the House Foreign Affairs Committee setting up and overseeing a program in what would be for it the new field of direct export promotion. (Foreign aid has always had a heavy aspect of indirect export promotion.) On these grounds, the sooner that Foreign Affairs chairman Thomas E. Morgan (D-Pa.) eases from his current posture of benign aloofness, as one observer calls it, to active sponsorship, the better.

The other big question which will shape the fate of the new economic aid proposal is its political relationship to the equally controversial question of military aid. The administration put the two together in a single package. Predictably the Senate split off the military items—these include general security assistance and grant military aid for Cambodia. Indochina reconstruction funds are also in the administration bill. In welcoming the House economic aid proposal, it was plainly one of Mr. Rogers' purposes to cultivate support for the other items in that bill. Some supporters of the House proposal favor the other items, some don't. A difficult and protracted negotiation is no doubt in store. Whenever and however it ends, we would hope that both Congress and the administration would keep high in mind the prospect for responsible engagement in the world, which the House aid initiative holds out.

**DR. RICHARD P. CRINIGAN, NEW
PRESIDENT FOR THE NEW YORK
STATE OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION**

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to pay a tribute to the newly elected president of the New York State Optometric Association, Dr. Richard P. Crinigan. Dr. Crinigan, who lives in Watervliet and is a native of Albany, is one of my constituents. He takes his new office with an outstanding background both of service to the community and in the area of vision care.

A graduate of Dartmouth College and Columbia University School of Optometry, Dr. Crinigan received his doctorate from the Massachusetts College of Optometry.

Dr. Crinigan just completed a 2-year term of office as president-elect of NYSOA and has also served as president of the Eastern New York Optometric Society.

Moreover he has served his local community well as president of the Kiwanis Club of Colonie, and has chaired the NYSOA Committee on Motorist Vision and Safety.

The New York State Optometric Association has long demonstrated its concern for the vision of New Yorkers and under the leadership of Dr. Crinigan I am certain that this fine organization

will continue its record of service to the State of New York.

I know I speak for the people of the capitol district in expressing my pride in Dr. Richard Crinigan's past achievements and in wishing him the best of luck as president of the NYSOA.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the week many of us joined our respected colleague, DAN FLOOD, in a special House commemoration of Captive Nations Week.

I commend those men that recognize the validity and continuing significance of the Captive Nations Week. I include and continue my remarks by inserting a commentary of Gen. Thomas A. Lane on the subject of Captive Nations Week which devotes particular attention to the history of the Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation within the U.S.S.R.

Recently I participated in a special program with the Ukrainian Congress Committee which commented on the tragic famine which the Communist inflicted on the Ukrainian peoples over 50 years ago. However, the tragic difficulties that have befallen the Ukrainian people have not stifled their nationalistic aspirations and they and other peoples continue to look forward to the day when their freedom will be regained.

CAPTIVE NATIONS SUFFER OPPRESSION

In the tolerant and friendly relations which ethnic groups develop in the United States, it is difficult to hold in perspective the oppression and even genocide which is practiced in other parts of the world. That is why the annual celebration of Captive Nations Week in the third week of July must remain a focus of our concern.

Ethnic oppression and exploitation is historically associated with imperialism. It may occur in any multi-tribal state or society where one tribe or national group controls the power of government, whether Burundi or Uganda or the Soviet Union. But in modern times, when most of the multi-tribal states of the free world have allowed a sharing in political power, the passionate excesses of the past survive chiefly in the Communist states. There the ethnic differences are exacerbated by the cruelty of a materialistic ideology.

One people who have for centuries suffered the deprivation of their liberties are the Ukrainians. Settled in the rich valleys of the Dnieper, the Dniester and the Boh rivers, north of the Black Sea, the Ukrainians held a rich and bountiful land. Their territory became the target of contending neighbors. In the mid-17th Century, the rulers of the Ukraine turned to the Czar of Muscovy for aid against Poland and Turkey, only to have their country divided between Poland and Russia. A systematic oppression by Peter I was designed to convert the Ukraine into a province of Russia.

In the aftermath of the Russian Revolution, the Ukraine achieved a brief national independence, 1917-1920, before it was reconquered by the Red Russian Army.

During the German invasion of 1941, the Ukrainians soon learned that the Germans came not as liberators but as new oppressors.

Ukrainians organized their own partisan army to fight both the Germans and the Russians. The story is richly told by Yuriy Tys-Krokmaluk in his new book, "UPA Warfare in Ukraine" (Society of Veterans of Ukrainian Insurgent Army, Inc. \$10.00 449 pp.) the story of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (1942-1952). This army of the people operated against the occupying German and Russian Armies; and during the German occupation, it fought also against Russian Partisans operating behind the German lines. The book is a chronicle of heroic tenacity against insuperable odds.

The Ukrainian Insurgent Army disbanded after the death of its great Commander-in-Chief, Lt. General Taras Chuprynska, but resistance to Soviet oppression has continued. Russian efforts to suppress the language and religion of the Ukrainian people have evoked new and heroic defiance from the young and the intelligentsia of the Ukrainian nation.

A SUMMARY OF THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star News recently printed an editorial which summarizes very well the current situation regarding what has become known as the energy crisis.

I insert that editorial in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

ENERGY—A CRISIS THAT WON'T WAIT

No, the country isn't running out of gasoline just yet. This is not, as many Americans had feared, the summer of the great filling station dry-up and the stalling of vacation-bound families all along the highways.

Rather, it is a summer of portents, of our first encounter with real shortages, our first retreat from the high-consumption ideal. We see stations rationing gasoline to their customers, cutting hours of operation and in some cases—if they are independent distributors—shutting down altogether. We are squeaking through, but the signs indicate this is only a foretaste of what's to come next year—and perhaps next winter, where heating and industrial oils are concerned. And with demand racing far ahead of production, the response of both government and the oil industry has been incredibly slow.

At last there is some movement of consequence, however. For the past several days the Senate has been locked in debate on legislation to allow construction of the trans-Alaska oil pipeline, which offers the only hope for a large increase in domestic oil production any time in the near future. Right now the \$3.5-billion project is stopped, dead still, by a Supreme Court decision, upholding an old federal statute that doesn't allow enough right-of-way for such a line across federal lands. Changing the law to provide a sufficiently wide corridor is the fervent intent of Chairman Henry M. Jackson of the Senate Interior Committee, and a vote on his proposal is coming up Tuesday.

For several urgent reasons, the national interest demands passage of this measure, and fortunately the Senate seems in a mood to pass it. This is indicated by the two-to-one vote Friday against an amendment that would have held up the Alaska pipeline so the United States could negotiate for a different route through Canada to the Midway of three to five years in tapping the west. That could have meant an additional abundant Arctic oil, which was sheer folly even to consider.

In fact, we think the Senate now should adopt an amendment by Senators Gravel and Stevens of Alaska to lessen the danger of further stoppage by environmental lawsuits, which still might stall the work another year or two. After all the environmentalists—through long delays they already have forced—achieved the inclusion of strong safeguards in plans for the Alaskan line. It's time to begin stringing pipe, for the fast-swelling U.S. reliance on foreign oil threatens a dangerous, destabilizing dollar drain. Add to this the apparent willingness of some Middle East nations to manipulate their vast oil resources as a level on American foreign policy, and the picture becomes grim indeed.

Even if Congress removes all obstacles, however, the Alaskan oil won't be flowing down from the North Slope for another three years or more, and there seems no prospect of any dramatic increase in U.S. refinery production before then. President Nixon waited about three years too long in easing the import quotas, to permit more foreign oil to enter this country. The petroleum industry, for reasons we cannot begin to grasp, let several years pass without building a single new refinery, so that now there is insufficient capacity to process all the foreign oil which the nation needs to import. Nor is there a single deepwater port capable of handling the gigantic new supertankers that will haul the crude oil to these shores from the Middle East and elsewhere.

How could the United States, with all its economic expertise and sophisticated predicting techniques, ever have gotten boxed into such a predicament? In some quarters there's suspicion that the big oil companies were in collusion to create a shortage, force independent dealers out of business and hike prices. It is well that the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission have launched studies to determine if there is any substance to these mutterings. But a few basic facts are beyond dispute—that gasoline consumption has far outrun the government's estimates, and that new car production and sales are setting new records. Prosperous America guzzles more and more energy—electricity as well as petroleum—and the day of accounting isn't far ahead.

The fastest that the government can act will not be soon enough, and solid proposals are at hand that must be expedited. The Senate soon will begin hearings on legislation to hasten the building of offshore deepwater ports to receive incoming foreign oil. Anyone doubting the need for this might consider last week's announcement that the first large domestic refinery in three years will be built beside the Mississippi River, above New Orleans. That's good news, but three years will be required for the job, and then the crude oil for this plant—coming from the Middle East—will still have to be unloaded from supertankers at a deepwater port in the Bahamas and towed in barges to the Mississippi. Obviously, this country must have offshore port facilities as quickly as possible, with the best possible environmental safeguards.

And Congress must get cracking, too, on a massive program of research and development across the whole energy field—from solar and fusion electricity to large-scale extraction of oil and gas from coal, which is our only abundant energy resource. This is envisioned in a bill by Senator Jackson that would launch a 10-year, \$20-billion effort. Time is critical, for at best we may be well into the 1980s before even the most advanced of these new modes—coal gasification—provides fuel in any significant quantity. And action is imperative on several other measures—to allocate scarce petroleum equitably (which is much better than rationing at this point), and to stimulate refinery construction and natural gas exploration. Congress also should come up with some tax incentives for energy conservation, down to the household level, instead of relying on appeals

for voluntary frugality, which is primarily the way President Nixon has chosen.

But the President has become a great deal more concerned over this whole menacing matter in recent weeks. In his second energy message of this year (the first one having been considerably too weak), he came out for a \$10-billion federal program over five years, to develop new sources of energy, and that represents quite a leap in White House objectives. Highly encouraging, too, is his plan to reduce the government's energy consumption by 7 percent in the next year, as the model for a new national "conservation ethic." He has proposed a sweeping governmental reorganization to consolidate the multitude of endeavors in the energy-fuels field, and persuaded Colorado's popular and persuasive governor, John Love, to resign and come here to head the enterprise.

So an initiative equal to the challenge at last may be in the making, and the question is whether the many wheels of government can turn fast enough. The first vital tests will be in those Senate votes this week on hastening the availability of all that oil in Alaska.

TESTIMONY REGARDING THE VOTER REGISTRATION ACT

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Elections had the privilege of hearing testimony regarding H.R. 8053, the Voter Registration Act, from Mr. James F. Dowd III, the deputy secretary of state from the State of Missouri.

I found his testimony very pertinent to the proposed legislation, and I am submitting the full text of his statement for the consideration of my colleagues:

TESTIMONY BY JAMES F. DOWD III, DEPUTY
SECRETARY OF STATE OF MISSOURI

My name is James F. Dowd, III. I am Deputy Secretary of State of Missouri, appointed to that position by Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick.

My purpose in being here is to suggest positive, constructive improvements in H.R. 8053. I'm here to talk about the mechanics of registration, from the Missouri viewpoint.

Missouri is unique in many ways, including the manner in which it conducts its elections. We have counties with registration, and some without; we have counties with registration by mail, and others which do not provide for mail registration.

In the most recent session of our General Assembly, a bill was passed with strong support from both parties which extended voter registration, with registration by mail, throughout the state. It has not yet been signed into law by Governor Bond, but we hope it will be shortly.

I'd like to suggest to the committee that this bill, as presently drafted, will not achieve the ends of its sponsors, but that it could with some basic changes, mostly designed to make it functionally compatible with existing state systems.

To make these suggestions, we must first look at what we feel what is wrong with the bill. In our opinion:

1. The presumption upon which it is based is incorrect
2. The time frame is unnecessarily short
- 2a. Inadequate time to determine qualifications
3. Postcards have built-in problems of legibility and incompleteness
4. The bill opens the door to the possibility of fraud, and

5. It will require the maintenance of dual registration systems.

1. INACCURATE PRESUMPTION

Our experience suggests that it is not registration which has impeded voter turnout. In the registration counties of Missouri, 74% of the eligible voters were registered for last year's election. Although only 80% of those registered turned out, the percentage of eligible voters that was registered exceeded the percentage of those voters who turned out in the nonregistration counties, where 72% of the eligible voters cast a ballot.

I suggest that the close correlation between the percentage of voters registered in Missouri in our registration counties, and the actual turn out in our non-registration counties (a variance of less than 2%), suggests that a 72% turn out might have been the maximum that we could hope to achieve, even with a change in our registration procedures.

Based on our experience, HR 8053 is unworkable as it is presently drafted for the following reasons:

2. THE TIME IS TOO SHORT

All the permanent registration systems in use in the country today depend entirely on the fact that voters may register throughout the year. No system of prior registration of which we are aware contemplates that all the registrations would be made within 60 days prior to the election.

We know of no policy reason why the bill should preclude the post office from distributing the registration cards prior to 45 days before the closing of registration. Certainly, we concur with Dr. David Dinkins, President of the Board of Elections of New York City, who suggested that the distribution should take place in January preceding the election, so as to provide sufficient time to process the cards.

2A. THERE IS INSUFFICIENT TIME TO DETERMINE THE QUALIFICATIONS OF VOTERS

Utilization of a nation-wide mail registration system is likely to prompt a change in habits on the part of our county clerks.

They will feel obliged to check more closely into the qualifications of registrants. This will, of course, take some time, substantially more time than is permitted by this bill. Their guard will be up because this bill will not only permit people to register without having to go before a registrar, but also to vote without having been seen by an election official. A twelve year old felon from Illinois could register in Missouri and, if he lies about his qualifications, vote absentee ballots the rest of his life—unless the registrar is permitted sufficient time to check his qualifications.

A basic premise of this bill is that all the determinations that need to be made by a registrar can be made within 30 days, that being the average closing period for registration throughout the country. But if hundreds, or thousands, or tens of thousands of post cards are received on the 31st day prior to the election, it will not be possible for a registrar to make the determinations necessary to fulfill his oath of office.

3. SOME CARDS WILL NOT BE ABLE TO BE PROCESSED

The Missouri experience with mail registration may be helpful to this committee. Even if our cards are complete, some are still unable to be processed.

A good example is the voter who completes his card properly, listing as his voting address "Canton, Missouri" or "Rural Route 1, Harrison, Missouri". In each case, the registrar is unable to assign the voter to a precinct.

The county clerk in Cases County is not helped with the address "Rural Route 1, Harrisonville". Rural Route 1 passes through five different election districts. It is impossible for that voter to be assigned to a precinct, unless more information can be gathered.

Fortunately, our county clerks are a persistent group. First, they try to call the voter. They frequently find, however, that his household is one of the 17% of Missouri households that does not have a phone or which has an unlisted number. He tries to write the registrant soliciting further information, but a reply is all too seldom forthcoming. Registered mail does not work because the voter refuses to accept it, thinking it is a service of process. But finally the day comes when the county clerk spots the registrant and his wife walking down the street, passing the court house, and calls them into his office. He points to a large map of the county on his wall, and asks the voter to point to the location of his house. The husbands points to one spot—the wife to another!

My point here is that these problems, with our limited mail registration system occur too frequently to encourage us that a nationwide post card registration system will be a success.

The difference between a mail voter registration system, and paying taxes, buying automobile licenses and the many other governmental duties that we perform by mail, is that we must somehow tell the registrar exactly where we live in the county in terms of voting precincts.

4. H.R. 8053 PROVIDES AN OPPORTUNITY FOR WIDESPREAD FRAUD

We are not aware of any situation in Missouri where mail registration has been used for fraudulent ends. But the concern of Missouri, and that of other states, is not just proving fraud, and prosecuting the offender after it has occurred.

It is the avoidance of the possibility of fraud in elections which is of paramount interest to the states, and I suggest that this bill, by making such an abrupt change in the manner in which voters will register, will open the door to fraud in a manner which has not been experienced heretofore by the various states.

5. THE BILL WILL REQUIRE THE MAINTENANCE OF DUAL REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, AS WELL AS DUAL BALLOTS

If I accurately read the thoughts of legislative leaders in Missouri, we will not rise to the "bait" of having the federal government pay 130% of our registration system, and will not adopt the federal system as our own.

Since we will have a dual registration system, we will also have the problems that come with it. The first problem will be the necessity for dual ballots, with an introduction of a new "short federal ballot" for voters who have registered only by sending in the post card.

The second problem will be explaining to the voters who have only registered for the federal election why they are not able to vote in state elections.

The net effect of this bill will be to open wide the doors of registration for Missourians who want to vote for their 14 federal officers, while slamming it shut on their right to vote for their 15,000 state, county and municipal officers. This bill does not make it simpler for people to vote, rather, it disenfranchises them, insofar as it will keep them from voting for their Governor, County Prosecutor, and City Alderman. Observed in that light, this bill becomes a fraud, a sham upon the public.

Our first recommendation is that H.R. 8053 not be given favorable approval by this committee. The bill in its present form should not be permitted to pass.

If the committee is of the opinion that it must report out a bill, then we suggest that it must be a modified version of H.R. 8053.

We suggest that H.R. 8053 be amended in the following ways:

1. Eliminate the 45-day requirement.

We suggest the post cards be distributed at least three months prior to an election

and preferably 6 months. This might provide sufficient time for registration officials to process the cards after they have been received. If the time is found to be too far in advance, it could be shortened at a later date. We suggest that this would be a wiser legislative move than enacting the bill in its present form, only to find out that 45 days is too short a time period to process the cards.

2. The bill should be amended to exempt States with mail registration systems.

Missouri, like some other states, provides for registration by mail. The imposition of another mail registration system upon those states can only cause confusion. If they are doing the job which the bill would require them to do, why impose it on them.

I suggest that an exemption be extended to any state which permits voters to register by mail, if the state permits registration for any reason and requires that notaries provide their services regarding registration without charge to the voter.

I might point out that Missouri does not fit the exclusion I have just described, insofar as absentee registration is only available to the sick, disabled, or those absent from the county. We do feel that the categories of those eligible to register by mail could be expanded, and are willing to "go that extra mile" if it would avoid dual registration system. We are of the opinion that the notarization of the registration form provides a valuable safe-guard and helps to "insure the purity of the ballot box" while not being unduly restrictive. (Other suggested changes are included in my full statement).

But even with these changes, the bill will not solve the problem of registered voters who don't exercise their right to vote and will still result in a dual system in some states. I return to my first suggestion that the committee not take favorable action on this bill.

Given the climate for change and given the incentive for positive state action by bills such as HR 8053, it is my firm opinion that the states will respond quickly—within the next few years—to provide registration procedures which will meet the intentions of the sponsors of HR 8053 and S 352.

I thank you for your attention and I would be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

THE LEGACY OF APOLLO 11

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, since July of 1969 when Neil Armstrong first set foot on the lunar surface our national space program has had an ever-increasing wealth of technology and new knowledge and practical information of direct benefit to the people of this Nation and of the world. The lunar landing marked a high point in adventure and achievement in our national space program. Neil Armstrong, who took this first step for mankind, is to be admired and again congratulated for his outstanding feat. The unparalleled achievement of the first lunar landing and the subsequent success of the Apollo program must rank among the greatest accomplishments of man in recorded history. But Apollo meant much more than achieving a lunar landing. It was an achievement of technology, management,

and human dedication. It provided a wealth of scientific information and solid technological application which has given strength to the programs which have followed.

Even in the face of a declining budget the "bank" of knowledge, skills, and technology has been a continuing resource in achieving our national space program goals since 1969. We must replenish this bank of knowledge and technology and add to it so that the achievements of Skylab and the application of the Space Shuttle for the benefit of our Nation and the world will be realized. In remembering the achievement of the first lunar landing we need to be reminded of the need for strong support for our national space program today and in the years ahead.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this past week marked the 15th observance of Captive Nations Week. This annual tradition of remembering should not be allowed to become routine. The reasons for initially adopting a congressional resolution to annually recall the plight of 100 million East Europeans are still valid today.

Our most precious freedom as a Nation has been that of self-determination. We have not known the disillusionment and the despair associated with foreign occupation and rule. We have not known the daily struggle to keep spirits high when an oppressed future is all you have to look forward to. We are strangers to the isolation and the hopelessness and the fear of the unknown.

We are what we are as a Nation by choice. The mistakes we make are freely admitted and, upon occasion, publicized. We strive for perfection but necessarily fall far short of our goals. We continue to strive, however, and this is the essence of the democratic form of government.

We are not afraid to laugh at ourselves nor do we shrink in fear when the world laughs at us. We recognize our limitations and try not to profess to be something we are not.

Traditionally, we have stressed individual freedoms. There has been discrimination, inequality and injustice but there has also been a clear determination to overcome our failings and shortcomings as a Nation.

As we remember the people of East Europe during this week and all others, let us rededicate ourselves to the freedoms which made our country great. And let us reaffirm our support for those who today live with the terror of tyranny.

We can and must use economic leverage with the Soviet Union to drive these points home. We as a Nation can go on indefinitely observing Captive Nations Week. But how much longer can we expect the people of the captive nations to fight the oppression?

**PORTUGUESE GENOCIDE IN SOUTH-
ERN AFRICA: THE NEED TO HALT
HERBICIDE EXPORTS**

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, two articles that recently appeared in the New York Times concerned themselves with the compelling possibility that Portuguese military forces are conducting genocidal massacres in Mozambique, a Portuguese colony in southern Africa.

I now submit the two newspaper articles for the collective attention of my colleagues in Congress:

PRIESTS COMMENT ON SLAYING REPORT

MADRID, July 11.—Three Spanish Roman Catholic missionaries said today that two fellow priests had personally met survivors of a massacre of at least 400 men, women and children by Portuguese troops in a Mozambique village.

The three missionaries said that they themselves had been expelled from Mozambique on the East African Coast, and that the two priests, who they said were the original sources of a report on the alleged massacre in The Times of London yesterday, were now in prison.

The missionaries, in an interview at the National Seminary of Missions' headquarters in Madrid, described what they said was their part in transmitting the reports.

The missionaries, all seminary members, said that they had given details of the alleged massacre at Wiriyamu village on Dec. 16, 1972, to an English priest, the Rev. Adrian Hastings.

LIKENED TO MY LAI

Father Hastings, in a frontpage article in the London paper yesterday, said he had received reports from missionaries in Mozambique of massacres of Africans comparable to the My Lai killings in South Vietnam. The two priests said to be in prison, in Lourenco Marques, Mozambique's capital, were identified by Father Hastings as the Rev. Alfonso Valverde and the Rev. Martin Hernandez.

One missionary, the Rev. Enrique Ferrando, said of Wiriyamu village, "First the Portuguese bombed it from aircraft and after the slaughter they razed it."

The Rev. Julio Moure said, "If no one believes our statements, let them ask the Bishop of Tete," Cesar Alves Augusto, Farraira da Silva, "who flew over the area in a helicopter after the slaughter."

The reported Wiriyamu massacre was said to have been the fourth and worst in a series of mass killings that occurred in the Northern Mucumbura area, bordering Rhodesia, over two years.

All three priests said that they had sent written protests to the Portuguese Premier, Marcello Caetano, and other Portuguese leaders but had received no reply.

"We held our silence for fear of jeopardizing other members of the mission, but after recent events we can no longer hold back," the Rev. Buendia Gomes said.

LISBON PROMISES INQUIRY

LISBON, July 11.—The Portuguese Government said today that it would hold an inquiry into allegations that Portuguese troops had massacred African villagers in Mozambique.

The Ministry of Information, in a statement printed in all Lisbon newspapers, said that the allegations were reported yesterday in The Times of London "with the obvious aim of starting a scandal on the eve of the

visit of the Portuguese head of Government and besmirching the nation and the people he represents." Premier Marcello Caetano is to visit Britain next week.

The ministry's statement said that the case "will not fail to be the subject of inquiry in the established way," provided that the site where the most recent massacre is said to have taken place could be found.

The Government said that it had investigated all reports of irregular behavior by troops in Mozambique and punished offenders on the "rare" occasions when charges were substantiated.

NO COMMENT IN MOZAMBIQUE

LOURENCO MARQUES, Mozambique, July 11 (Agence France-Presse).—General Kaulza de Arriga, commander in chief of the Portuguese armed forces in Mozambique, refused comment today on the Times of London report of a massacre at Miriyamu village.

General de Arriga, a spokesman said, was tired of "fantastic allegations by the friends" of the Mozambique Liberation Front, which is also known as Frelino.

High command sources here noted that in an official comment yesterday Lisbon had said that the village of Miriyamu did not appear on the Mozambique map.

GENOCIDE IS LAID TO LISBON'S ARMY

LONDON, July 10.—A Roman Catholic priest said today that he had received reports from Spanish missionaries in Mozambique of Portuguese army massacres of Africans comparable to the My Lai killings in South Vietnam.

The Rev. Adrian Hastings said in a frontpage article in The Times of London today that he had been told that the Portuguese forces had been "carrying out the systematic genocidal massacre" of villages whose residents were thought to have helped guerillas of the Mozambique Liberation Front known as Frelino.

"The security forces," Father Hastings wrote, "feel free in the knowledge that there are no journalists for hundreds of miles and the victims know no European language; but the Spanish missionaries in the area obtained detailed information and themselves buried many of the victims."

Father Hastings, of the College of the Ascension in Birmingham, England, said that according to the reports a series of massacres, "for ghastliness each rivaling that of My Lai," took place in the area of Mucumbura between May and November, 1971.

He said that he had learned that two priests, the Rev. Martin Hernandez and the Rev. Alfonso Valverde, had attempted to protest and publicize the killings. They were arrested, Father Hastings said, and have been detained without trial in Lourenco Marques, the capital of Mozambique, for the last 18 months.

Many massacres have taken place since their arrest, Father Hastings said, he had been told. The latest, he said, included the killing of "several hundred" persons at the village of Wiriyamu on Dec. 16, 1972. The village was said to have been bombarded and troops brought in by helicopter were said to have ransacked the houses and killed the inhabitants.

Father Hastings gave the names of more than 130 persons, many of them women and children, who he said had been killed by the troops.

In this sordid and ugly light, I have submitted legislation in Congress to ban the exportation of all chemical herbicides to Portugal and the Republic of South Africa—H.R. 8574, the Chemical Warfare Prevention Act of 1973.

In the past months, I have sought to inform this legislative body and the public at large of the use of poisonous herbicides in the Portuguese and South

African perpetration of chemical warfare against the citizens of Angola and Mozambique.

It appears that Portuguese and South African airplanes are conducting a massive spraying of food crops, particularly cassava, to stifle support for the liberation movement that is rapidly growing among farmers and peasants in the Portuguese colonies. Much of the herbicide used in this vicious operation comes from the United States.

It is only recently that we have learned of this chemical aggression and its resulting devastation. Just last week we learned of the wholesale destruction of entire villages by the repressive colonial regimes of Portugal and South Africa, genocidal acts which were committed with U.S. supplied weapons.

These Portuguese and South African policies of chemical violence and genocide should be unequivocally condemned and rejected by the United States. By halting the exportation of herbicides that are only useful in warfare, we can see that this is possible.

**NATO AND THE GERMAN
"WATERGATE"**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans wonder if the assurances of our Government to the Brandt-controlled coalition of West Germany that we will continue 210,000 forces in southern Germany carried with it any reciprocal agreements that the Brandt government will not sell out our men.

Americans who read past the Watergate-Washington front page of the daily papers are very much aware of the "Watergate am Rhine" which constitutes a far greater threat to the German people than those posed by the domestic Watergate to the American people.

The reports of the Brandt party buying two votes from the opposition—the margin needed to swing Brandt's reelection as West German Chancellor—must create an atmosphere of lack of confidence among the West Germans. The announcement that Julius Steiner, former deputy of the West German Bundestag, who reportedly received about \$20,000 from Brandt's party to abstain in voting, was far surpassed by the further revelation that he has confessed to being an East German double agent on the payroll of the Warsaw Pact nation.

It certainly seems strange for the American military men to continue as mercenaries in West Germany, 28 years after the war is over, to defend the West German Government from Communist aggression, when the Chancellor of that country was manipulated into power by Communist agents.

If NATO is to be a strong Atlantic alliance to defend our European forefathers and allies from Communist aggression, there must be the con-

stant fear that some of our NATO allies have been compromised, and America's willingness to help them is being exploited as a political ploy.

I include related newsclippings:

[From the Washington Star-News, July 19, 1973]

TALKS LEAVE BONN ENVOY "REASSURED" ON NATO

(By George Sherman)

West German Defense Minister George Leber has concluded two days of talks here reassured that the Nixon-Brezhnev summit agreement against nuclear war changes nothing in the Atlantic alliance.

"I return home with the reassuring conviction that nothing in the Soviet-American agreements has a negative effect on the position of Europe," Leber told newsmen at the German embassy before leaving for Bonn last night.

Yesterday he and U.S. Defense Secretary James B. Schlesinger released a six-point communiqué reaffirming the NATO strategy of "deterrence and flexible response, including forward defense."

They also agreed that the United States and Europe should press ahead with "important force improvements" in Europe. Leber suggested that "combat efficiency" and "cost effectiveness" of existing forces in Europe, including the American forces there, were the primary aims—not any cutback in forces.

The German minister acknowledged that the agreement between President Nixon and Soviet leader Leonid I. Brezhnev on June 22 here to take all possible steps against nuclear war have raised "doubts and questions" in West Europe.

America's allies, he said, wondered whether the Atlantic alliance could go on as before now that the two most powerful antagonists have committed themselves to efforts to prevent nuclear war. Since Moscow and Washington have now pledged "urgent consultation" in any crisis threatening nuclear war, he explained, Europeans have asked whether the threat of conventional aggression in Europe would be "de-coupled" from escalation into nuclear war.

West Europeans live with the fear that superior Soviet conventional forces in Europe could "blackmail" West Europe in any crisis if no ultimate recourse to the American nuclear deterrent exists.

But Leber, who conferred yesterday with presidential aide Henry A. Kissinger and spent Tuesday at Camp David with Schlesinger, said he was now convinced that the Soviet-American declaration is only an attempt at "safeguards" against any war breaking out.

Should those paper safeguards fail, he said, echoing arguments of Kissinger, the whole NATO defense structure—nuclear and conventional—remains intact to cope with aggression.

"I am convinced now," said Leber, "that nothing in the Soviet-American agreement calls for a change in the structure of the alliance or hurts its capability to defend against aggression."

Leber said he expects a new two-year German-American agreement later this month or early in August continuing the large German "offset" support for U.S. foreign exchange losses resulting from the costs of 210,000 American forces stationed in Germany.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 13, 1973]

BRANDT WILLING TO GIVE TESTIMONY IN SCANDAL

(By Joe Alex Morris, Jr.)

BONN.—Chancellor Willy Brandt has expressed willingness to testify before a parliamentary investigating committee looking into allegations of bribery which an opposition leader described Tuesday as "worse than Watergate."

"If they want me to testify, I will come more than willingly," Brandt told journalists aboard his plane returning from his official visit to Israel.

The case involves a former opposition deputy, Julius Steiner, who admitted recently that he was one of at least two Christian Democratic deputies who abstained in a crucial vote of confidence more than a year ago. The abstentions meant the Social-Liberal coalition government headed by Brandt continued in office, at a time when defections from its ranks had resulted in a parliamentary standoff with the opposition.

Steiner also admitted he was a double agent, working for the East Germans and, he maintained, the West German Office for the Protection of the Constitution, the local equivalent of the FBI. This has created a bizarre political epilog here, in which an East German agent helped to save the Brandt government.

Steiner is in hiding, under the protective care of Quick, a conservative Munich illustrated magazine. Tuesday, he authorized the magazine's publisher to say in his name that the parliamentary whip of Brandt's Social Democratic Party, Karl Wienand, had offered him 50,000 marks (\$20,000) to switch his vote.

Since the Steiner affair broke into print, a Free Democratic Party deputy who switched to the opposition in protest against Brandt's Ostpolitik has claimed he was offered twice that amount, although he refused it.

The affair came up in Bonn Tuesday at a Christian Democratic Party congress called to elect a new leadership for the next two years and where Helmut Kohl, the minister-president of the Rhineland-Palatinate, was elected party chairman without opposition.

Alfred Dregger, a conservative CDU leader from the state of Hesse, charged that the "scandal in Bonn is worse than Watergate." The Washington scandal concerns only unfair election procedures, Dregger said, but in Bonn it concerned the corruption of a Parliamentary decision.

It was even worse because a foreign power was involved, Dregger added. This was a reference to Steiner's confessed activity for the East Germans.

"This Bonn scandal will show what German democracy is worth," he declared.

Wienand, who first admitted only to casual contacts with Steiner but later confessed he had dealt with the CDU deputy many times, Tuesday offered to resign as parliamentary whip for the SPD in view of the impending parliamentary investigation. The SPD faction rejected his request and expressed full confidence in him.

[From the New York Times, June 11, 1973]

BONN'S "WATERGATE" RIVALS WASHINGTON'S IN CONFUSION

BONN, June 10.—A cartoon in one of West Germany's biggest newspapers last week showed Uncle Sam and John Bull sitting in a coin-operated laundry, with bundles of dirty laundry labeled "Watergate" and "Lambton Sex Scandal." Timidly approaching, with his dirty linen, was Grober Michel, the peasant character with the tassel cap who represents West Germany. His bundle was labeled "The Steiner Case."

The cartoon reflected a scandal over espionage and alleged Government vote-buying that has pushed Watergate off the front pages of West German newspapers. If there is any resemblance between the Watergate scandal and the "Steiner affair," it appears to lie less in the substance than in the way each day brings some new, contradictory statement from a bewildering cast of characters.

ROLE OF DOUBLE AGENT

The furor revolves around an obscure former Opposition lawmaker named Julius Steiner. From self-imposed exile abroad, the 49-year-old Mr. Steiner has told several German publications that he acted as a double agent, taking orders from West German Se-

curity men to maintain contacts with East German spy-masters who wanted information on his Christian Democratic party.

Mr. Steiner has also announced that he was one of two hitherto unidentified Opposition legislators whose secret abstentions narrowly averted passage of a no-confidence motion in Parliament in April 1972.

The motion was raised by Rainer Barzel, the former floor leader of the Opposition in the lower house, in an effort to oust Chancellor Willy Brandt and halt his drive toward East-West accommodation at its most crucial phase.

Mr. Steiner's admission that he voted against the Barzel motion was immediately connected with unconfirmed reports that two Opposition men who abstained in the key balloting had been bribed to do so by members of Mr. Brandt's ruling coalition of Social Democrats and Free Democrats.

Mr. Steiner denied that he took or was offered money, but his statements were followed swiftly by events that alternately threatened to cast suspicion on the coalition to confuse the issue.

OFFER OF \$30,000 REPORTED

Several Opposition legislators swore that they had seen pencil marks on two abstention cards when the votes were counted after the 1972 balloting. They suggested that the marks could have been made by the supposedly bribed Opposition men to show Government tallies that they had stuck to their bargain.

Whatever slender evidence of bribery might have resulted from a recheck of the cards disappeared when the speaker of the lower house told newsmen that an official, against regulations, had kept the cards unsealed in a tin filing cabinet for more than a year, instead of in his safe. The speaker said that the presence of pencil marks, would prove nothing, since the marks could have been made later.

Wilhelm Helms, a member of Parliament who switched from the Brandt coalition by quitting the Free Democrats a month before the vote of confidence, said that he had been offered \$30,000 not to break ranks. The defection of Mr. Helms and of four of his colleagues lost Mr. Brandt his ruling majority and helped set the stage for the confidence vote.

A former member of the smaller liberal coalition party to which Mr. Helms had belonged said that he offered Mr. Helms money not to defect. But he added that he made the offer only to test whether the Opposition had offered Mr. Helms a bribe. He said that the party leaders knew nothing of his proposal.

The head of the federal intelligence service offered, under opposition pressure, to brief Parliament on Mr. Steiner's role as a counter-spy. Opposition legislators said that the offer to reveal the federal file on Mr. Steiner apparently contradicted previous statements by the agents of the semi-autonomous state government at Stuttgart.

STEINER ACTIVITIES TRACED

While Bonn buzzed with rumors and speculation, additional information on Mr. Steiner came to light, indicating that his involvement in cold-war spying dated to the early nineteen-fifties, when his home state of Baden-Württemberg was still under French military occupation.

Mr. Steiner, whose rise in the Christian Democratic ranks began in 1952, told one interviewer that even then, he occasionally met French agents to pass on inside information about his party.

And he said that he had acted as a double agent once previously. He said that he spied in the Soviet Embassy near Bonn in the late fifties for the federal intelligence service while ostensibly taking part in meetings of a Soviet-German friendship circle that leaned toward Moscow.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
June 6, 1973]

CHARGES OF VOTE BUYING SHAKE WEST GERMANY

(By David R. Francis)

Unsubstantiated charges of parliamentary vote-buying are focusing attention on West Germany's Bundestag.

The charges are that Chancellor Willy Brandt won a close vote of confidence last year after two opposition members were bribed not to vote for their candidate.

One of those accused of accepting bribes, Julius Steiner, denied in an interview with the magazine *Quick* that he was paid to abstain in the crucial vote. Rather, he said, he abstained to prevent Christian Democratic Union (CDU) leader Rainer Barzel from becoming chancellor. This, he held, would have been a "national catastrophe."

Whatever the case, the ruling presidium of the CDU this week demanded a "ruthless probe" into the allegations about the April, 1972 election.

That presidium was chaired by Dr. Barzel. His defeat in last year's vote of confidence was only two votes short of the necessary 249. It was followed last fall by a decisive defeat in a special election that returned the Brandt government to power.

The bribery charge has been given another sensational angle by Mr. Steiner's claim that he served as a double agent.

In interviews with the press, Mr. Steiner admitted that he was approached by East German agents six days before the confidence vote and agreed to spy on his own party for about \$900 a month.

After the first payment, he said, he informed agents of West Germany's counter-espionage agency of the offer. They advised him to continue his contacts and not to inform his party of them, he said.

The Interior Ministry in Bonn has confirmed that Mr. Steiner, who did not run for re-election last fall, did deal with the Stuttgart branch of the agency.

The affair could arouse considerable bitterness in the opposition party if it is shown that it was cheated from power by bribery.

So far, however, no solid proof has been offered.

Similarly, last summer, Chancellor Brandt intimated that some of the defectors to the opposition from the government side in Parliament could have had financial motives. He also produced no evidence.

[From Time magazine]
WATERGATE AM RHINE

"I, Julius Steiner, hereby make the worst confession in my life. I am aware that in doing so I am disclosing the greatest scandal in the history of West Germany."

With these words, Steiner, a former Deputy in the West German Bundestag, admitted that in April 1972 he sold his vote to keep Chancellor Willy Brandt in power. Writing in last week's issue of the illustrated weekly *Quick*, Steiner (who is currently in hiding, probably outside Germany), confessed that he received 50,000 marks (about \$20,000) from a member of Brandt's Social Democratic Party to abstain in a secret vote of confidence on the Brandt coalition government. By not voting against Brandt, Steiner betrayed his own party, the opposition Christian Democratic Union (C.D.U.), which expected to oust the Chancellor (*TIME*, May 8, 1972). Thanks to Steiner's abstention, and that of another as yet unidentified C.D.U. deputy, Brandt squeaked through with a razor-thin two-vote margin.

Steiner's confession was the latest, and most startling, in a series of revelations about a political scandal that West Germans have dubbed *Watergate am Rhine*. Although substantially different from the scandal enveloping the White House, the Steiner affair involves not just bribery but cover-up at-

tempts and even espionage. It could cause considerable embarrassment—or worse—for Brandt and his coalition government. Already Bonn's cocktail-party circuit talks of little else but the scandal.

For the past month, the West German press has been publishing stories hinting that bribery had saved the Brandt government. When Steiner's name first appeared, he admitted that he abstained from voting against Brandt, but did so, he insisted, for ideological reasons, not for money. But then, à la Watergate, bits and pieces of evidence surfaced. The national daily *Die Welt* reported that shortly after last year's crucial Bundestag vote, Steiner bought himself two Mercedes and a Mini-Cooper.

Finally Steiner confessed—but not before dropping another bombshell. He claimed that since fall 1972 he had been a double agent, ostensibly supplying East German intelligence with inside dope on the C.D.U., while also reporting to West Germany's own internal security force.

The momentum of the scandal builds as West Germany's press features it on Page One every day. As with Washington's Watergate, newspapers and magazines frantically scramble to dig up new clues with which to scoop each other. Brandt's dispirited C.D.U. opponents have enthusiastically embraced the Steiner affair as a means of discrediting the Chancellor. They have demanded that a Bundestag special investigatory committee, established last week, find out whether Brandt knew about the bribes and whether the internal security force deliberately failed to inform the C.D.U. that Steiner was giving information about the party to East Germany.

The Chancellor has welcomed the investigation, declaring his willingness to testify before the committee. Yet, even if it appears that he did not know about the bribes, the deepening mess will likely dim his image. More worrisome, the corruption and venality in Bonn that the investigation is revealing could, in the extreme, topple Brandt. His demise could rekindle the familiar fears about the stability of West Germany's relatively young democratic institutions that accompany the nation's major political crises.

TECHNOLOGY MENDS LIVES

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, often when we think of the space program, we think of the giant rockets, astronauts, and the spectacular achievements of recent years. In addition to this, much of the technology generated by our national space program is contributing directly to the well-being of all people. One particular example of this has been the development of medical devices which are aiding people in living normal lives where heretofore they would have been invalids for the remainder of their lives.

A recent article by Bob Thomas from the June 26, 1973, issue of *Today* spells out clearly the importance of the national space program contributions in the medical field:

TECHNOLOGY MENDS LIVES

(By Bob Thomas)

Detailing NASA's contributions to the field of science and technology would be equal in labor to reconstructing the pyramids from individual grains of sand.

To do an honest job is difficult enough. To do a complete job is near impossible.

There are individual stories to be told, and others that affect the lives of thousands and even millions of persons.

Mrs. Celeste Thompson is a California housewife and mother left near totally paralyzed following an attack of polio in 1954. At the time she was 19 years old, and the illness left her with movement of only the neck and head and a slight residual motion of her left thumb.

A year ago, engineers and technicians at NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., completed the design of a number of advanced teleoperator systems—including electrically powered, robot-type arms and proportional control devices for mechanical arms.

With NASA assistance and funding through its Technology Utilization Office, the Rancho Calif., adapted these devices to Mrs. Thompson's use. All the devices are operated by sensitive tongue-pressure switches.

Because of that technology, Mrs. Thompson has acquired a state of "self-sufficiency" not enjoyed for almost 20 years. She even corresponds with friends, typing 24 words a minute with relative ease.

Mrs. Thompson's equipment is not inexpensive. Her unit costs about \$3,500, but what price can we put on our independence?

Control devices of this nature can be tailored to individual needs, and their potential uses to industry are countless. Wherever remote manipulators are required—be they servicing nuclear reactors, handling toxic or infectious materials or other operations that could prove hazardous to man—the technology could be applied.

Staying with NASA's role in advancing the medical state-of-the-art: there is the electronic pacemakers that keeps the heart beating at a normal rate. An integral part of the pacemaker is the technique of miniaturization perfected in the space program.

Physiological monitoring techniques, similar to those used for Apollo astronauts, are now standard equipment in many of the country's hospitals. Pneumography systems that measure respiratory rates, originally developed for the Gemini program, can detect lung and heart disorders in newborn babies.

A space helmet, designed to obtain electroencephalographic tracings in astronauts under stress, now detects hearing defects in children.

Another spinoff of the space program is the accelerometer that measures muscular tremors and can aid doctors in early diagnosis of neurological ailments such as Parkinson's disease.

And the list goes on: an astronaut's pressure suit has been used to control internal bleeding, a computer used to enhance photographs radioed back from Mars now analyzes human chromosomes, ultra-fast dental drills using minute ball bearings developed through space technology.

There is no end. And we have touched only on the field of medicine.

There have been just as many, and just as impressive, advances in environment, oceans, earth resources and urban studies. NASA technology has expanded the knowledgeable boundaries of weather forecasting, communications, manufacturing and—lest we forget—international peace.

Without realizing it, the advancements from the space age have touched all of our lives.

Fishermen—both the commercial and weekend variety—are better informed of weather, tides and even fish locations because of information gathered by weather satellites. Our food supply is assured because photographs from space can spot agricultural diseases. We are entertained by instant coverage of news and sports events around the world through the science of communication satellites.

And because of all of this—and by the fact that NASA shares its information with the

world—we are beginning to experience a handshake friendship that is encircling the globe.

OBJECTIONS TO SONNENFELDT CONFIRMATION MUST BE ANSWERED—PART VI

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of May 23, 24, 29, and July 16, contain material relating to the nomination of Helmut Sonnenfeldt, now a senior adviser at the highly sensitive National Security Council, for the office of Under Secretary of Treasury. Mr. Sonnenfeldt's confirmation before the Senate Finance Committee was opposed by Mr. John D. Hemenway, a former Foreign Service officer and former colleague of Mr. Sonnenfeldt. In his extensive prepared statement for the Finance Committee Mr. Hemenway raised the question, among others, of the suitability of the nominee in the area of security.

In support of his position Mr. Hemenway offered the names of several individuals who had personal experiences with Mr. Sonnenfeldt on security matters. Among those named was Stephen Koczak, also a former colleague of Mr. Sonnenfeldt's at the State Department who states that he personally witnessed the improper and illegal transfer of information from Mr. Sonnenfeldt to unauthorized foreign nations. Mr. Koczak also asserted that the FBI entered the case and that he was subsequently interviewed by an agent from the Bureau.

In order to get more details on the case I wrote to the FBI for a mere confirmation that Mr. Koczak had, indeed, been so interviewed, realizing that the Bureau was not authorized to divulge specific details in the matter. The FBI correctly referred the matter to the Justice Department, and over a year later, and after the second inquiry, confirmation of the interview was received.

Questions logically arise as to the alleged illegal transfer of information, the sensitivity of the information involved in the alleged transfer, and the final disposition of the case. Hopefully, these questions will be answered in upcoming hearings before the House Internal Security Committee's extensive and continuing review of the Federal employee security program.

The letter of confirmation from the FBI follows:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1973.

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASHBROOK: Reference is made to my letter dated May 29, 1973, concerning Helmut Sonnenfeldt which advised that I had forwarded a copy of your letter of May 21, 1973, to the Department of Justice requesting that you be furnished with any information relating to Sonnenfeldt which the Department is in a position to provide.

Please be advised that by memorandum dated June 13, 1973, the Deputy Attorney General stated that the Department of Jus-

tice has no objection to this Bureau verifying to you that in 1959, Stephen Koczak was interviewed by a Special Agent of this Bureau regarding Helmut Sonnenfeldt.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS,
Acting Director.

THE VITAMIN CONTROVERSY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

INDEPENDENT PHI BETA KAPPA
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY GROUP,
New York, N.Y., July 9, 1973.

HON. CHARLES RANGEL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANGEL: According to Food Chemical News of May 14, 1973 the Department of Health, Education and Welfare formally opposed, in a letter to Chairman Staggers of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, the bills sponsored by over 150 House members, which would short-circuit the Food and Drug Administration's proposed Dietary Food Regulations and Standard for Dietary Supplements that will become operative unless Congress intervenes.

Also on May 14th the New York Times published a misleading article which created a diversion from this issue by an attack on one consumer organization responsible for only a part of the extremely heavy mail urging Representatives to prevent actualization of the FDA's plan.

Since in the course of long and costly hearings numerous consumer organizations testified against the FDA proposal and tens of thousands of protesting letters were sent from all parts of the country, while many able scientists in the field registered their opposition, this issue merits clarification.

THE FUNCTION IS SAFETY

The purpose of the Pure Food and Drug Administration was and is to safeguard the nation's food, an increasingly complex and crucial function which, for a number of reasons including special interest pressures, is far from being adequately performed. There is neither a mandate nor a need for rigid, freedom-constricting, scientifically dubious agency control of food supplements with which varied persons desire to enrich their diet.

It should be understood that nutrition is not an exact science, there are many unknowns; nor is there a "scientific-medical fraternity" with a unified approach. Industry-linked scientists such as Dr. Fredrick Stare advise the government in contradiction to the findings of nutritionists like Dr. George Briggs of the University of California who are concerned about Americans' poor nutrition and regard over one-third of chronic illness responsible for 83% of male deaths as diet-linked. FDA dogmatism is therefore unwarranted.

There are only two vitamins commonly used in supplements which have been shown to be toxic in vast amounts, vitamins A and D. An intake over a period of time by adults of 75,000-200,000 international units daily of vitamin A, for example, and about half that amount by children has been responsible for serious harm. Most of the cases in the literature resulted from mistaken therapy by physicians administering these high pharmacological doses, chiefly to arthritis patients and ill-advisedly to children. Vitamin D in correspondingly enormous doses can cause demineralization of bones. Since there are some self-dosing fanatics medical prescriptions for

such high pharmacological doses of these two vitamins are justified.

THE PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed bills would statutorily define "food supplement" as "food for special dietary use," would amend the definition of "drugs" to exclude "food supplements," and would provide that the FDA can not "limit the potency, number, combination, amount or variety of synthetic or natural vitamin or mineral substance or any ingredient of any food supplement unless such article is injurious to health in the recommended dosage. The last provision covers the question of safety, and the whole is consonant with the will of the people to enjoy legitimate freedom of individual choice and protection from injury. As Dr. Leo Lutwak of the University of Southern California has said, "People have few options and food is one place where they have at least the illusion of control."

Commissioner Weinberger's claim that the bills place the onus of proving harmfulness on the FDA is not valid since if harmfulness is suspected in any food supplement ingredient (and there is an ample research and clinical literature) nothing prevents the agency from exacting proof of safety from the product's proponent. Also, a mechanism exists for preventing false claims in labeling or advertising. The truth is that there is no reason for forcing on consumers a whole new system of controls which involves, as will be indicated, harassment and increased expense.

FDA, AMA AND BIAS

As Justice William Douglas has observed, FDA executives pass freely back and forth from high positions in the food industry and the AMA hierarchy. Commissioner Weinberger's letter to Congressman Staggers expresses a familiar obsession that food supplements in non-pharmacological potencies should be viewed as drugs. He states that "there would be especially detrimental effects if the food supplement-drug were intended for use in a serious disease condition," since the consumer "might delay seeking medical attention." The people, however, are not "like the children in the family" and do not need assistance from the FDA in knowing when to go to a doctor.

The FDA has been consistently concerned with protecting the good image of the food industry over its total spectrum from soil to supermarket. Despite considerable contrary evidence, the agency has maintained that the meals of Americans supply all essential food values and supplements are virtually unnecessary. FDA has resisted "the insurance principle" of supplementation. The official view of the AMA is that people should eat balanced diets (they should, although many do not or can not) and should consult a doctor if malaise is experienced—although as Dr. Jean Mayer of Harvard has deplored, medical schools offer little or no nutritional education, so that diet-caused disorders could be overlooked.

WHY TAKE SUPPLEMENTS?

Many nonsensical supplements (and food items) are offered on the market but there are valid reasons why experienced scientists approve "the insurance principle" of even generous supplementation. (1) A sizeable part of the population, as studies have shown, is deficient in nutrients, a few or many. (2) Some people physiologically utilize nutrients inefficiently. (3) Restaurant meals involve more or less loss of nutrients. (4) Most of us live removed from sources of fresh food. In the Department of Agriculture's Books of Foods, for instance, Louise Gray, Ithaca extension researcher, recorded differences of 2½-fold of vitamin C in tomatoes, similar discrepancies in carotene, a 6-fold range of difference in calcium in the same kind of food, wide variations in iron, and so on. (5) Junk foods have invaded the school lunch programs. (6) Losses of nutrients in food processing have been estimated to vary from 10 to 50%. In Modern Food Processing, Mil-

dred Boggs and Clyde Rasmussen observe: "Quality can be lost at almost every step of processing." Vitamins B and C are water soluble and some are thrown away with water. Vitamins A and D dissolve in fat and oil. Contact with air damages vitamins A, C and D. B-1 is destroyed by heat and sunlight, etc. Exposure to sulfur gas processing, fumigation, pesticide treatment and many chemicals take their toll. Four-thousand to five-thousand chemicals are used in food. For these reasons many scientists favor more flexible and ample supplementation than does the FDA.

WHY THE PROPOSAL REQUIRES CONGRESSIONAL INTERVENTION

1. A somewhat limited list of vitamins and minerals, based on the 1968 recommendations of a National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council Committee, with some increases, is the basis for the official FDA list but a recommendation—would be converted by the agency into a rigid rule.

In the Journal of the American Dietetic Association (February 1964) Dr. R. M. Engel of the Biochemistry Department of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, observes: "The original objective of (the recommendations) was providing guidelines for planning diets for the population . . . was never meant to be applied to individuals. . . . Scientific data indicate that individuals vary in nutritional requirements. Therefore, it would be unrealistic to provide an allowance that would insure good nutritional health in every individual." The FDA is too restrictive.

2. The official list omits some substances widely regarded as valuable. For example, bioflavonoids are found together with vitamin C in natural foods such as lemons, oranges and peppers. The FDA separates them. Bioflavonoids do not appear on the sanctioned list. Other substances such as choline and inositol, important in fat metabolism, might have been included, as might certain trace minerals.

3. Some of the "official" vitamins and minerals have been assigned potencies which many nutritionists regard as unnecessarily low. One example: vitamin C which has helped and never harmed animal or man in moderate or even relatively high concentrations is assigned a range of only 40 to 90 mg., for no fathomable reason.

4. These vitamins and minerals must all appear in all allowable combinations. If other nutrients are desired (and arbitrarily they cannot be called nutrients) they must be bought separately—and only in the decreed potencies.

The net result: A terrible nuisance, an array of bottles to clutter the home and increase the serious environmental solid waste problem—with increased expense for consumers. Many persons, to get the amounts they now take—often on authoritative recommendation, as is the case in our family and among our friends—would have to buy and consume a ludicrous number of tablets or capsules—if indeed the ingredients remain on the market.

5. Any supplement nutrient which is 1½ times the potency assigned by fiat is a "drug." For instance, the small dose of 135 mg. of vitamin C is a "drug."

When such alleged "drugs" could be treated as prescription pharmaceuticals is unclear.

WHY SOME OUTSTANDING NUTRITIONISTS DIFFER WITH THIS RIGID APPROACH

Dr. Roger Williams, universally esteemed nutritionist who identified and synthesized the important B vitamin pantothenic acid, pioneered and researched on folic acid and for over 20 years directed the Clayton Foundation Biologic Institute, a world center of research on vitamins, enzymes and biochemical relationships; author of outstanding books on biochemical individuality:

"Too little is known about the variation of human needs . . . The information that is

available in respect to needs for calcium and amino acids, for example, points clearly to the conclusion that 5-fold variations are by no means uncommon . . . In some respects needs can vary as much as 100-fold and in certain instances, even 500-fold."

The McGraw-Hill Handbook of Nutrition (1965), an authoritative work, contains this statement by Dr. Benjamin G. Burton, biochemist and nutritionist:

"Actually there is little justification in nutritional thinking for the concept of average requirements . . . The typical individual is more likely to be one who has 'average' needs with respect to many nutrients but also . . . some requirements for a few essential nutrients which are far from 'average'."

Dr. Emmanuel Cheraskin, physician, doctor of dentistry and nutritional researcher commenting on differences in nutritional requirements from 2 to 10-fold:

"Healthy young men from the same racial stock showed a 4.5 range in individual calcium requirements."

"For this reason perfectly safe nutrients should be taken in excess of the average need as assurance against possible deficiency."

Nobel laureate Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgy who isolated vitamin C and was awarded the Nobel prize for studies of its metabolism, also discoverer of the bioflavonoids. The FDA declines to accept bioflavonoids as vitamins. Szent-Gyorgy says:

"The flavones (bioflavonoids) are vitamins, their deficiency causing cerebral edema and bleeding—this is not opinion but based on extensive research—and they are valuable with vitamin C in preventing colds." Dr. Szent-Gyorgy believes that he has been greatly benefited by the large amount of vitamin C he takes, 2 grams daily. (The FDA ruling would require him to consume 22 capsules or tablets.) Note: These high amounts are not recommended for children. With prolonged use some adults experience a diuretic effect, while others have no side effects.

Dr. Paul Gyorgy who identified and isolated vitamin B-6 and vitamin B-2 wrote in the American Journal of Clinical Nutrition (Oct. 1971):

"As a protective health measure a daily intake of 25 milligrams of vitamin B-6 is desirable." This is almost ten times the FDA allotment. It is doubtful whether the meals of many people would furnish enough vitamin B-6 to assure anything like the protective health measure advocated by this leading authority on the vitamin.

Nobel laureate Dr. Linus Pauling, who was awarded the prize in chemistry, is devoting his efforts to the biochemistry of food. He has denounced the FDA regulations as unjustifiable:

"The proposal would limit the freedom of the American people . . . with disadvantages to the people."

FOR THESE AND OTHER REASONS

Legislators should not be dissuaded from protecting the public by statutory intervention from a rigid, oppressive and needlessly expensive regulation in a field conspicuous for wide differences of opinion.

It is also high time that informed representatives of the public should participate directly, on a mandatory basis, in decision-making crucially affecting the people.

In multiple ways government science now militates against the freedom and welfare of the citizens-and-taxpayers.

ELISE JERARD, *Chairman.*

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1973]
CANCER RISKS IN FOOD

A private financed commission was formed yesterday to study food additives, pesticide residues and other contaminants, and food spoilage. The commission will attempt to develop risk/benefit guidelines in these areas.

Commission findings would presumably be applied in the controversy over the U.S. law

prohibiting cancer-causing additives in food—the so-called "Delaney Clause."

Sponsors of the organization include the Rockefeller Foundation, the Macy Foundation, National Science Board, Nutrition Foundation, and Food and Drug Law Institute.

The study will be conducted by internationally recognized authorities.

The announcement was made at a press conference yesterday afternoon called by the Nutrition Foundation, which is supported by the food industry.

A spokesman for the foundation said the Citizens Commission on Science, Law and Food Supply will be supported by initial contributions of about \$500,000.

Asked after the conference why such a study should not be handled by the Codex Alimentarius Commission—a group set up by more than 90 governments, including the United States, to develop uniform standards for food safety the FDA dodged the question. Various doubts concerning propriety appeared to be involved in this lavishly financed enterprise—\$500,000 initially—led by Nutrition Foundation, which is backed by the food industry, and other involved parties. The use of the name "Citizens' Commission" is certainly questionable. The need to gather "internationally recognized authorities" to discuss matters which have already been thoroughly scrutinized, leads to some suspicion of bias, inasmuch as the Food and Drug Commission, and members of the Nutrition Foundation and the food industry have repeatedly demanded that "safe tolerances" be assigned for potential cancer causing substances in foods. Ever since the anti-carcinogen clause was incorporated into the food law the same industrial and bureaucratic elements have been gunning for the so-called Delaney Clause.

A CAUTIOUS DISSENTER IN THE FDA

A memorandum opposing any change in the clause from Alan T. Spiher, Jr., presently Chief of the "generally recognized as safe" review branch in the Division of Petitions Processing at FDA, was made public in hearings recently released by the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs (See Food Chemical News, Feb. 19, Page 27).

Spiher's memo dealt with a revision being considered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare late in 1969 that would have permitted use of a carcinogenic food additive, after study by experts, where the observed effect "raises no substantial question of safety under the proposed conditions of use."

In his memo, the FDA-er complained that any attempt to change the clause represents "a serious misunderstanding of the intent of the law and the need for conservatism in protecting public health," adding: "No scientific breakthroughs have occurred in understanding cancer or learning whether there is in fact a finite level for a carcinogen below which no effect can be expected." He also argued with the contention that the Delaney clause "leaves no room for scientific judgment."

THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY'S PLANS FOR THE NATION'S CAPITAL MAY BE DANGEROUS TO YOUR FREEDOM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency—EPA—has ordered several cities and metropolitan areas to purify their environment by reducing the use of private automobiles.

Some of the data used to justify this drastic step is questionable and the loss of personal freedom resulting from implementation of this "cure" may be worse than the illness.

Brought to their logical conclusion, many of the EPA's recommendations would wreak havoc in the Nation's major industry—producing and selling automobiles—and the host of other industries from steel to transportation dependent upon Detroit's activities.

In Los Angeles, the EPA urged severe limitations on auto use through gas rationing and other devices. Politician and populace rose to decry this folly and to announce it never would be allowed to happen.

In another city, the EPA proposed that cars display stickers of various colors that would show on which day that city's representative government would deign to allow people to bring their private property—cars—into town.

On July 24, the EPA will issue another in its series of infamous edicts, this one for the District of Columbia. It will be based on recommendations received earlier this month from Virginia, the District of Columbia and Maryland, responding to the same noxious statute that established the EPA.

People living in the Capital of this supposedly democratic republic who own cars would be required to display a sticker on their vehicles attesting to their residence and their right to park on city streets.

Nonresident motorists without the sticker would be barred from parking on some or all Washington, D.C. thoroughfares. Details as to times of day, days of the week still are being studied.

Obviously, nonresident motorists would have to use commercial parking facilities or the limited number of free parking lots. But under the EPA proposal, there would be a \$2 parking tax added to the current fee at commercial facilities.

Finally, free parking would be eliminated for Federal employees.

This is an absurd plan fraught with fascistic overtones that I find impossible to accept. It would create a bureaucratic complex of as yet unknown proportions and a Government-created windfall for commercial parking concerns, as well as the likelihood of a black market for resident parking stickers.

I cannot believe that the general public in the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area—including thousands of Federal employees, many already seeking early retirement rather than suffer further Federal service—or Senators, Representatives, Cabinet officers, their staffs or the millions of visitors here will appreciate further abridgement of their freedom through such schemes.

I am as much in favor of preserving the environment as anyone, but I want to see substantive scientific evidence of the causes of environmental degradation and well-reasoned solutions that can stand the rigor of scientific inquiry.

It is this continuing aura of science about the EPA that is disturbing. Its enveloping pronouncements are pasted together by scientists beholden to government for their funds and positions.

Where is the scientifically derived data from experts working outside government to support EPA orders?

The shrieks of environmentalists at every request for technological improvement of the human condition also are becoming intolerable. Man is capable of taming his environment and making life easier, not the other way around that proposes that man is at the environment's mercy.

Our current crisis over fossil fuel results, in part, from the environmentalists' successful efforts to block development of alternate energy sources.

Farmers and dairymen should keep watch for EPA inspectors carrying emission control devices.

According to "EPA Log," an agency publication, "Burping cows must rank as the number one source of air pollution in the United States." Studies by ecologists, the "Log" continues, show that "the Nation's cows burp 50 million tons of hydrocarbons into the air each year."

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF HOSPITAL FINANCING

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, "More than 90 percent of hospital income is from third party or public sources. The public has a right to know where its money goes."

This is one of several valid arguments presented by Hospital and Drug Employees Local 1199, for full financial disclosure and stricter regulation of the country's hospitals.

I insert in the RECORD an article recently published in 1999 News, entitled: "Hospital Finances: A Deep, Dark Secret."

The article follows:

HOSPITAL FINANCES: A DEEP, DARK SECRET

The cloak of financial secrecy that clothes America's hospital industry is damaging to the entire health field and must be ripped away.

Mounting evidence to back up this position has led concerned observers across the nation to call for stricter regulation of the country's 7,093 hospitals.

A key demand is one that has long been advocated by Local 1199: full public disclosure by hospitals of their finances.

Reasoning behind this demand is threefold:

More than 90 percent of hospital income is from third-party or public sources. The public has a right to know where its money goes.

As long as hospital costs are shrouded in mystery, public misconceptions will flourish about the impact of higher wages for hospital workers.

Dramatic reports publicizing misuse of funds by individual hospitals will continue to smear the entire industry until hospitals start operating in a fishbowl financially.

The New York State Legislature passed a bill last month that at least on the surface gave the appearance of recognizing the need for financial disclosure by voluntary hospitals. The bill was sponsored by two Republicans, Senator Tarky Lombardy, chairman of the Senate Health Committee, and Assembly-

man Milton Jonas. It awaited Governor Rockefeller's signature in early June.

The Lombardy-Jonas bill requires all voluntary and proprietary hospitals to file a financial report annually with State Health Commissioner Hollis Ingraham.

But Local 1199 Pres. Leon J. Davis feels there are a number of areas where the bill does not meet the public interest.

Davis feels the measure should be more emphatic in provisions concerning public disclosure of information submitted to the commissioner of health. As written, the bill says such information shall be made available to the public "under such conditions as the commissioner shall describe."

Davis feels the bill should have required greater itemization of hospital costs, particularly administrative and medical staff salaries. As written, the bill would allow reports of salary totals by department without figures on what individuals receive.

Davis also feels hospitals should be required to file fuller information on the occupational and business interests of members of hospital boards of trustees. This would simplify detection of possible conflicts of interest by trustees.

Supporting evidence for the argument that hospitals should open their books to the public was presented in detail in a six-part Washington Post series last fall by reporter Ronald Kessler.

Studying financial abuses at Washington Hospital Center, Kessler discovered:

Rampant conflict of interest in financial dealings of administrators and trustees.

Astonishingly high incomes of up to \$500,000 a year for radiologists, anesthesiologists and pathologists, many of whom receive a percentage of the profit of the departments they operate in voluntary hospitals.

Chaotic accounting systems in which prices in some departments such as pharmacy are doubled to make up for losses in other departments.

Duplication of expensive, prestige facilities. For instance, six Washington hospitals can perform open heart surgery, but experts believe such facilities in two D.C. hospitals would be entirely adequate. In fact, with duplicated facilities the limited use each facility gets creates a danger for patients because of under-used equipment and out-of-practice staff.

The Post series stirred up a hornet's nest. Senator Edward M. Kennedy commented:

"The troublesome aspect of these stories is the danger that the situation described in them is probably not unique to the Washington Hospital Center, but may exist on a widespread basis elsewhere."

Richard J. Davidson, executive vice-president of the Maryland Hospital Association, was obviously shaken by the Post revelations. He informed his 55 member hospitals that many of them are guilty of the same sort of conflict of interest, favoritism and lack of competitive bidding that was exposed in the Washington stories.

"If there is even one trustee on your board who personally benefits . . . from his relationship to your institution, you need to know it and you need to end it," Davidson told the Maryland hospitals. He added that such abuses constitute "a malignancy in this industry."

Profiteering by some doctors and administrators and lax money management are not the only arguments for hospital financial disclosure.

Local 1199 filed suit in 1971 in New York State Supreme Court to force financial disclosure of hospitals such as Adelphi and Roosevelt in New York City. The 1199 suit charges Adelphi and Roosevelt "spent untold sums in their efforts to defeat Local 1199." Anti-union activities in election campaigns at Roosevelt and a strike at Adelphi involved "extravagant non-health-related expenditures" that came ultimately from the public's pocket, charged 1199. Yet

the hospitals were able to conceal from public view the amounts spent for anti-union legal, public relations and security expenses.

A more recent example of hospital extravagance in anti-union activity came in the 159-day National Hospital Union strike that ended this April at Massachusetts Rehabilitation Hospital in Boston. The hospital told the Boston Globe last month that the strike cost it \$900,000 worth of business lost plus another \$200,000 spent for security and police. National Hospital Union Exec. Vice Pres. Elliott Godoff estimates another \$100,000 was spent by the hospital for public relations and legal fees. The hospital claims the eventual contract settlement costs it about \$60,000 per year.

The more than one million dollars spent by the hospital in fighting the union eventually comes from the public pocket.

It is this aspect of hospital financing that has drawn fire from such officials as Pennsylvania Insurance Commissioner Herbert S. Denenberg. "There is no policing of hospitals or health care. It's really incredible," says Denenberg. "Probably the area where the

consumer gets the biggest screwing is health delivery."

This is made possible because of the cost-plus basis on which most hospitals are run. Nine out of ten consumers pass their health care costs on to a third party such as Blue Cross, Medicaid or Medicare.

"The doctors and hospital people... want everybody to behave like a patient and to roll over and play dead and do what they're told," says Denenberg.

In line with this attitude has been the position of voluntary hospitals on disclosure.

"There is a deliberate conspiratorial effort by hospitals to refuse to disclose their finances to the public," charges 1199 Pres. Davis.

A side effect of financial secrecy by the hospitals is public misconceptions that hospital workers are responsible for rising hospital rates.

In fact, a 1969-1972 study by Humanic Designs Corporation of New York hospitals reveals that the major component of increasing personnel costs is in supervisory and administrative salaries. Non-supervisory work-

ers accounted for only 28 percent of the increased personnel costs during the period studied. Supervisory non-union personnel accounted for about 40 percent of total hospital employment in the institutions studied, and yearly earnings in this category clustered between \$19,325 and \$23,950.

Hospital costs have also been driven upward by the increasingly intensive and technical nature of hospital care.

Another major component of rising health personnel costs is simply numbers. America's hospitals now employ 2.5 million workers and the figure is growing rapidly. The number of hospital workers increased at a rate of 24 percent between 1955 and 1968.

During the same period, reports Harvard economist Martin S. Feldstein, labor's share of total U.S. hospital costs dropped from 61.7 percent to 59.6 percent.

While labor costs were dropping, the public may well wonder what kind of hospital costs were increasing. In the absence of financial disclosure by the hospitals, no one can be blamed for suspecting the worst.

SENATE—Monday, July 23, 1973

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, we lay before Thee the solemn duties committed to our hands by the will of people. In the light of Thy presence keep our hands clean and our hearts pure. Above all lesser loyalties may our highest loyalty be to Thee and to Thy law. Hour by hour may our ruling passion be to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with our God. In these days of trouble and confusion grant us serene and confident spirits to do well the work we have to do for the good of all.

We pray in the name of Him who walked before us with a loving heart. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BURDICK thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of

the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 20, 1973, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AN OBSERVATION

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I merely observe that this week is a clean slate for the Senate and I hope that what we inscribe upon it will not only be legible but will also make sense, that it will serve to advance the interests of the Nation, that it will increase respect for the Senate, that it will magnify our works before the people, and that we will be granted forgiveness for any errors we may commit during this 7-day period.

I also hope that all of us may proceed with amity and brotherhood in a constructive approach to the betterment of those whom we are designated, through the franchise of the people, to serve.

May our service be worthy. May we deserve well of the Republic.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) is now recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

INVESTIGATION OF SECRET CAMBODIAN BOMBING—A PRELIMINARY REPORT

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, a number of my colleagues have asked me for information on various points relating to the recent disclosure of secret airstrikes in Cambodia and the falsification of reports to conceal them.

While controversial in its aspects, this is a subject that cuts across political administrations, party lines, and positions of personal bias relating to our national security. It raises profound questions concerning the future of our country and its civilian, democratic rule as set forth in the Constitution. In this, whatever our other differences of opinion, we share common concern.

Since coming to the Senate, I have consistently pressed for maximum disclosure, consistent with the safety of our troops in the field and the security of delicate diplomatic negotiations, of the facts of the conflict in Southeast Asia. This is born of the conviction that if we are to pursue peace or prosecute continuing war, the people and the Congress should have a clear vision of the direction in which the Nation is moving.

If the military and/or its civilian command obscures this clear vision of Congress and the public, we encounter the danger of private or secret warfare that, however well intentioned, is subversive of the constitutional processes.

This, as I see it, is the basic point at issue in the current investigation by the Senate Armed Services Committee into secret bombings and falsification of official reports in Indochina.

You will recall the shock of the American people a few years ago when they learned, from American newsmen, that we had been conducting a secret war in Laos. Now we have learned that we were waging a secret war in Cambodia before the invasion of that country and at a time when we were officially proclaiming its neutrality.

In March of 1969, the United States began sending B-52's to bomb inside