By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 9679. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to encourage physicians, dentists, optometrists, and other medical personnel to practice in areas where shortages of such personnel exist, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9680. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in alleviating the shortage of health care personnel in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 9681. A bill to authorize and require the President of the United States to allocate crude oil and refined petroleum products to deal with existing or imminent shortages and dislocations in the national distribution system which jeopardize the public health, safety, or welfare; to provide for the delegation of authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. REES, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MANN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. STARK, Mr. GUDE, Mr. SMITH of New York, and Mr. McKINNEY):

H.R. 9682. A bill to reorganize the governmental structure of the District of Columbia, to provide a charter for local government in the District of Columbia subject to acceptance by a majority of the registered qualified electors in the District of Columbia, to delegate certain legislative powers to the local government, to implement certain recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 9683. A bill to strengthen and improve the protections and interests of participants and beneficiaries of employee pension and welfare benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 9684. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to require, when the construction or leasing of Government buildings or space is proposed for metropolitan buildings or space is proposed for Metropolitan Washington D.C. that alternative proposals be submitted for municipalities of less than 75,000 population in other parts of the country; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 9685. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 for the purpose of determining the causes and means of preventing shoreline erosion; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 9686. A bill to amend section 3401 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Ms. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 9687. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for a system of children's allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 9688. A bill to amend section 102 of the National Security Act of 1947 to prohibit certain activities by the Central Intelligence Agency and to limit certain other activities by such Agency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 9689. A bill to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. REES, and Mr. RONCALLO of New York):

H.R. 9690. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex or marital status against individuals seeking credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORMACK (for himself, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, and Mr. BOWEN):

H.R. 9691. A bill to further energy research and development by establishing a Coal Gasification Development Corporation; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and to authorize and direct the National Science Foundation to fund basic and applied research related to energy and thereby support the objectives of the Coal Gasification Development Corporation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 9692. A bill to further energy research and development by establishing an Advanced Power Cycle Development Corporation; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1050 and to authorize and direct the National Science Foundation to fund basic and applied research related to energy and thereby support the objectives of the Advanced Power Cycle Development Corporation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. McCORMACK (for himself, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, and Mr. BOWEN):

H.R. 9693. A bill to further energy research and development by establishing a Shale Oil Development Corporation; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and to authorize and direct the National Science Foundation to fund basic and applied research related to energy and thereby support the objectives of the Shale Oil Development Corporation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. McCORMACK (for himself, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, and Mr. BOWEN):

H.R. 9694. A bill to further energy research and development by establishing a Coal Liquefaction Corporation; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and to authorize and direct the National Science Foundation to fund basic and applied research related to energy and thereby support the objective of the Coal Liquefaction Corporation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 9695. A bill to establish a national program for scientific research, development, and demonstration in energy and energy related technologies and for the coordination and financial supplementation of Federal energy research and development; to establish a research corporation to demonstrate certain energy technologies; to amend the National Science Foundation to fund basic and applied research related to energy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H.R. 9696. A bill to establish an Office of Solar Energy Research in the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.J. Res. 691. Joint Resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating 1 day during each year as "National Registered Nurses Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.J. Res. 692. Joint resolution, a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 278. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the joint committee print "Soviet Economic Prospects for the Seventies"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia introduced a bill (H.R. 9697) to direct the burial of the remains of Marie E. Newman in Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Va.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

257. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the council of the county of Maui, Hawaii, relative to the conveyance of the island of Kahoolawe to the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

258. Also, petition of the city council, Chicago, Ill., relative to the application of Israel El Al Airlines for landing rights at Chicago-O'Hare International Airport; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HON. GLENN ANDERSON LAUDS BALTIC STATES

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable GLENN ANDERSON, recently presented remarks to the Los Angeles Chapter, Lithuanian American Council, paying tribute to the "heroes and martyrs of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia."

Representative ANDERSON presented an optimistic, yet realistic, talk that related our values and our traditions to those of the peoples of the captive nations—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. His statement that "your cause necessarily transcends any single people or any single nation is particularly significant, and I join with him in the belief that "while there is a nation in bondage, no nation is truly free."

Mr. Speaker, so that our colleagues may have the opportunity to read these enlightened and well-reasoned remarks, I place Representative ANDERSON's talk in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN GLENN M. ANDERSON

Thank you Mr. Chairman—Ladies and Gentlemen.

Thank you for this opportunity to meet with you today, and to join in this tribute to the heroes and martyrs of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. And while the prime purpose of this occasion is to focus attention upon the continuing struggle of a gallant people to win personal freedom and national independence, in a larger sense your cause necessarily transcends any single people or any single nation. Many years ago a great American (Eugene Debs) once said, "While there is a soul in prison; I am not free." I think we might expand that thought to, "While there is a nation in bondage, no nation is truly free."

It is perhaps ironic that we are meeting here during a visit to this country by the Soviet Party Leader, Mr. Brezhnev. Let me say first of all, that I believe when the leaders of a foreign state come to this nation as guests of the President of the United States, they should be greeted with the same courtesy which we hope and expect that our President receives when he visits foreign capitals. It is necessary in an age of fearful dangers and immensely difficult problems for the heads of state of the most powerful countries in the world to meet from time to time. Nothing will be accomplished, for the people of the United States, or the people of the Soviet Union, or the peoples which are held in bondage by the Soviet Union, by any show of rudeness and discourtesy.

However, I do not believe that in the long run, the hopes for a world of peace and national freedom are served by closing our eyes to unpleasant facts. One of those facts is that the Soviet Union has ruthlessly imposed a military dictatorship upon its neighbors to the west, specifically including the free and independent people of the Baltic States. And, that this dictatorship imposed with tanks and machine guns at the cost of thousands of lives, continues to be maintained by force.

One of the dangers we face is the temptation to believe, or at least acquiesce in the idea that tyranny plus time equals respectability: That is, with the passing of years, what has been taken by force and maintained by force, somehow becomes the legitimate property of the conqueror.

I believe it would be wrong to hold out false hopes to those who must endure unpopular puppet governments imposed by foreign troops. As a practical matter there is little immediate likelihood of imminent liberation for these people. And whatever our wishes and feelings in the matter, there are realistic limits to American power. But I also believe it would be profoundly wrong for the United States to simply write off the Baltic States' struggle for freedom, or indeed to forget the peoples of all the eastern European nations which have at least as much claim to our sympathy and support as the people's of Southeast Asia.

Clearly the era in history known as the Cold War is drawing to a close and some new epoch in international affairs has begun. The Soviet Union, while maintaining absolute immediate control over its own people and those of its neighbors, has indicated an interest in opening doors to the western world. There is a mutual desire for trade, for some degree of cultural exchange, for normalization of relationships between the so-called superpowers. The experts tell us that this desire did not come about miraculously as the result of some sudden change of heart on the part of the men in the Kremlin. Rather it is a logical reaction to increasing danger from the East, that is, from China, and increasing demands on the part of the Soviet people and their subject states for a better and freer life. These pressures apparently cannot be resisted indefinitely with concentration camps and machine guns.

Apparently the President and Dr. Kissinger believe, and I certainly support them in this, that an opportunity may exist not merely to sell some wheat and computers to Russia and perhaps to receive some products in return, but to achieve a decisive change in the unhappy state of the world which has existed ever since the end of World War II.

But if that change is to be real rather than merely cosmetic, it must ultimately encompass military and political as well as purely economic agreements. For the Cold War will not truly end until American troops are in America, and Russian troops are in Russia—and nowhere else. And that "generation of peace" which President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger seek is not likely to come to pass until all nations are free from foreign despotism and the people of this earth live under governments of their own choosing.

I know that many of you here tonight have known first hand the horrors of living under a totalitarian regime—as I have not—and therefore perhaps it is you who should be speaking and I who should be listening.

But that, perhaps unfortunately, is not how matters have been arranged here today. In any event, I am sure you would agree that we are all Americans now—and that our essential task is to preserve free government here, if it is to remain a viable hope for men everywhere in the world.

And in that vein—we might ask ourselves, what is the nature of totalitarian regimes, whether they frankly label themselves as such, or choose to masquerade as "People's Republics?" First of all, a dictatorial regime almost invariably assumes absolute power in the guise of defending the people against some threat—external or internal. Dictators do not usually say to the people, "I am taking power because I enjoy it or want it." Rather they will argue that there is a grave emergency, a danger of "capitalist encirclement" if the dictatorship is of the left—or a "communist conspiracy" if of the right—or to forestall invasion of they don't bother about ideology. Presumably, the dictator invariably shoots you for your own good.

Secondly, dictatorships invariably choose to cover their acts under a mantle of secrecy. As the Bible says, and as Senator Ervin has noted, evil deeds are best done in darkness. Those whose conduct offends the consciences of men will find reasons why the press should be suppressed, why dissent and debate represent not a healthy antidote to the errors of politicians and bureaucrats, but a menace to public order.

Free governments make mistakes—sometimes dreadful mistakes. But so long as men and women are permitted to stand up in public and condemn these mistakes, or to describe them in the press and on television, the possibility of corrections exists.

Third, is the use of force. Now all governments must ultimately possess, and be willing, to use, power to enforce their laws. Totalitarian regimes rest not on the support or consent of the people, but upon the fear of the secret police. In my view, the world which we have begun to enter will no longer be divided so much by communism versus capitalism, as it will be by those nations where leaders are chosen by and subject to the will of the people, and those nations where the people live in fear of their so-called leaders.

Whatever fancy names dictatorships may give themselves, they are always characterized by certain ugly similarities: There is the omnipresent secret police whose business it is to check on everyone else's business, to listen to our phone calls, keep track of our movements—particularly when we meet together for some common political end—and monitor what we read, watch and even think.

And there are the freight and cattle cars carrying people away from their communities off to camps. And the students, writers, artists, and intellectuals continually being arrested for vague "crimes." And the fact that conviction invariably follows arrest, particularly in connection with political offenses, which in turn is followed by a quick and mysterious disappearance of the accused. Finally, there is the conspicuous display of raw power—armed soldiers in the streets—as a constant reminder to the people that resistance is futile.

But again I need not detail these facts for you here—many of you have experienced them first hand, and most of the others know them all too well from the fate of loved ones and relatives.

My plea to you, however, is that, while enjoying the benefits of this free nation, you make use of your knowledge and your experience to help us maintain that freedom. For I do not think that the United States has some God-given immunity to the fate that has fallen on so many nations.

Although the event we are commemorating here was grim and sad, I would not wish to leave you with too depressing a message. The history of mankind is, too often, a record of sorrows. But it is also a story of human hope. And if we are all sinners, we are also therefore eligible for redemption.

Clearly there are some new and hopeful elements in the breakup of traditional alliances and enmities which is now taking place in the world. For one thing we are witnessing, in Korea, in Germany and perhaps ultimately in Vietnam, tentative moves toward reunification of those countries which were torn apart by World War II. Only a few years ago most of us would have regarded such movement as almost inconceivable without another major war. But what seems to be happening is that ancient historical, cultural, religious and social bonds are proving stronger than political ideology or economic theory. Thus the desires of the peoples of these countries to be reunited and free cannot indefinitely be ignored by their leaders.

As you all know, Europe too is a social, a political, a religious and an historic community. The ancient ties that have bound eastern and western Europe together are beginning to reassert themselves even today, in the form of increased trade, travel and cultural exchange. Given time and freedom from another major war, I think these natural and organic ties will grow steadily stronger. And the time may come when the Soviet Union will begin to see that free and independent states in Eastern Europe might prove more useful as a bridge to the Common Market countries of the west than as a series of fortifications to shut out the west. When and if that happens, the Soviets may well wish to reexamine their present policies with regard to the Baltic States.

Finally I think we have entered a phase in history where the large nations, the so-called super-powers, may begin to question the benefits to themselves and to their own people of unlimited expansion and global empires. Certainly we here in America are asking ourselves whether it is really to our interest to maintain armies all over the world and hence to become involved in everyone else's quarrels. I think this lesson will not be lost on the Soviets.

And so it may well be that those of you who have maintained your faith in and continued the struggle for the right of small nations to live in peace, unmolested by their larger and more powerful neighbors, will yet be vindicated by history. At least we have the right to continue to hope—and to keep green the memory of those who suffered and died in mankind's ancient struggle against tyranny and for the inalienable human right to live under a government of our own choosing.

POINT MUGU: FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SACRIFICED FOR PRIVATE PROFITS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, an absolutely outrageous Navy decision to contract out its activities in the Pacific Missile Range at Point Mugu, Calif., to private industry is being followed despite the fact that it was based upon erroneous findings. The decision to convert PMR was made in light of a potential for recurring annual savings and the Government's general policy of relying on the private enterprise system to supply its needs. Reportedly, the projected annual savings amounted to $1.5 million. However, a cost study prepared by Task Force 1, the employees' organization at Point Mugu, estimates that the conversion will be much more costly than previously estimated by the Navy and identifies the following three major areas as not being adequately considered by the Navy:

First. Potential decreases in efficiency, responsiveness and flexibility under contracting;

Second. Transfer or retirement of affected retired staff; and

Third. Procurement and administration of contract services.

Because of the interest and concern of employees, civic groups and Members of Congress regarding this proposed conversion, the U.S. General Accounting Office launched an investigation to review the costs and other factors involved in justifying this conversion. The following is an excerpt from the Comptroller General's interim report dated July 24, 1973:

We met with Navy officials and reviewed records at Navy Headquarters and at Point Mugu. The purpose of the plans for contracting at Point Mugu is to follow the policy of reliance on the private enterprise system, expressed in Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-76. The annual savings figure of $1.5 million is not adequately supported and—as believed by senior responsible officials—could prove to fluctuate heavily up or down. Realistic data for a cost comparison will not be available until the Navy designates the specific functions to be contracted and requests and receives bids from potential contractors.

It is clear that the Navy cannot substantiate its claim of $1.5 million savings per year by contracting out PMR and it is also clear that the study which was conducted to justify the Navy's decision was deceptive and done in complete secrecy. A transcript of the minutes of a meeting held by the top officials of the Naval Air Systems Command which fell into the hands of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service is included at the end of my remarks.

The participants at the meeting expressed doubt that the contracting out to industry, which would eliminate 1,400 civil service jobs, would save costs. Actually, it was said that the cost to Government would increase. At one point Rear Adm. T. R. McClellan, chief of the systems command, remarked, "Now that the President has put his stamp on this ill-considered action, we must carry it out." At another point he remarked, "Apparently the analyses which led to these—decisions were completely unconfused by facts." Further, the official study was "made in complete secrecy." He said he was not given the facts on which to base a realistic appraisal of contracting out versus in-house performance. "If I was uncertain about anything, I could not ask any questions because of the secrecy requirement," he said. Admiral McClellan sought to find out how the study originated. "Who originated the boundaries?" he asked. The official who made the study replied that he did not know. At another point in the meeting, one of the Navy's civilian officials said, "Our experience has been that GOCO—Government-owned contract operated—which is what Point Mugu would be under the proposal, contracting out 'costs more money' than doing the work in-house with civil service employees."

The Navy has used OMB Circular A-76, the Government regulation on commercial and industrial products and services, as justification for the decision to contract our PMR. However, the Navy does not classify PMR as a commercial or an industrial facility and, therefore, using OMB-A-76 as justification is clearly, on its face, illegal.

The effective intent of those who decided that PMR should be contracted is to give "private enterprise" a clear profit of about $2 million per year without any investment or risk on their part. This profit would be given at the expense of the Navy's local employees and the American taxpayers. Furthermore, it would cost the taxpayers at least $6 million more per year so that the contractor could have this profit.

A great national facility is rapidly becoming a disaster area while the Navy continues to expend millions of dollars in management effort, overtime, travel and other costs to prepare for the day when the bids come in. If the Navy could not substantiate its arguments when it started the action, it should not have started. If it cannot substantiate its arguments now, it should not continue. The Navy knows that the bids will not support its position. The Government should not enter into cost plus contracts, as the PMR contract would be, unless such contracts are undoubtedly the only viable alternative.

Today, I am calling upon the Navy to either reverse its decision to contract out the Pacific Missile Range at Point Mugu, Calif., or to stop its attempt to convert this base until it can present hard proof as to cost-savings—something which I am convinced will not be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the minutes of the Naval Air Systems Command meeting which took place at the Pentagon on April 19, 1973, follows:

MINUTES OF MEETING, NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, 19 APRIL 1973

Subject: Review Shore Establishment Realignment (SER) decisions with respect to PMR, and determine how these decisions bear on the current reorganization study

Enclosure: (1) List of attendees

(NOTE.—These minutes are not a verbatim transcript, but are a paraphrase made from longhand notes taken at the meeting. Therefore, there may be errors and omissions.)

1. The meeting was Chaired by RADM McClellan, NAVAIR (AIR-00). RADM Wittmann was moderator and Acting Chairman in the absence of RADM McClellan.

Rear Admiral MCCLELLAN. SER decisions which have been approved by the Navy, DOD, and the President, and announced publicly, are considered irreversible. These decisions include the facts that PMR will be Government Owned/Contractor Operated (GOCO), that 1,448 Civil Service billets will be reduced, and that 225 military billets will be reduced. Apparently the analyses which led to these SER decisions were completely unconfused by facts. We are here for a brainstorming session to inquire into the analyses and to try to apply facts to this situation.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. We are here to try to determine the top-on-down objectives of the SER decisions. We want to try to find out what they want to get out of this action. In other words, what they are trying to do.

Rear Admiral THOMAS. ADM McClellan, I like your personal letter to the Director of Naval Laboratories.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. I would like to call on the DDR&E representative first.

J. A. WEBSTER. I have come to this meeting as an observer. I have no orders as to what to say, and I am unprepared from that point of view. We have been watching the PMR situation for some time, and the only serious problem we have encountered was in trying to explain to Senator McIntyre the funding flow between commands at Point Mugu. We in DOD believe a single Commanding Officer would be good; however, it is the Navy's business how they want to organize. We would look with great concern over any lack of support to NMC and would be interested in whether the new organization would continue to support the Army and the Air Force, and whether downrange support would be continued.

(At this point, the meeting was interrupted while RADM McClellan took a message requiring him to be at the office of CNO in about five minutes. He then departed.)

J. A. WEBSTER. What kind of control at Point Mugu does the Navy want? Perhaps in your organization study, you consider us part of the problem. However, General Starbird does not want to manage someone else's business. There are only three of us in his office to oversee Ranges, and there are no plans to augment this office. Therefore, I see no chance that any kind of "Range Czar" would be established in DDR&E.

Captain DUNNING. I understand everything out at Mugu is going to change shortly, and all the projects are going to have to pay for services.

Commander BELK. That is not entirely correct. Beginning in 1975, projects will be required to pay direct costs only. We in OP-983 have a major interest in PMR, as well as AUTEC. We had no idea that this "SER Action" was coming about. We had no questions asked of us at all. As far as we know, General Starbird deferred to us with respect to SER at PMR. We have a great interest in what we maintain at PMR from a development and test point of view. PMR has the greatest capabilities of any Navy range for development tests, and we are concerned that that capability be maintained, particularly the capability to support OT&E. We have no intent to interfere on how, but we have a great interest on the outcome.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. OP-983, as sponsor for PMR, you should be vitally involved in the dollars required. In the past, NAVAIR and NAVMAT, and the Fleet, got a free ride. Now, we are going to have to pay.

Commander BELK. The projects are only going to have to pay for the direct funding. The intent of General Starbird's policies are that if the projects cannot get the services they need at PMR, they can go elsewhere for the same price. We are concerned with monitoring DT&E, and OPTEVFOR is monitoring IT&E.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. What do you in OP-983 need and want to do? Do you back the development work? Aren't you interested in 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4 money?

Commander BELK. Our real interest is development tests and IOT&E. NMC is in NAVAIR. We are interested in what they do, but we are primarily concerned about the range support.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. You are not interested in NMC?

Commander BELK. Well, we have the line item for PMR.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. MAT-04 is also concerned about PMR funding. I would like to call on Rear Admiral Thomas.

Rear Admiral THOMAS. PMR is not a MAT-04 function, it is a MAT-09 function. Apparently, we have been given the responsibility in NAVMAT because we can tiptoe barefoot across the lawn on all of NAVMAT and SYSCOM functions. Perhaps this SER action has been a result of the fact that the Fleet has been cheated at PMR. By that I mean, having to do their work on weekends.

V. J. PRESTIPINO. We have a great interest in PMS. I would like to correct an impression given earlier in this meeting. That is, for most development test functions, there is simply no other place to go. Therefore, we have to maintain our range capability at Point Mugu.

P. G. ANDRICOS. I am here as an observer and not as a GOCO expert.

Rear Admiral MCCLELLAN. (Who had returned to the meeting sometime earlier with the announcement that a meeting in CNO had been delayed, and that he could continue in this meeting for awhile). Who is here from NAVMAT who knows how this SER study was made?

R. G. IVERSON. I am the one who made the study, and I was given the following boundary conditions: First, there has to be absolute secrecy; second, that the Range was required to convert to GOCO; third, that conversion had to be complete by the end of Calendar Year 1974; and fourth, that the study had to show net savings in about five years. I have never been to PMR and I had no listing of workload or the people there. If I was uncertain about anything, I could not ask any questions because of the secrecy requirement.

Rear Admiral MCCLELLAN. Who established the boundaries?

R. G. IVERSON. Who established the boundaries? I don't know.

Rear Admiral MCCLELLAN. Did Dr. Lawson's staff give you the boundaries?

Rear Admiral THOMAS. How does Lawson get into the chain?

V. J. PRESTIPINO. He has a direct channel to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for R&D.

Rear Admrial MCCLELLAN. If we requested a presentation on all the aspects of this study, who would make it?

R. G. IVERSON. I wrote the paper.

Rear Admiral MCCLELLAN. Then I request of you that you tell me all the factors that were involved in the study.

R. G. IVERSON. I was directed to go GOCO and show a savings. GOCO is more flexible. You have the ability to increase or decrease more rapidly.

J. A. RAXROTH. Our experience has been that GOCO costs more money. In the papers called, "The Case Study", you show contractor monitoring being accomplished by 100 civilians, 5 officers, and 1 enlisted man. How did you arrive at this?

R. G. IVERSON To do a study like this, you are forced to work backward. I had the logistic support background information from FY 1969, primarily to find out about cross-servicing. I scaled the information from FY-69 to the current total population.

Rear Admiral MCCLELLAN. How can you assume that the Range can be reduced? It appears that someone decided to reduce the Range and you made a study to make it palatable.

R. G. IVERSON. Yes sir.

Commander BELK. Just the opposite is the case. Our studies show that there has been a 40% increase in workload at the Range, and our projections are that with the implementation of IOT&E, there will be a further increase required of approximately 25%.

Rear Admiral HARNISH. What about SAMTEC? In the Congressional Report draft that we have a copy of, it states that we are to convert to a GOCO portion of the SAMTEC. I have talked to the Vice Commander of SAMTEC and he is of the opinion that the Commanding General of SAMTEC is not interested in a joint contract, nor am I. If the objective of the SER action is to decrease cost and to reduce Civil Service personnel we can accomplish that.

Rear Admiral MCCLELLAN. Now that the President has put his stamp on this ill-considered action, we must carry it out.

Rear Admiral HARNISH. We can carry it out providing we have a clear understanding of what is intended.

Rear Admiral MCCLELLAN. That is what we have to thrash out. What will be the parameters? What flexibility have we, and what can we do?

Rear Admiral HARNISH. Those of us at Point Mugu are concerned about what is meant by GOCO.

Rear Admiral MCCLELLAN. GOCO has been around for some time.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. Is SAMTEC operated by GOCO; is that illustrative of what is wanted?

R. G. IVERSON. We had no desire to make a single range and I don't believe SAMTEC is in the final version.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. Is NAS intended to be host to the Range?

R. G. IVERSON. The Range is currently serviced by NAS.

Rear Admiral HARNISH. NAS is part of the Range.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. Do we have latitude?

R. G. IVERSON. From my study, I understood there were wage board personnel in the Air Station that provided service to both PMR and NMC, such as communications and calibration, that would have to be continued. Therefore, they should be retained with NAS to provide that service to the future GOCO.

Rear Admiral HARNISH. Did you understand that the Range is presently a host or a tenant?

R. G. IVERSON. Presently a tenant, but does support the host.

V. J. PRESTIPINO. We have got a problem. This study was made on a crash basis. No request for information outside of the working room was permitted, and Bob Iverson could not unravel it all.

R. G. IVERSON. I don't think you have to follow the detailed directions.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. You mean we can set up a GOCO and have some latitude as to where the people are coming from, such as NMC, NAS and the Range? Obviously, DDR&E has nailed down the GOCO. How much to T&E?

J. A. WEBSTER. DDR&E did not recommend GOCO.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. If we change the support function, we have a problem. No change in a line item is permitted unless you go to SECNAV.

J. A. WEBSTER. GEN Starbird is not concerned. He is merely performing a staff function for DDR&E.

Commander BELK. GEN Starbird wants the Navy to run the Range.

Rear Admiral HARNISH. But the policy comes from Starbird's office. I would like to get someone to retract the words GOCO. If the intent of GOCO is complete contractor operation as it has been employed, for example, in ordnance production facilities, it would be contrary to past experience. I do not think GEN Starbird or the Navy would back it. We should get that restriction out. We can achieve the required savings without it.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. The word GOCO cannot be reversed.

Rear Admiral HARNISH. GOCO is not simple at Mugu.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. Can we agree that we have to keep GOCO, but that we have flexibility on how we do it? I notice that the end requirement provides about 1400 Civil Service and about 1400 contractor personnel. What we contract for and how we run the Range is flexible. We will reduce 1,448 civilians and 225 military. Having accomplished those things, we have complied with SER. I hope you are not going to hold our feet to the fire on the exact savings.

F. PAUL. How about the eight million dollars required to implement SER? Someone has to come up with that.

Rear Admiral HARNISH. We would need some of those funds in FY 74 and some in FY 75. If our present plans are approved, photo would be contracted out, which is now part of NMC. Therefore, there are many problems that need to be resolved, and we cannot take the over-simplistic approach used in SER.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. How do we do the savings? Who is in charge of operating the Range? Is the contractor in charge of range operations?

Commander BELK. I believe AUTEC is an example of GOCO.

Rear Admiral HARNISH. In my judgment, Barking Sands is not strictly GOCO. We have Civil Service personnel to evaluate the contractor, and military personnel to operate and maintain the aircraft.

Rear Admiral WITTMANN. We must meet GOCO and reductions specified, but it appears that how much mixing between Range and NMC is our business.

J. A. WEBSTER. The Navy is going to be the prime user of PMR. However the Navy plans to manage it, we would just like them to be able to explain it to us.

(At this point, the meeting was adjourned as 12 noon, with NAVAIR and PMR personnel to reconvene in RADM Wittman's office at 1400.)

UNDERSTANDING SOVIET GOALS IN EUROPE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, despite recent meetings in Helsinki, and discussions in Washington and Moscow, there is little evidence that the Soviet Union has in any way changed its long-range goal of dominating Europe, both East and West.

There is some evidence, however, that many in the West, including our own country, no longer believe that the Soviet Union is serious about its goals.

Writing in the New York Times of July 11, 1973, C. L. Sulzberger points out that:

The Soviet Union's diplomatic offensive has now succeeded in altering a basic Western and, above all, United States precondition that has hitherto underlain the complex of East-West negotiations.

Mr. Sulzberger is referring to the question of mutual and balanced force reductions. We still insist that such reductions be "mutual," but we seem to have backtracked on the requirement that they be "balanced."

He notes that—

A sizable shrinkage in U.S. forces stationed in Europe means they must return across the Atlantic. A similar shrinkage in Soviet forces means they simply have to pull behind the U.S.S.R.'s frontier. If three American divisions fly home, they are a lot further than than three Russian divisions motoring eastward.

While our NATO allies are concerned that any force reductions be "balanced," the new Defense Secretary, James Schlesinger, gave what Mr. Sulzberger refers to as "an ugly hint to the alliance that America was reevaluating the situation and reckoned there were 35 fewer Soviet and Warsaw Pact divisions in East Europe than NATO's own intelligence staff originally estimated. Allied diplomats promptly suspected Washington was getting ready to respond to political pressures and reduce its forces."

It is to be hoped that such unrealistic thinking does not prevail in this administration. The stakes in Europe are far too high for us to withdraw our troops in the hope that the Soviet Union will do the same, and to be unconcerned with the specific numbers involved.

Fortunately, there are a number of observers in Europe who are well aware of the real stakes in this conflict. One is Dr. Franz Josef Strauss, leader of the Christian Social Union and emerging as the outstanding opposition politician in West Germany, championing European unity, friendship with the United States, and anticollectivism.

In an interview with the magazine, To The Point, Dr. Strauss stated that—

Soviet policy in Europe wants to use German Ostpolitik to expand its influence into Western Europe and to prevent the Common Market countries from forming a federal political union with a common defence . . . The alternative to it is an Atlantic Policy.

Dr. Strauss notes that—

The basic struggle is now between the idea of a being in the image of God, that is, man with an inalienable right to individual freedom and rights, or the vision of man as a cog in the machine of a great society. Here, some people view the symbiosis between Germany and Russia as a possible "common society" opposed to Western society.

I wish to share with my colleagues the interview with Dr. Franz Josef Strauss which appeared in the June 30, 1973, issue of To The Point, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

FRANZ JOSEF STRAUSS

ORIGIN

Born September 6, 1915, son of a Munich artisan. Studied economics, classical languages, history and German culture at Munich university. Conscripted in 1939, served until 1945 on the front in France and Russia, and as first lieutenant saw the war out in an American POW camp.

POLITICAL CAREER

Founder member of the CSU (Christian Social Union) in 1945. Elected secretary-general of the party and member of West German Parliament in 1948. First cabinet appointment as Minister for Special Tasks in Adenauer government 1953–1955; Minister of Atomic Questions 1955–1956, Defence 1956–1962 and Finance 1966–1969.

Now a key figure in the Christian opposition in the Bundestag. A skilled politician, dangerous opponent in debate and expert on economic affairs, European integration and European security.

TO THE POINT. Dr. Strauss, where is Europe going? Is integration at an end?

STRAUSS. The '70s will decide Europe's long-term future: whether the free countries of Europe will move towards a political union with a common policy towards the East, with the United States, in a reorganised NATO, or whether they will renounce political union and tie their future to economic and political co-operation with Moscow. The consequences of *Ostpolitik*, the CESC negotiations in Helsinki and MBFR negotiations in Vienna must be seen in this context.

Soviet policy in Europe wants to use German *Ostpolitik* to expand its influence into Western Europe and to prevent the Common Market countries from forming a federal political union with a common defence. It is not in our interest to support this policy. The alternative to it is an Atlantic policy, which is not anti-Soviet, but which gives priority to Atlantic co-operation.

TO THE POINT. Does Atlantic co-operation have any meaning today?

STRAUSS. NATO cannot go on as it is. The Americans are worried about European economic competition and are therefore no longer willing to shoulder the whole burden of defence as they did when Europe was economically weak. They want a different division of burdens: this is the core of Kissinger's call for a new Atlantic charter. The Americans are prepared to accept European economic competition, if the Europeans are willing to shoulder their part of the burden. Then NATO would have an American and a European pillar. The European one is only feasible if Europe's NATO countries, or the Common Market countries, are prepared to unite in an active political organisation.

TO THE POINT. In the light of growing anti-Americanism in Europe, how can this European pillar be built? We have just heard that Chancellor Brandt is not an "Atlantean" but a man in Bismarck's tradition.

STRAUSS. One should not see Willy Brandt in historical masks, but rather as Willy Brandt. He is in danger of eventually being named Wilhelm the Third. I sometimes have the impression that Brandt is moving between incompatible political aims. I said once in Parliament that one cannot simultaneously pursue European unification and support Russian policy towards Western Europe. Ultimately, one has to choose.

TO THE POINT. Anti-Americanism does not only exist in Germany.

STRAUSS. Anti-Americanism began in a misrepresentation of the Vietnam war, but there is more to it. What is behind anti-Americanism is the resurgence of Marxism—an old, rotten, obsolete salvation doctrine—which, because of its appeal to justice, appeals to the younger generation. The world is being painted in black and white: the "bad capitalists" in the US and the "benefactors of mankind" in Moscow. Still, a majority of the German voters—and, I think, of German youth—prefers co-operation with the US to the "other solution". But we must not deceive ourselves: this majority is decreasing and the number of those who want co-operation with Moscow is increasing.

This is a consequence of *Ostpolitik*. The problem also concerns the US where, inevitably, there are anti-German and anti-European reactions to anti-American actions in Germany. The Soviets know this. And this results in the US and Europe drifting apart. Sometimes I think that those who want to move Europe closer to Moscow welcome the anti-European reactions in the US.

TO THE POINT. But the US and also France have long applauded *Ostpolitik*.

STRAUSS. It is a mysterious procedure. The Soviets have let the Stalin-Hitler alliance slip into oblivion, while keeping alive the idea of German responsibility for the war. This means that our present allies simultaneously sympathise with the Soviet Union against the Germany of yesterday, while they are allied with the Germany of today against the dangers of tomorrow. Adenauer has linked Germany's "yes" to Europe and to NATO with our allies' irrevocable support for German reunification.

TO THE POINT. A whole-hearted support?

STRAUSS. This duty was certainly more and more annoying for them: they would have like to have had dealings with the East, which this tie prevented. If the Germans free themselves from these duties, the American, English and French cannot resent Germans taking this burden from them. As soon as *Ostpolitik* is seen to be more than a price for peace paid to the Soviets, more than war reparations, the Germans having to pay with partition of their country and large territorial losses, and suddenly Western interests are jeopardised, then the West's applause of *Ostpolitik* changes to mistrust. In private, they ask "Quo vadis Germany?"

TO THE POINT. In Holland, the Christian parties are vanishing and in Germany they are torn between left and right. Can they continue to exist when the churches are empty?

STRAUSS. Christian democratic parties are in a phase of decadence. It is too early to say whether this is part of an historical process or merely a low point in the graph of history. It will depend on the parties and on their leading personalities. The churches have lost faith in themselves and this has led to fringe movements such as the "God is dead" theology. But in both churches one can see tendencies against this decadence.

TO THE POINT. Do you still want to keep the Christian label?

STRAUSS. We Christian democratic or Christian social parties are faced with the question of whether the capital "C," meaning "Christian," fits into the political scene. By striking off the "Christian" now, we might help the forces of dissolution, therefore we should postpone the decision. If it must be cut out, then it should only be done when the social and spiritual situation is clearer.

TO THE POINT. In France, Christian Democracy has been replaced by Gaullism, a movement which stresses French patriotism and social reforms. In Germany, where Socialism is appealing to patriotism—a winning combination in Germany since 1918—what can you oppose?

STRAUSS. The basic struggle now is between the idea of a being in the image of God, that is, man with an inalienable right to individual freedom and rights, or the vision of man as a cog in the machine of a great society. More and more, the nation is replaced by "society"—understood as socialist society. Here, some people view the symbiosis between Germany and Russia as a possible "common society" opposed to Western society. Individual freedom stands opposed to "class rights" of the other side. It is typical how the word "democracy" is being misused through the slogan of "democratising society." Democracy is an irreplaceable principle of controlling and allocating the power of the state. It means that a worker, a Nobel Prize winner, a beggar or a millionaire have the same vote.

But if you try to transpose the principle of democracy into the institutions of society, you destroy freedom. The best examples of this process are the German universities, where "democratisation" has reduced freedom of research, learning and teaching.

To THE POINT. And what are you doing to counter this?

STRAUSS. This question will decide the world of tomorrow. I have said that the alternative to the socialist policy of Marxist parties cannot be the same policy by Christian Marxist parties, but rather the ideals of the free, responsible citizen, the creation of individual property and the ideal of equal opportunities for education and the acquisition of wealth for everyone. Our society and our youth must choose between the two ideals of individual freedom and of collectivism. I am sure that youth is prepared to understand, that it is only being misled, so we have to contact youth at an age when, in previous days, we considered it unfit for politics. We cannot let the Left take over youth at this stage: we are now going into the schools.

To THE POINT. Are you optimistic?

STRAUSS. We still have equal chances.

To THE POINT. What do you think of the mass media? Europe is being poisoned: one is no longer allowed to say "I am an individual", but nightly the television says "You must be a collectivist."

STRAUSS. We must clearly define the role of the mass media. I am wholly for press freedom, but this does not mean press privilege. Radio and TV have no right to attempt to change society. We have put it into the Bavarian constitution that radio and TV have the right and duty to report unbiasedly, to differentiate between information and comment and in the commentary to reflect different opinions. In Germany, radio and TV are public corporations; whether we will ever have private organisations depends upon technical and constitutional developments. Up till now, radio and TV have been controlled by radio councils and there the representatives of the CDU/CSU have been sleeping for too long. They must catch up with the Socialists who have pursued their aims with more energy.

What have the Christian Democratic parties done to help young journalists who are not leftist? If young journalists are chances for advancement only on the Left, it is hardly a wonder that the picture is one-sided. We must catch up.

PEOPLE AGAINST HIGHWAY EXPANSION IN WINDSOR

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Governor of the State of Connecticut finally acknowledged the validity of arguments of scores of opponents to the construction of the controversial northern segment of Interstate 291, a beltway which would have cut through a municipal water supply reservoir and through stable, racially, and economically integrated neighborhoods.

The Governor ordered the State Transportation Department to examine alternative transportation plans, in effect killing this segment of I-291.

His decision was clearly a victory for the citizen opponents who have invested thousands of volunteer hours in research, analysis, dialog, comments, and lobbying. Their effort was prodigious, their output well documented and convincing, and the outcome was inevitable.

My own limited involvement in this effort to stop I-291 came at the behest of one such individual, a Windsor, Conn., housewife who decided to do something about the impending construction of what she called a "Berlin Wall" that would have bisected her neighborhood.

We have often heard of the power of an aroused citizenry, but in most instances the spark of public outrage and concern must be ignited by one person. In Windsor that individual was Alice Finstad.

In a few short weeks in the summer of 1972 following publication of the draft environmental impact statement on the proposed highway in Windsor, Mrs. Finstad marshalled facts and mobilized people and formed People Against Highway Expansion in Windsor—PAHEW. I had the pleasure of setting up several meetings in Washington with Federal agencies and was impressed by her well-prepared arguments.

Through PAHEW's efforts the very serious dislocations I-291 would cause in one of Greater Hartford's few racially integrated middle-class neighborhoods were finally accorded attention.

While Alice Finstad and PAHEW were building up a well-documented case, including a sophisticated noise pollution study, on the effect of I-291 on a densely settled neighborhood, Charlotte Kitowski of West Hartford and her Citizens' Committee on I-291 had been developing a massive study of the impact of the highway on the Metropolitan District Commission Reservoir which serves in excess of a quarter of a million people.

Mrs. Kitowski's group compiled a 539 page "comment" on the draft environmental impact statement that exhaustively examined such issues as lead pollution in the drinking supply and noise levels on surrounding homes.

Because this was truly a citizens' victory I want to pay tribute to those who have played a prominent role, often at great personal expense. While the following list is by no means complete it is fairly representative of the scores of citizens who responded to this effort:

Dr. George N. Bowers of West Hartford who prepared a 60-page analysis of the impact of the highway on water purity.

Dr. Robert Brewer, assistant professor of zoology and ecology, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

Douglas L. Brooks, National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere.

Richard J. Dalphin, assistant professor of civil engineering, University of Hartford.

Frank E. Elger, Yale University Ecologist.

Ernest B. Gardow, University of Hartford.

Archie J. Golden, M.D., Wethersfield, Conn., chairman of Conn. Clean Air Task Force Health Committee.

Mrs. Barbara Tucker of West Hartford, president SHAME.

Mrs. Reuben Plen of Windsor, Conn.

Mr. Maurice Devin of Windsor, Conn.

Mrs. Olive Folger of Windsor, Conn.

Mrs. Raymond Ferrari of Windsor, Conn.

Mrs. Mabel Wilshire of Windsor, Conn.

Mrs. Edward Judge of Windsor, Conn.

Mrs. Peter Sawka of Windsor, Conn.

Miss Josephine Baracchi of Windsor, Conn.

Mrs. Sally Morrison of West Hartford.

Thomas Zetterstrom of Canaan, Connecticut.

Jonathan von Ranson, editor of the Newington Town Crier.

Former State Senator Jay Jackson of West Hartford.

Robert Watkins of Bloomfield.

Mario Zavarella, Windsor Town Planner.

James A. Swomley, Bloomfield Councilman.

Mark Juneau, a University of Hartford student who worked on the noise pollution study.

State Senator Wilbur Smith of Hartford.

Ellen Douglass of West Hartford.

Myra Bowers of West Hartford.

Toby Moffitt, director of the Connecticut Citizens Action Group.

Lauchlin McLean, West Hartford Councilman.

State Senator Nicholas Lenge of West Hartford.

POLITICS: CEMENT OF CIVILIZATION

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, during the Watergate hearings last week, Senator MONTOYA asked Mr. Gordon Strachan what advice he would give to young people who had the opportunity to serve in politics and government. The young White House aide who had just testified about his participation in the Watergate affair replied he would recommend they "stay away."

In my judgment that answer reflects far more on Mr. Strachan than it does on politics.

The problem lies not so much with politics, as Mr. Strachan would imply, but rather with the character of some of the people who have gravitated to it in recent years.

Because it makes so much sense, I want to include below a recent editorial from the Milwaukee Journal. Politics, the editorial says, "needs good people in its ranks, not leftovers."

I hope all young people take note. The editorial follows:

CEMENT OF CIVILIZATION

Sadly, a recent Gallup Poll shows that only one adult in four would like to have a son go into politics as a career. This is a sharp decline from the last survey, taken in 1965, when 36% of those interviewed would approve of a son choosing politics as his lifework. The chief reason cited for the current distaste is a belief that politics is "too corrupt or crooked." That may seem logical in view of the Watergate scandals, yet it is well to note that real politicians—the kind who run for elective office—are not clustered at the center of the perfidy. Rather, the culprits are lawyers, admen and others from the world of business who sought to pervert the political process. Politics may not be the most noble calling, but it is important work. It is, as someone once said, the "cement of civilization." It needs good people in its ranks, not leftovers.

POLICE - COMMUNITY RELATIONS: CLOSING THE GAP

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months, New York City has experienced a welcome improvement in police-community relations and cooperation. Citizens are beginning to come to the aid of fellow citizens in trouble. Young people are beginning to respect, and welcome the police in the struggle to make New York a better place in which to live.

An excellent example of this renaissance in good feeling was recently reported in the New York Times, in an article entitled "Police Employing T.V. To Start a Dialogue." I insert the article for the attention of all CONGRESSIONAL RECORD readers:

[From the New York Times, July 11, 1973]

POLICE EMPLOYING TV TO START A "DIALOGUE"

(By John J. O'Connor)

Clustered in front of two television monitors in a long narrow storefront on the Lower East Side yesterday, city police officials, members of the Ninth Precinct and local residents watched an hour-long production called "No More Words."

The production offered selections, videotaped by Community-Action-Newsreel, a branch of Young Filmakers Inc., from a recent week-long "dialogue" instigated by the Ninth Precinct in an effort to isolate specific problems and specific solutions" for the area it covers—south from 14th Street to East Houston Street and east from Broadway to the East River.

The precinct has a staff of 260; the area has a population of about 100,000 and the dialogue with local residents, community leaders and local youth gangs ran for a total of 35 hours.

For the police, the use of the dialogue and video had one overriding purpose. As one officer put it, "We want no hot summer down here." The new concept, devised by Sgt. John Kelly and Sgt. Daniel Daley with the support of Inspector Edward Rogers of the Ninth Precinct, was geared to "get the people involved."

MANY TOPICS COVERED

As condensed in "No More Words," the frank and wide-ranging dialogue appears to have enlisted all sides. Among those speaking out at the meetings, which included 25 members of the Ninth Precinct, were:

Three teen-aged Dynamite Sisters, counterparts of the Dynamite Brothers, a large local gang. Calling for more jobs and more police, they were asked, "What's your biggest problem out there on the street?" The answers: "Killing."

John Davis, a teacher and local resident, who had "bad vibes" about the way the girls were being "used" to do "public-television business."

A community leader charging that the police were reluctant to intervene in explosive situations involving blacks or Puerto Ricans.

A gang member explaining the prevalence of weapons, with the observation that "cops got guns, other people got guns," and adding that "you don't want anybody to get on your back."

ON A REGULAR BASIS

Emoe community groups were confronted by critical residents. After announcing plans for a new social program, a Mobilization for Youth worker was asked by a young man how there seemed to be "money for programs, but none for jobs." A spokesman for University of the Streets, which provides vocational training, was immediately faced with a graduate who is still looking for a job.

Despite the criticism, however, the police are optimistic about the experiment. Inspector Rogers announced yesterday that the dialogues were being put on a continuing basis, with one session scheduled every six weeks.

All sides insist that the dialogues must be uninhibited. At one meeting, Luis Fuentes, district 1 school superintendent, urged his audience to take advantage of "an opportunity to tell these public servants how they can best serve us."

He then extended, however, his "complete and wholehearted thanks and support to the Ninth Precinct, adding that "not all policemen are pigs, and a lot of us are pigs."

Throughout the tape, the dominant concern was the lack of jobs in the area for young people. Police officials stressed that limited department funds were being used to support "cultural festivals," some bus trips and other diversions, but that they had little or no control over the job market.

The point, they stressed, was that the police were sympathetic to legitimate problems. At one point, an officer came to the defense of local youths, declaring that many drug-related crimes in the area had been traced to "transients" from outside the area using local methadone centers.

A POSITIVE ASPECT

Near the end of "No More Words" a gang leader said that the dialogue had given him a chance to get to know some good policemen.

"When I see cop on the street," he said, "before I wanted to spit in his eye. Now I want to shake his hand." That positive aspect of the situation, several members of the Ninth Precinct said after the screening, should be used to counter-balance some of the "bad press" the gangs have been getting lately.

Community-Action-Newsreel, on Rivington Street, has been training local residents in the use of videotape equipment since the beginning of this year. The resulting "documentaries" have been shown in the neighborhood, on cable TV and occasionally on television.

"No More Words" will be used in various parts of the city to demonstrate a new concept of police-community relations.

I have contacted the New York Police Department, urging them to utilize this excellent film in other parts of our community.

RALLY AMERICA IS A GREAT SUCCESS

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month a group of citizens from Broward County, Fla., came to the Nation's Capital at their own expense to rally America. Many of my colleagues in the Congress and some officials from the administration attended this fine event and from the comments I received thereafter, it obviously was a tremendous success.

It was heartening to witness such enthusiasm from the citizens I am honored to represent in the Congress, especially when the peddlers of doom are harking their lamentations daily and would like to destroy our Nation's people by destroying our form of government.

Many of you who attended this rally on July 10 heard the proclamation brought forth by the Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce, but for those of you who did not attend I am presenting the resolution passed by the chamber. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE GREATER FORT LAUDERDALE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas, our country has recently celebrated its 197th anniversary and proudly looks forward to its Bi-Centennial year, and

Whereas, our country has been tested by the ravages of foreign war and the tragedy of internal dissension, and

Whereas, the citizens of this country have consistently united in purpose and strength in time of crises, and

Whereas, our representative form of government has provided our country with just and democratic elected officials to serve in the best interest of our people, now

Therefore, be it resolved:

That the Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce has declared this event of July 10, 1973, as Rally America! in honor and grateful appreciation of our 535 members of Congress and appointed officials who dedicate their lives to the greatest welfare of our country.

And furthermore we convey and reaffirm the solidarity and dedication of the citizens of Broward County, Florida, to the American Democratic system of government which has been tempered and found worthy during nearly two centuries of existence.

Adopted this the 10th day of July, 1973.

FLOOD CLAIMS FOR USE AS RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to establish a national floodplain policy and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with Federal agencies and the States, to encourage the dedication of the Nation's flood plains as natural floodways, to protect, conserve and restore their natural functions and resources and for other purposes.

The flood plains of the Nation's rivers and streams naturally serve functions of floodwater detention and regulation, water conservation including groundwater replenishment, soil conservation, bottomland hardwood timber production, and fish and wildlife production. In conserving soil and reducing sediment production, they lengthen the life of downstream reservoirs, channels, harbors, and estuarine areas. Additionally, they provide open space areas of scenic and other outdoor recreational attractions and sites for scientific and educational ecological purposes. These functions and values deserve full recognition in the planning and development of the Nation's lands and waters which are not presently provided because of imperatives of economic development.

The proposed bill would declare that flood plains have the above values to the Nation; would direct Federal agencies constructing, sanctioning, or assisting the construction of water and land development work which affects flood plains to give priority consideration to their preservation, would authorize such agencies to acquire, support, and encourage the acquisition of estates in flood plains at Federal cost with administration optionally vested in the States; would require perpetual use of such acquired lands for such purposes as are compatible with the intent of the bill, including fish and wildlife habitat, outdoor recreation, timber production, natural area preservation, and the like, as well as established conforming economic uses.

The bill would require Federal planning and construction agencies to conduct public hearings and to obtain and publish the views of the Secretary of the Interior prior to implementing plans in the Nation's flood plains. It would insure consistency in the administration of the bill's provisions with other acts through the development of guidelines by the Water Resources Council. Use of eminent domain would be limited where valid and effective land-use regulations are in effect.

The objective of the bill is to encourage selection of nonstructural alternatives by Federal flood control and flood prevention planners in the interest of natural area preservation and maintenance of environmental quality. Planners would be clearly provided the option of analyzing the benefits and costs of flood-plain acquisition as an alternative to channelization or other flood protection and prevention measures. Where this alternative demonstrated a competitive or better benefit-cost ratio, agencies would be encouraged to seek its authorization.

The proposal is in harmony with the declarations and purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act as amended, the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and the Wild and Scenic River Act as well as many other acts.

It would supplement and round out existing water development planning authorities. It would be a logical corollary of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act which provides that fish and wildlife shall be equally considered with other features in water resource development planning. In many cases, fish and wildlife, as well as outdoor recreation and flood control, could be best served at lowest cost by outright acquisition of flood hazard areas. Further, the bill complements the provisions of section 103 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 which requires review of present statutory authority, regulations, policies, and procedures which prohibit full compliance with purposes and provisions of that act followed by the proposal of corrective, conforming measures.

Since the proposal anticipates least-cost solutions to flood management with coincident natural area and environmental quality preservation, savings in flood control and flood prevention costs as well as in social costs are expected.

I include the full text of this bill in the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill to establish a national flood plain policy and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with Federal agencies and the States, to encourage the dedication of the Nation's flood plains as natural floodways, to protect, conserve, and restore their natural functions and resources, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) this Act may be cited as the "Flood Plains Conservation Act".

(a) The Congress finds and declares that the flood plains of the streams and rivers of the United States are natural floodways rich in a variety of natural, recreational, esthetic, and scientific resources of immediate and potential value to the present and future development of our Nation; that encroachment upon these flood plains by flood-damageable developments increases the damages and hazards of floods and causes increasingly higher costs for effective flood control; that unplanned or poorly planned wetland reclamation, drainage, flood prevention, flood control, runoff and water flow retardation, erosion control, channelization, and channel rectification as well as development and use of flood plains have destroyed or have the potential of destroying the basic natural environment and the resource and other values of such flood plain areas and has restricted the most efficient and beneficial utilization of such areas, including, but not limited to: their use for floodwater flowage, detention, and storage; conservation of soil and water; scenic, greenspace, and recreational purposes; wildlife and timber production; nursery, rearing, and food supply of fishes; and scientific and educational purposes; and that it is the policy of Congress to preserve, protect, develop, and where possible to restore, the flood capacity and resources of the Nation's flood plain areas for this and succeeding generations through comprehensive and coordinated long-range planning, development, and management designed to produce the maximum benefit for society from such flood plain areas, taking full and explicit account of nonmonetary and intangible benefits and values as well as monetary and tangible benefits and values both long run and short run.

(c) The purpose of this Act is to effectuate the policy set out in (b) above and to insure that the preservation of flood plains and their unique natural functions and values, their other values, and related human uses shall be equally considered and coordinated with other means and measures planned and adopted for the development and management of the Nation's surface and ground waters. It is the further purpose of this Act to encourage the participation of State and local public bodies in effecting the policies and objectives set out herein.

SEC. 2. (a) All Federal agencies conducting, assisting, permitting, or supporting construction of water and related land development, urban and industrial development, agricultural development, highway development, airport development, other construction, or any related activity in or on the flood plains of the United States are directed to give priority consideration to the protection and preservation of flood plain resources and related values, and shall in formulating plans for flood prevention, flood control, flood routing, runoff and water flow retardation, drainage, soil conservation, erosion control, navigation and similar and related developments, or for assisting in planning and furthering such developments, select structural means and programs of flood plain management that will preserve, protect, and restore the natural flood capacity, soil conservation, and groundwater replenishment functions; the natural scenic, inspirational, esthetic, and recreational values; the natural commercial fish and wildlife and timber values; and the historic, archeologic, ecologic, and other scientific values of flood plains to the fullest practicable extent.

(b) All Federal agencies authorized to plan, conduct, assist, permit, or support through financial or technical assistance any construction or any activity in or on the flood plains of the United States are hereby authorized to modify or to require modifications of project plans and are authorized to acquire or support the acquisition of flood plain lands in fee or easement, to withdraw public lands, to accept donations of lands or interests in lands or of funds to be used to acquire lands or interests in lands for purposes of this Act, and to convey or reconvey title to or administration of any such lands acquired by the United States to appropriate non-Federal public bodies or to other Federal agencies with appropriate conditions to assure their availability for public uses not incompatible with the purposes of this Act and to effect such purposes: *Provided,* That such acquisitions shall be limited to those which the Federal planning agency finds will contribute significantly to rational flood plain management in harmony with the purposes of this Act: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding other provisions of law, such acquisitions as are so found shall be made at Federal cost and shall be nonreimbursable.

(c) Properties acquired pursuant to this Act shall be dedicated in perpetuity to uses which are compatible with intermittent flooding and which are in accord with the purposes of this Act, including but not limited to fish and wildlife propagation, public outdoor recreation, sustained-yield timber production, scientific research, and scenic and cultural pursuits: *Provided,* That lands acquired in easement estates may continue to be used for agricultural, lumbering, or other uses not incompatible with the principal purposes for which the easement was acquired if they have been so used within a five-year period preceding the consummation of the easement, but they may only be encumbered by additions of buildings, other structures, or facilities that are flood-proofed in accordance with Federal standards and they may not be newly cleared except in accordance with a sustained-yield timber management plan: *And provided further,* That lands acquired in fee which have value to the national park, national recreation area, national wildlife refuge, wilderness, or wild and scenic river systems shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for administration in such a manner as he may deem appropriate: *Provided, however,* That any lands acquired within the exterior boundaries of a national forest, national grassland, other Federal reservation, or State or local park shall be added to and become part of such reservation or park, and shall be administered by the agency administering such reservation or park under appropriate conditions as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

(d) Federal lands acquired or withdrawn for purposes of this Act shall continue to be used for such purposes and shall not become the subject of exchange or other transactions if such exchange or other transaction defeat the initial purpose of their acquisition.

(e) Federal agencies authorized by this section to acquire or to support the acquisition of lands shall not acquire lands by condemnation for purposes of this Act if such lands are located within any State, or political subdivision thereof which has in force and applicable to such lands a duly adopted, valid zoning law or ordinance that conforms with the purposes of this Act. In order that the provisions of this subsection may be carried out, the Water Resources Council shall issue guidelines, specifying zoning standards which are consistent with the purposes of this Act.

(f) The Water Resources Council shall establish such principles, guidelines, standards, and procedures as may be necessary to insure that the administration of this Act shall be consistent with the administration of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 572), and with the policies set out therein.

SEC. 3. All Federal agencies, in planning for the use or development of water and land resources or in considering applicants for Federal assistance or license for the planning, use, or development of such resources, shall conduct public hearings during the formulation of plans and prior to any implementation of the plans and shall obtain and publish the views of the Secretary of the Interior as to the probable effects of said use and development on the flood plains prior to their implementation. The Secretary shall, in the light of the declaration of policy and purposes set out herein, conduct investigations, report his findings, and shall recommend any needed measure to protect flood plains which are found to have significant natural and other values including, where appropriate, his recommendation that the proposed structural and mechanical measures not be carried out: *Provided,* That whenever he recommends against structural and mechanical changes to the stream or flood plain, he shall also consider whether it is feasible and desirable to place such flood plains in public ownership through acquisition of fee title or easement, and to make recommendations to that end. The Secretary shall make available his views, and recommendations within ninety days after receipt of documents which adequately set out the plans for the project proposed.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to conduct and sponsor studies, surveys, and research related to the hydrologic and ecologic characteristics and values of the Nation's flood plains and to their management for the best interests of the people as a whole. This shall include research into uses of flood plains in their natural state, including but not limited to compatible uses for industry, agriculture, flood storage, groundwater replenishment, and wildlife propagation.

SEC. 5. The words defined in this section shall have the following meanings for the purposes of this Act, to wit: (1) The term "flood plain" means lands, wetlands, swamps, marshes, bogs, and waters within the natural or simulated natural once in one hundred-year flood frequency boundaries of any river or stream of the United States.

(2) The term "river or stream" means any fluvial water, perennial or intermittent.

(3) The term "United States" includes the fifty States and Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

(4) The term "fish and wildlife" shall include birds, fishes, shellfish, mammals, and all other classes of wild animals and all types of aquatic and land vegetation upon which these forms are dependent.

(5) The term "Federal agency" shall include but not be limited to all Federal corporations and all departments and independent agencies of the Federal Government.

(6) The term "Federal reservation" means national parks, national monuments, national forests, tribal lands embraced within Indian reservations, military reservations, and other lands and interests in lands owned by the United States, and withdrawn, reserved, or withheld from private appropriation and disposal under the public land laws. Also lands and interests in lands acquired and held for any public purposes.

SEC. 6. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) Federal agencies authorized to plan, conduct, assist, permit, or support construction and related water development activities are hereby authorized to transfer, from funds appropriated therefor, moneys to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the necessary investigations and reporting required by this Act.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept contributions and donations of funds, lands, and other valuable considerations for purposes of this Act.

ROSEMEAD, CALIF., OBSERVES 14TH BIRTHDAY

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, August 4, 1973, marks the 14th anniversary of the city of Rosemead, Calif.

The incorporation of Rosemead on August 4, 1959, ended one era and began another in the long and colorful history of the community. Around 1852, a couple named John and Harriet Guess came to settle in the San Gabriel Valley. By 1867 they had purchased a ranch covering 100 acres along what is now known as Valley Boulevard.

At about the same time, a man named L. J. Rose established his ranch, the Rosemead Ranch, between today's Rosemead Boulevard, Walnut Grove Avenue, Grand Avenue, and Shea Place.

Other pioneers joined Rose and the Guesses in this part of the San Gabriel Valley and the community of Rosemead began to develop around their two ranches.

Throughout the 1880's Rosemead consisted primarily of large ranches. By 1920, however, Rosemead had been divided into small truck farming areas and chicken and rabbit farms. The year 1919 was an historic one as it marked the opening of the first grocery store, with two more soon to follow. And this was only the beginning.

Despite the objections of many that Rosemead should remain strictly a residential area, other businesses developed. By 1925, Rosemead had its first newspaper and in 1927 the Rosemead Chamber of Commerce was organized. The First City Bank and a post office arrived in 1928.

By 1930, with the population at 5,000, Rosemead was buzzing. It contained 50 businesses, a public library, a doctor, several churches, and two schools. Growth continued at a furious pace in Rosemead, as it did throughout California in the 1940's and 1950's, until by the time of incorporation in 1959, the population had swelled to 16,000.

Today, after 14 more years of growth, Rosemead is home to approximately 42,000 people. It is a truly thriving community, with a healthy balance of industry and commerce, as well as variety in the makeup of its population.

The people of Rosemead have devoted much time and effort during the past 14 years to make the city of Rosemead a vital contributor to the Nation as well as to the area surrounding the city. As I see the community of Rosemead continuing to thrive, I have great hopes for the future of this city.

A city that has progressed so far in so short a time surely will do even better in the future.

U.S. TROOPS IN EUROPE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am including below, for the benefit of Members considering the military procurement bill, some important material relevant to the question of U.S. troop levels in Europe and worldwide. The following material was prepared for hearings by the Subcommittee on Europe, which I chair, on U.S. troops levels in Europe:

A comparison of U.S. military and civilian balance of payments which demonstrates the large role of military expenditures in our balance-of-payments deficit;

Tables on burden-sharing among the NATO nations, which convincingly show the excessive burden borne by the United States for the defense of Western Europe;

The estimated cost of U.S. general purpose forces for NATO and European contingencies, by region in fiscal year 1972 which elucidates the U.S. contribution to the defense of NATO:

An editorial from today's New York Times favoring a phased withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe.

It is my hope that Members will examine these tables carefully and their implication for American foreign policy and the American dollar before the debate and votes tomorrow on U.S. troop levels overseas.

The material follows:

COMPARISON OF U.S. MILITARY AND CIVILIAN BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

[Millions of dollars]

	U.S. defense expenditures abroad					Deliveries of U.S. military equipment [1]					Net U.S. military balance of payments deficit				
	1960	1965	1970	1971	1972	1960	1965	1970	1971	1972	1960	1965	1970	1971	1972
Worldwide	3,087	2,952	4,851	4,829	4,724	335	830	1,480	1,912	1,166	2,752	2,122	3,371	2,927	3,558
Western Europe [2]	1,652	1,468	1,775	2,021	2,252	222	516	599	929	461	1,430	952	1,176	1,092	1,791
Germany (FRG)	649	714	1,080	1,265	1,379	152	253	194	589	212	497	461	886	676	1,167

[1] Under U.S. military agency sales contract; does not include straight commercial sales.
[2] Includes European NATO countries plus Austria, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Yugoslavia.

THE ABOVE SUMMARY OF MILITARY BALANCE OF PAYMENTS IS INCLUDED IN AND CAN BE COMPARED TO THE FOLLOWING SUMMARY OF ALL U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS ACCOUNTS OVER THE SAME PERIOD

	1960	1965	1970	1971	1972
U.S. Worldwide balance of payments (current accounts and long-term capital flow)	1,174	1,846	3,038	9,281	9,243

Source: All data is taken from Department of Commerce sources including updated figures supplied directly to the Subcommittee on Europe.

BURDEN SHARING

DEFENSE EXPENDITURES AS A PERCENTAGE OF GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

	1965	1970	1971	1972
Belgium	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.6
Denmark	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.3
France	5.2	4.0	3.9	3.7
West Germany	4.3	3.3	3.4	3.4
Greece	3.6	4.9	5.0	4.5
Iceland				
Italy	3.3	2.7	2.9	2.8
Luxembourg	1.4	.8	.9	1.0
Netherlands	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.3
Norway	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.4
Portugal	6.2	6.8	6.4	5.9
Turkey	5.1	4.5	4.4	4.0
United Kingdom	5.8	4.8	5.0	4.9
Total:				
NATO Europe	4.55	3.68	3.72	3.64
EC NATO	4.56	3.63	3.68	3.60
United States	7.6	8.0	7.1	6.7
Canada	3.0	2.4	2.3	2.1

Note: "NATO Europe" is all NATO countries but the United States and Canada. "EC NATO" includes all NATO countries which are members of the European Economic Community as of 1973: Belgium, Denmark, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.

DEFENSE EXPENDITURES AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL TAX REVENUES

	1965	1970	1971 [1]
Belgium	9.8	7.8	7.4
Denmark	9.1	5.7	5.6
France	14.2	11.3	10.8
West Germany	13.2	9.7	9.7
Greece	18.1	NA	NA
Iceland			
Italy	11.4	8.9	9.5
Luxembourg	4.4	2.4	2.3
Netherlands	11.4	8.7	8.3
Norway	11.2	8.9	8.1
Portugal	30.2	31.1	NA
Turkey	30.3	23.0	NA
United Kingdom	19.1	12.8	13.9
Total:			
NATO Europe	14.2	[2] 11.8	NA
EC NATO	14.1	10.4	10.4
United States	30.0	26.1	24.6
Canada	11.2	7.8	7.1

[1] Latest figures available.
[2] Not including Iceland and Greece.

MEN IN ARMED FORCES PER 1,000 POPULATION

	1965	1970	1971	1972
Belgium	11.3	9.8	9.9	9.2
Denmark	10.7	9.0	8.2	8.7
France	11.4	10.0	9.8	9.6
West Germany	7.7	8.0	7.9	7.9
Greece	18.7	18.1	18.0	17.4
Iceland				
Italy	7.6	7.7	7.7	7.8
Luxembourg	16.7	1.6	1.6	1.5
Netherlands	11.0	9.3	8.8	9.2
Norway	8.7	10.6	9.2	9.0
Portugal	16.1	19.3	22.7	18.4
Turkey	14.2	13.6	14.1	11.9
United Kingdom	8.1	7.0	6.8	6.6
Total:				
NATO Europe	10.0	9.5	9.6	9.15
EC NATO	8.9	8.25	8.1	8.1
United States	13.7	15.4	13.0	11.4
Canada	6.1	4.4	3.9	3.8

Note: Figures rounded to nearest 10th.

Sources: [GNP] U.N. Monthly Bulletin of Statistics through 1971, AID estimates for 1972. [Tax Revenues] OECD, 1973 Edition of "Revenue Statistics of OECD Member Countries." [Defense Exp.] NATO International Staff. [Armed Forces] International Institute of Strategic Studies (London).

ESTIMATED COST OF U.S. GENERAL PURPOSE FORCES FOR NATO AND EUROPEAN CONTINGENCIES, BY REGION, FISCAL YEAR 1972

[Costs in millions of dollars]

Region and force	Units: In Europe	Units: In United States	Total cost
CENTRAL REGION			
Army divisions:			
Active	4-1/3	3-2/3	8,250
Reserve		6	2,100
Air Force tactical wings:			
Active	7	9	5,650
Reserve		7-1/3	750
Antisubmarine and antiair warfare forces (percent of total) [1]	10	25	2,300
Airlift and sealift forces (percent of total) [1]		50	600
Subtotal			19,650
SOUTHERN REGION			
Marine active divisions/wings	1/9	8/9	1,050
Navy active carrier task forces	2	2	2,600
Antisubmarine and antiair warfare forces (percent of total) [1]	5	10	1,000
Amphibious and other naval forces (percent of total) [1]	7	26	1,100
Subtotal			5,750
Total			25,400

[1] In U.S. force structure; excludes escorts for attack carriers.

Sources: Charles L. Schultze and others, Setting National Priorities: The 1972 Budget (Brookings Institution, 1971), p. 55; statement of Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird in Department of Defense Appropriations for 1971, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 92d Cong. 2d sess. (1970), pt. 1, p. 270; statement of General Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, ibid., p. 74υ; testimony of Admiral Thomas H. Moorer in CVAN-70 Aircraft Carrier, Joint Hearings before the Joint Senate-House Armed Services Subcommittee of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees, 91st Cong. 2d sess. (1970), p. 135; The Military Balance, 1970–71 (London: Institute for Strategic Studies, 1970), pp. 3–5; statement of William W. Kaufmann in Changing National Priorities, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee, 91st Cong. 2d sess. (197C), pt. 1, p. 211. From John Newhouse (ed) "U.S. Troops in Europe", Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C. 1971.

[From the New York Times, July 29, 1973]

TROOPS IN EUROPE

For nearly three decades the United States has maintained an expeditionary force in Western Europe, which has been blessed for a generation with peace, prosperity and relative stability. So much is evident fact; a strange situation has now arisen in which this historical truth is being cited to support both sides of a debate resuming on Capitol Hill for the third year running

The status quo has worked—don't tamper with it That is the kernel of the traditional Administration argument that American troop strength in Europe must be retained at its present level. The increasing circle of critics argues that, precisely because the military commitments of the last 28 years have worked so well, the job of the American garrisons is done and the boys can be brought home.

Neither of these arguments is acceptable as the premise from which to examine the future United States role in the defense of Western Europe. It is not enough to say that the troops should remain where they are just because they have been there for longer than a majority of Americans can remember. It is certainly not enough to argue that all, or even a substantial number, of these troops should come home just because Europe has become prosperous and safe and Leonid I. Brezhnev seemed like such a pleasant fellow when he dropped in the other day.

The Secretary of Defense, James R. Schlesinger, has shown a new Administration awareness of Congressional sensitivities by conceding that the United States might well be paying more than its "fair share" of European defense costs. Over 6 per cent of this country's gross national product goes to fulfill American commitments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, he told a House committee, compared with a West European average of 4.1 per cent of G.N.P. for defense expenditures. The promised effort to increase the European contribution will be an essential element in the Administration's campaign to stall off any major cuts in strength.

More important in determining how soon and how much the American force can be reduced will be the tenor of the eagerly anticipated East-West negotiations to achieve a mutual reduction of forces in Europe, those of the Warsaw Pact as well as NATO. These talks are to open Oct. 30 in Vienna.

There mere fact of work in progress cannot be held as a legitimate reason to shun all consideration of a unilateral American cutback, since the talks may go on for more years than anyone now cares to contemplate. Against the Vietnam and Cambodia experiences, Congressional critics have good grounds for being suspicious of self-serving Administration pleas to delay action while allegedly delicate diplomatic steps are under way. An abrupt Congressional move to force unilateral reduction in American forces in Europe before the negotiations even begin, however, is clearly not justified by any urgency of circumstance

The American expeditionary force in Europe will—and should—be phased down, though certainly not out, over the coming years This must be accepted as an integral reality in the self-examination which the NATO allies have now undertaken.

But the growing weakness in the Administration's argument before the Congress is the inability so far to present any coherent, if necessarily long-range, program for winding down what is portrayed as an almost open-ended commitment in perpetuity. As Representative Riegle, Republican of Michigan, warned Administration witnesses at House hearings: "Policies that do not make sense to the American people only increase the mood of isolationism in the United States."

WIRIYAMA MASSACRE—ONLY PART OF THE PICTURE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, while it is heartening to see the world's attention focused upon Portuguese atrocities in Mozambique, it is wise to remember that what happened at Wiriyama on December 16, 1972, was not an isolated incident in any respect. The African people have been subjected to slaughter, torture, starvation, physical, and mental abuse since the first Portuguese settlers arrived on the continent. Genocide is not a word which I use lightly or rhetorically. But genocide is the name which must be applied to Portuguese policies in southern Africa.

In recent years, the Portuguese Army has used napalm, defoliants, and bombs to obliterate the lives of the African people. The methods and the material may be more sophisticated than they have been in the past, but the goal has remained constant for centuries—genocide.

Mr. Speaker, Catholic clergy have testified to personal knowledge of Portuguese-perpetrated slaughters. They felt that they could no longer remain silent, and they have received support for their position from the Pope.

The Portuguese Embassy has sent every Member of Congress a press release dated July 19, 1973. Mr. Speaker, the Embassy's statement never denies that the massacre occurred. Instead, it relates newsmen's accounts of the difficulty of locating the precise site of the massacre. The Portuguese Government apparently has not asked its own soldiers where the slaughter occurred. I suggest that they discuss this matter among themselves before sending another communication to the U.S. Congress.

The Mozambique Liberation Front—Frelimo—has issued a statement which places the Wiriyama massacre in the proper context. The only context is that of Portuguese policy toward the African citizens. It is a policy of genocide—almost beyond comprehension in its brutality.

I would like my colleagues to read Frelimo's statement for themselves. I, therefore, include it below:

PRESS STATEMENT

World attention has recently been focused—with a mixture of horror and indignation—on a report by Spanish and British priests describing the massacre by Portuguese troops of about 400 Mozambican civilians in a village in Tete Province.

While welcoming the international denunciation and condemnation of this genocidal act, the Mozambique Liberation Front wishes to point out that this massacre must not be seen in isolation. In fact, massacres are the common practice of the Portuguese troops in Mozambique, they are inherent to the Portuguese colonial system. As early as 1960, more than 500 villagers from Mueda in Northern Mozambique, were slaughtered with grenades and machine-gun fire as, in a peaceful demonstration, they demanded independence from the Portuguese authorities.

Time and again, FRELIMO has published detailed reports of many other large-scale Portuguese atrocities against the Mozambican people. These reports—some of which have been presented periodically to the U.N. Commission of Human Rights—describe the bombing and destruction of whole villages, plundering, forced removal of population, the torture and murder of prisoners of war, and the use by the Portuguese army of chemical weapons in the liberated areas. Let us recall just a few cases:—

In June, 1970, the Portuguese troops arrived in the village of Joao, in Tete Province, gathered everybody they could find (about 60 people, among them children), and told them dig a big hole "for us to hide from the bandits". The people, unaware, obeyed. At a certain point the Portuguese told the people to enter into the hole "to see if all of us will fit into it". The hole was still not big enough. The people enlarged it. Then the soldiers said: "Let us try again". The people entered again, and now there was room for all. When our people were inside, the Portuguese started shooting at them. They killed all 60 Mozambicans and buried them in the hole.

In another village, in Xidecunde, in February 1972, the Portuguese soldiers locked 16 people—men, women (some with babies) and children—in a house and threw grenades inside. 15 people were killed—among them 4 pregnant women and 6 babies. Only one woman survived, with the loss of an arm, blown off by the grenade.

On September 28, 1972, in Angonia, Tete, the Portuguese locked up about 30 people inside a house, set fire to the house and burnt all of them to death. The people were accused of knowing the hide-outs of the FRELIMO guerrillas.

In early December, 1972, as a reprisal against FRELIMO's successful attack against the town of Tete, the Portuguese troops rounded up the neighbouring villagers and arrested 60 people. They were locked inside a house and burnt to death.

In May, 1973, Rhodesian troops in Mucumbura massacred 15 people from a village. They took others away in their helicopters, and they were never seen again.

By the end of 1971, Portuguese soldiers in Tete ordered civilians to leave their villages and the day when they were on their way to other places, they were attacked by helicopters and savagely slaughtered. On that occasion, several mothers were caught with their children and forced by the Portuguese troops to crush their babies in mortars. (Reported also in the South African newspaper The Star, November 6, 1971).

In our reports we have also denounced an infamous practice which has become common among Portuguese soldiers: killing all pregnant women by ripping open their abdomens with bayonets to take out the fetus in order, in their own words, "to prevent the birth of new terrorists". Sometimes they placed explosives inside the woman's dead body as a booby-trap, to kill other villagers when they bury her.

More recently other voices have also been raised in Mozambique, especially those of priests, condemning these crimes. We recall the overwhelming evidence given by the White Fathers Missionary Congregation, who decided to leave Mozambique in May, 1971, appalled by the crimes and torture inflicted on Mozambicans. In October, 1972, a Portuguese priest, Father Afonso da Costa, revealed in a Press Conference in Europe, after being expelled from Mozambique, that he had irrefutable information that over one thousand Mozambican civilians had been massacred in Tete Province alone, between March 1971 and May 1972.

The colonial repression is worsening and spares no one. In June, 1972, 1800 people were arrested in Southern Mozambique, on the grounds that they had contacts with or were working for FRELIMO. In January, 1973, two priests were jailed and sentenced by a military court to terms of 5 months and 20 months respectively, charged with having denounced the atrocities of the Portuguese army. In mid-June, 1972, 30 African Presbyterian church leaders were arrested and jailed; two of them, the Head of the Presbyterian Church in Mozambique, and a member of a local Church Council, were murdered in jail. In announcing their deaths in December, 1972, the colonial authorities alleged that they had "committed suicide".

One does not need to look too far to find the reasons for these acts. It is sufficient to quote the words of the Commander-in-Chief of the Portuguese army in Mozambique, General Kaulza de Arriaga. He has said that "the Portuguese strategy in Africa should be aimed at achieving an equilibrium between the black and white population". After having hailed the export of slaves to Brazil as a good thing, he put forward the present aims of Portuguese action: "on the one hand, the growth of the white population; on the other, the limitation of the black population". He could not have been more explicit.

It is, therefore, this fascist policy of genocide combined with the desperation of the colonialist troops who are suffering defeat after defeat in their war against the Mozambican people, which is the root cause of these bestial acts.

This is the context in which the atrocities denounced by the Spanish and British priests should be seen.

Several times we have expressed our regret that the world conscience, the peace and freedom-loving people, have not played as effective a role as they both could and should have done in denouncing and condemning Portuguese colonialism. It is our earnest hope that the world-wide reaction to the recently revealed crimes of the Portuguese colonial army is an indication of a growing awareness of the true nature of Portuguese colonialism and of the imperative need to oppose and combat it.

COMMISSION ON THE REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL POLICY TOWARD GAMBLING

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Treasury-Postal Services appropriations bill is before the House on Wednesday, I intend to offer an amendment to add

$356,000 to finance the Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling.

The Commission was established prospectively by Public Law 91-452 on October 15, 1970, to become active 2 years after the effective date of that act. The purpose of the Commission is to review the effectiveness of law enforcement practices in controlling and taxing gambling activities, to prepare a study of existing statutes relating to gambling in the United States, and consider and make recommendations on the changing of laws, statutes, and practices regarding gambling. The statutory mandate requires that the Commission make appropriate recommendations for legislation and administrative action to the President and the Congress of the United States. The Commission may make special interim reports as it deems advisable and must make a final report within the 4-year period following its establishment. The Commission terminates 60 days after the submission of the final report.

The Commission comprises 15 members, 4 of whom were appointed by the Speaker of the House, 4 by the President of the Senate, and the remaining 7 by the President. The following is a list of the members of the Commission and the dates of their appointments to the Commission:

COMMISSION TO REVIEW THE NATIONAL POLICY TOWARD GAMBLING

MEMBERSHIP

Senator John L. McClellan (D. Ark.).*
Senator Howard W. Cannon (D. Nev.).*
Senator Marlow W. Cook (R. Ky.).*
Senator Edward J. Gurney (R. Fla.).*
Congressman Lawrence J. Hogan (R. Md.).*
Congressman John E. Hunt (R. N.J.).**
Congressman James M. Hanley (D. N.Y.).*
Congressman Charles J. Carney (D. Ohio).***

The public members were appointed by the President on December 23, 1972.

Chairman—Charles H. Morin, Wayland, Massachusetts. Attorney, Colson & Shapiro, Washington, D.C.

James M. Coleman, Jr., Asbury Park, New Jersey. Attorney, Prosecutor of Monmouth County, N.J.

David D. Dowd, Jr., Massillon, Ohio. Prosecuting Attorney, Stark County, Ohio.

Ethel D. Allen, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Physician and Surgeon, City Councilwoman, 5th District, Pennsylvania.

Joseph A. Gimma, New York, New York. Partner, Hornblower & Weeks-Hemphill, Noyes, Chairman New York State Racing Commission, New York.

Robert List, Carson City, Nevada. Attorney General, State of Nevada.

Charles F. Phillips, Jr., Lexington, Virginia. Professor of Economics, Washington and Lee University, Virginia.

To support the Commissioners in their work a professional staff is presently being assembled. The staff will include an executive director, deputy director, a general counsel and representatives from law enforcement, as well as the social sciences, the number of which will be limited to budget ceilings.

The Office of Management and Budget has recommended an appropriation of $356,000 for the Commission in fiscal year 1974.

*appointed 9/6/72.
**appointed 10/5/72.
***appointed 2/73.

Budget analysis—OMB proposal

11.1 Permanent positions	$207,000
11.3 Positions other than permanent	--------
11.5 Other personnal compensation	4,000
12.1 Personnel benefits	21,000
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons	31,000
23.0 Rent, communications and utilities	7,000
24.0 Printing and reproduction	15,000
25.0 Other services	60,000
26.0 Supplies and materials	4,000
31.0 Equipment	7,000
99.0 Total	356,000

There is a widespread call for decriminalization of gambling as a victimless crime. Apart from philosophical or religious considerations, two major lines of argument are offered to justify change: First, to raise public revenue and second, to cut down profits going to organized crime.

The widespread interest in the various States is reflected by an increasing public acceptance of legalization. For example, referendums by a margin of 7 to 1—New Jersey, Ohio, New Hampshire, Maryland, Washington, Iowa, and Montana. Presently eight States have lotteries in operation. New York City, three New York counties, and Connecticut either have or are considering off-track betting. Thirty States have horse racing and 10 State have dog racing. Nevada has casinos and slot machines. California has card parlors, and many States allow bingo and raffles for charitable purposes.

In the near future 14 States are actively considering lotteries; 5 States are actively considering sports pool betting, and many other States are studying casinos, off-track betting, specialized race betting schemes such as the exacta and daily numbers game. It has been forecast that within the next 5 to 10 years 30 States will have lotteries. Many others will legalize bingo and raffles, some will legalize sports betting, numbers, and off-track betting, and several others are considering established casinos.

Presently in the States 56 percent of our population are exposed to lotteries and 85 percent of our population are now exposed to some form of legalized gambling.

The Commission was created by the organized crime statute which Congress passed in 1970 to take stock of where our Nation is and what directions it should take in the future regarding this critical social issue of gambling. The Commission must necessarily decide whether the existing statutes of the United States are in need of change, and must necessarily further decide whether the present Federal statutory and regulatory scheme should be continued. For example, there are existing Federal statutes which outlaw some of the current practices of the States and by the news media. It must determine, among other things, whether the States should retain the right to decide upon the legality of gambling.

In addition, it will be necessary to review the existing practices in law enforcement and judicial administration regarding the existing statutes in both this country and in foreign jurisdictions and to make an interim report to the President and the Congress in the fall of 1974. This interim report will provide the basis for additional public hearings to be held on the recommendations of the Commission allowing the final report to reflect an awareness of the reaction of the public to the recommendations.

In short, it will be the work of the Commission to discover the attitudes of law enforcement agencies and the general public to its recommendations and then to provide the meaningful data upon which the public may ultimately concern itself regarding this social issue.

It is further anticipated that there be a second interim report reflecting those attitudes in the fall of 1975. Therefore, the work of the Commission must be finished by October of 1976, and to be of real meaning to the President and the Congress, it should be finished by December of 1975. Thus, it is necessary to assemble the mechanical means of accomplishing the Commission's work as soon as possible.

As a member of this Commission, I think it is appropriate to discuss some of the proposals which are presently under consideration for this Commission. These proposals generally are to conduct a national survey of law enforcement to determine the effectiveness of the existing practices regarding enforcement of gambling laws through criminal enforcement procedures.

In addition, we are to examine the existing practices of the various States regarding the revenue aspects of taxation of gambling. Further, it would appear that it is necessary to study the existing attitudes of the various States which prohibit and/or allow certain gambling practices. The Commission may well find it necessary to propose uniform State laws as an ultimate recommendation.

To guide States which are considering widening legal gambling the Commission must prepare a study of the revenue which is available through the various legalized experiences in this country, compare that with the experiences of foreign jurisdictions and ultimately be prepared to comment upon the revenue impact of State-run legalized gambling, as well as the national advisability of such activity.

It is submitted that many of these States are desperately crying for leadership on behalf of the Federal Government to provide the answers to many questions regarding both revenue and the effect upon law enforcement and its conversant effects upon the social mores of their population. In contemplating a State lottery, for example, States want to raise revenue? Does it stop illegal gambling? How do costs compare with results?

Presently there exists principle conflicts between the Federal laws and regulations and many of these activities in the States. Specially, excise taxes, the Federal Communications Commission laws of the Postal Service and the criminal Code of the United States, title 18 as enforced by the Justice Department, provide real violations which are presently being corrected by the States in order to carry out their legalized gambling functions. It is submitted that these conflicts must be resolved.

The Commission is further to study the effectiveness of the Federal statutes as they exist. This Commission was purposely delayed for a 2-year period in order to allow its study to encompass a new gambling statute—title 18, U.S.C., 1955—which was passed concurrently by Congress with the statute creating the Commission. The last statute completed the cycle of Federal involvement and made gambling jurisdiction of the Federal Government concurrent with that of the States.

The Commission must study the effectiveness of these Federal statutes, not only in terms of their possible infringement upon the States, but also in terms of the cost of the Federal enforcement prohibiting gambling. This cost must be weighed against the ultimate resulting effect in terms of tax dollars spent. The effectiveness must include the need to consider statutory alternatives, such as changes in our methods of taxation of gambling activity. No one really knows how much income organized crime receives from gambling. The corruption of police and public officials by gamblers is another important concern.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is vitally important to the Nation that this Commission begin its work. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to appropriate $356,000 for fiscal year 1974 for the work of this Commission.

WASHINGTON REPORT

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, herewith is my July Washington report and results of the Minshall opinion poll:

WASHINGTON REPORT, JULY 1973

Watergate: The Ship of State Sails On . . . Despite the pervasiveness of the issue and contrary to doom-criers who sell short the sea-worthiness of our Constitution in times of crisis, the Watergate flood has not capsized our government—nor will it. Though it rocks the boat temporarily, as witness the dollar fluctuation abroad, the end result hopefully will be to irrigate some long arid acres of thought in the Nation's Capitol . . . The Watergate flood should bring about a welcome harvest of reforms—not only in campaign practices, but in a return of constitutional powers to the Congress which, over the last 40 years, paved the way to Watergate by abrogating more and more of its responsibilities to the White House.

Congress Is Hard At Work, far less distracted from its duties by Watergate than headlines would have you believe. Nearly 400 votes and quorum calls have been recorded in the House of Representatives alone as we pause for a breather at the midway mark of the First Session. Capitol Hill's hive of committees is buzzing with legislative activity: restructuring of foreign aid, compaign and election reforms, import quotas, investigations of the energy crisis, environmental issues, tax reform and dozens of other important matters, all either under study or due for committee hearings this year. My Defense Appropriations Subcommittee continues to meet in day-long sessions that will go on well into late autumn.

Silver Lining Department—Despite our problems, Americans have much for which to be grateful. Never before in this century has the outlook been brighter for world peace. Long-time enemies are beginning to communicate for the first time in years and a heartening spirit of detente marks the new relationships between the United States and China, the United States and the Soviet Union, Japan and China, India and Pakistan, East and West Germany, North and South Korea—even North and South Vietnam are at least talking to each other . . . At home, the shadows of war and the draft have been lifted from the lives of our youth, with Selective Service mothballed for the first time since 1947 . . . And, despite inflation, Americans are more affluent than ever before. Employment has risen by 4.4 million since the Administration launched its new economic policies in 1971, the largest 21-month increase in history, more than double the long-term average. Per capital disposable real income, the amount left over after taxes and adjustments for inflation, is up 7.5%, twice the long-term average. Total output, up 11.5% since August 1971 shows the most rapid growth rate over a comparable period in the last two decades.

Phase 4, essentially a re-run of Phase 2, will embody much the same controls that helped dampen inflation between November 1971 and January 1973. Voluntary controls, under Phase 3, proved disastrous, ended June 13th when the President clamped a 60-day price freeze that will be supplanted by Phase 4 August 12th. Phase 4 will continue the 5.5—guideline for wage increases, require Cost of Living Council approval for price increases by major business and industry, and will add new price ceilings on gasoline, heating oil and diesel fuel. However, the freeze on all food prices but beef was lifted in an effort to prevent future food shortages and even prices later on. Either your pocketbook or your market basket will be somewhat lighter in the next few weeks, but on September 12th the entire food industry will be brought under the same Phase 4 controls as all other sectors of the economy . . . Any system of controls is full of uncertainties. Even though Phase 4 is mandatory, its success still will depend to a great extent on compliance by business, labor and consumers. I am pleased that the Phase 4 package contained no request for an anti-inflationary tax increase—instead *the Administration is placing heavy emphasis, as am I, on holding down Federal spending, right down the line.* When Americans are asked to pull in their budgetary belts to fight inflation, the Federal Government should certainly do the same.

Reminder: In addition to my Federal Building office, I have two other locations in the 23rd District to serve you—9 to 1, Mondays through Saturdays, at 20939 Lorain Road, Fairview Park, telephone 333-9936, and 1 to 4 every Tuesday at North Royalton City Hall, 13834 Ridge Road, telephone 237-5686. The latter is through the cooperation of Mayor Harry E. Loder, Jr.

See the U.S.A. on the first new map of the coterminous (lower 48) States published by the Geological Survey since 1961. Scale 1 inch to 40 miles, this six color map measures 54x80, in two sections, has inserts of Hawaii, Alaska and territories. Plain or buff background. Send $2.00 in check or money order to: U.S. Geological Survey, Washington, D.C., 20244, and allow a week to 10 days for processing.

Thanks to all the nearly 20,000 of you who answered the Minshall Opinion Poll. Results are on the reverse side of this newsletter.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL RESULTS

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you believe:			
(a) The President had prior knowledge of the Watergate break-in?	36.4	47.6	16.0
(b) The President knew of or participated in the cover-up?	64.2	23.2	12.6
2. Do you think the President has done a good job in foreign affairs?	73.6	16.0	10.4
3. Has he done a good job handling domestic affairs?	25.6	63.8	10.6
4. Should Congress further curtail spending to slow inflation?	78.0	10.0	12.0
5. If Congress does not keep within the budget ceiling, should the President refuse to spend the funds?	67.0	17.6	15.4
6. Phase 4 economic controls, due in August, are under study by the administration. Do you favor controls on:			
(a) Food prices	69.0	17.4	13.6
(b) Rent	65.0	19.0	16.0
(c) Wearing apparel	60.8	25.8	13.4
(d) Petroleum products	72.4	16.6	11.0
(e) Home appliances	57.4	27.8	14.8
(f) Interest rates	65.4	23.0	11.6
(g) Corporate profits	64.0	24.6	11.
(h) Wages	59.8	27.0	13.2
7. If both sides honor the peace agreement, do you approve of U.S. aid to Indochina, including North Vietnam, for reconstruction purposes?	17.2	74.2	8.6

	Percent
8. What is the most important issue facing the Nation today?	
(1) The economy	50.2
(2) Watergate	32.6
(3) Law and order	4.4
(4) Biased news media	1.8
(5) The environment	1.2
(6) Indochina	.8
(7) Miscellaneous	5.0
No opinion	4.0

VOTES ON THE MINIMUM WAGE GIVE ANSWER TO CRYING NEED

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees have agreed on the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1973 to increase the minimum wage to $2.20 an hour.

I supported the minimum wage increase in the Education and Labor Committee and on the House floor.

A recent editorial in the Miami Herald closely reflects my own reasons for supporting this legislation to allow people to work their way out of poverty.

I urge President Nixon to sign this fair wage increase into law.

The editorial follows:

[From the Miami Herald, July 23, 1973]

VOTES ON THE MINIMUM WAGE GIVE ANSWER TO CRYING NEED

Looking through the want ads and trying to find a handyman or a maid might cause some persons to discount the action of Congress on the minimum wage as a matter affecting very few people. Who in the world would be working today for $1.60 an hour, with everybody begging for help?

The answer is a great number, more perhaps than we realize, say employment officials, though unfortunately they did not offer precise figures. Many of the jobs in that proliferation of want ads, for example, pay only $1.60 an hour. What Congress proposes to do is raise the floor to $2.20 over a period of time, perhaps as early as 14 months. This then will boost the earnings, through the ripple effect, not only of persons making the minimum but those now making more. For if the lowest man on the wage ladder gets a boost, so must the man on the second rung, and the third.

The result, warned opponents, will be more unemployment plus more inflation, which shortly will discount the working man's gains. That is one side of the long and bitter battle waged in Congress over the increased minimum wage, which both House and Senate have approved. It now goes to conference but may be vetoed by the President.

The other side argued that the economy would be stimulated by the measure, which not only raises the minimum but extends the protection to millions not currently covered and eliminates overtime exemptions in many categories.

It is well to bear in mind what the figures mean in weekly earnings. At the present minimum wage, a worker earns but $64 a week, or $3,328 a year. If he is supporting a wife and two children on that, he is deep in officially defined poverty. At the rate of $2.20 he would be making only $88 a week, or $4,576 a year. That would put a family of four barely above the poverty level.

Many on welfare today are people who work but do not make sufficient earnings to support their families. Raising the minimum and applying it to more people would move the nation closer to much needed welfare reform.

The objection about the over-all effect on the economy and the threat of inflation was answered adequately, we think, by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. It said it "does not believe that a successful anti-inflation program depends upon keeping the income of millions of American workers below officially established poverty levels."

HOW TO MAKE IT HAPPEN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. C. Wilson, president and chief executive officer, Collins Radio, participated in a panel at the 19th annual meeting of the American Astronautical Society in Dallas, Tex. On June 21, 1973. Because of the importance of his comments, I am including his address in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and the general public:

ADDRESS OF R. C. WILSON

It is a great pleasure to meet here with leaders in astronautics from around the world in this 19th annual meeting of the American Astronautical Society. The rich cultural and geographic diversity represented by the participants in this three-day gathering is symbolic, I think, of the global benefits that only a few farsighted observers could foresee even a decade or two ago.

In the last century, Alfred Lord Tennyson glimpsed such a future in his poem, Locksley Hall, when he wrote:

"For I dipt into the future, far as human eye
could see,
Saw the vision of the world, and all the
wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies
of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down
with costly bales."

Today the air commerce that Tennyson envisioned is a basic way of life, even though the critics and the skeptics in the early years of aviation could visualize no practical benefits to mankind. Air travel is today being supplemented by benefits from our activities in outer space—truly a realization of the benefits that Tennyson foretold.

The contribution of our investments in space to the welfare of mankind are currently substantial and will increase significantly with time. The members of this audience can appreciate the enrichment of life on earth that will ensue—however, a recent series of interviews with the man on the street here in Dallas confirmed the fact that the average citizen has little understanding or appreciation of the space program. Specifically the space laboratory has considered to be a waste of taxpayers money—and there appeared to be a common feeling that the same money could have been much more effectively spent on welfare or social programs here on earth.

Ultimately we must convince the peoples of the world that space represent a good investment of current dollars. In order to do so, they must be first informed and, more importantly, convinced. This will require that all of us who so ardently believe in space take the initiative in presenting the "case for space" to the public in simple down-to-earth terms—and even more importantly that we take the initiative to provide them with the goods and services that bring them personally into contact with the benefits from space investments.

Today I'd like to attempt to cover two areas of benefits from space—and to present those benefits in terms that are salable. The two areas are communication and navigation. Through our history the progress of mankind has been closely related to these two fields. The effective utilization of space potential provides for major advances in both fields.

First let's talk about communication. This history of the world is full of the violence of man against man. Much of this violence came about because of a lack of communication, only a few hundred years ago even the next town was too far away for understanding to develop.

As a result, city fought city and state fought state, as communication improved, so did understanding. In my opinion, the greatest single contribution of the space program has been its message to the people of the world that all of us mortals share a fragile perch in space.

Who can ever forget the impact of Sputnik I, beeping its way over the world, or the first views of the earth from the moon? Suddenly all of humanity could see how small spaceship earth really is and how interdependent are all of its passengers.

Surely these dramatic communications startled even the most hostile mentality and caused it to reflect soberly on the need for cooperation among mankind. In my opinion much of the progress that has been made toward peace on earth has been due to that awesome message from space.

On a less philosophical plane there has been a continuing progress in communication from one country to another. The televising of the Olympic Games from Mexico in 1968 was an international love-in. Who can forget the emotion of the closing ceremonies when the packed stands sang La Golondrina—the Mexican "Home Sweet Home"—while the athletes from all over the world danced and laughed together. How could anyone who saw tiny Olga Korbut perform so magnificiently for Russia in the 1972 games withstand her captivating charm? President Nixon's recent visit to Red China gave most Americans a completely different and more favorable impression of China and its people than any they had had before.

In America the advent of national television was a major factor in enabling all of us to see our country in perspective and then to initiate long-overdue reforms. Today the promise of satellite communications is that of providing instant live pictures and voice communications to even the most remote and underdeveloped corners of the globe. In a way, globe space communications are analogous to the advent of mass television in the United States. Surely international social, economic and political reform will progress as a result of this escalation in understanding. It is one thing to read a reporter's view of the news and quite another to see and hear the actual happenings for yourself. There can be no question but that the understanding among peoples will grow rapidly and the probability of conflict will lessen as a result of space communications.

On still another aspect of space communication—it will permit economically feasible communications within underdeveloped countries who cannot afford the vast investment required to duplicate a bell system. The effects in terms of the quality of life may be gauged by one, among many, global problems—the threat of overpopulation. Here communication—the transmission of birth control information—is crucial. Today we have the potential capability to communicate with all of the world's people. Our previous investments in space have made this possible.

Before passing the social-political implications of space communications, it may be well to point out that reliable "hot lines" between heads of state may serve as the final factors in heading off a new world war, and I would point out the obvious international ties that will be strengthened by the apollo-soyuz program between the United States and the Soviet Union to rendezvous and dock spacecraft in 1975. It is a measure of the progress in understanding that has been developed between the people of the two countries—achieved partly through our space investment—that a joint space program was not widely accepted in both countries when it was first proposed by President Kennedy, but is today an approaching reality. A recent Gallup survey shows the dramatic improvement that has taken place in the manner in which Americans view Russia. Let me quote some statistics:

In 1954—less than two decades ago, 75 percent of those Americans questioned held a highly unfavorable view of Russia. Today this has been reduced to only 30 percent.

In the same span of time those with highly favorable opinions of Russia increased from 1 percent to 21 percent.

And all those holding favorable views in varying degrees increased from 5 percent to 34 percent.

While all of this improvement in attitude cannot be attributed to space communications, they have certainly played a key role in facilitaing this dramatic change.

Surely the benefit from space in the one field of human togetherness has already given a value equal to many times the cost of the total space program. However, if that isn't enough, there are very substantial economic benefits to the United States and to the world

The telecommunications field is growing rapidly throughout the world. It's a huge international activity. Annual volume for the principal types of equipment is expected to reach around 14 billions of dollars next year. The increasing economies of communications through space will escalate the growth of that industry. The recent decision of Canada to install a satellite communications system illustrates the point. The cultural enrichment among the peoples of the world can well be imagined. Think, for example, of the Eskimos watching Charles Boyer conducting a tour through the Louvre.

With the passage of time the economics of space communications will continue to improve. The Space Shuttle will make it more economical to put the birds in orbit. The space station may well become a service station for communication satellites. Power supplies will grow even more effective. With increasing capability in the satellites, earth stations will become less costly. The use of microelectronics will provide for highly reliable, secure communications and the use of digital technology for both voice and data will make the total system more efficient.

With all of these factors working together, the worldwide industry growth should exceed anything experienced in the past. No island will be so remote, no ship or airplane so small that it cannot be equipped with an earth terminal. At last, we frustrated sports fans will be able to enjoy live weekend sports on television while flying to the remote corners of the earth.

Truly the economics of the space communication industry will be impressive. We in America who have made the principal investments in space will derive substantial material benefits as well as enjoying the inner satisfaction that can be derived from this splendid contribution to the welfare of the peoples of the world.

The sale of the products and services to equip the communication plant is only the beginning of the benefits that will accrue. Commerce today is multinational and complex. It will grow more so with the passage of time. Think of the economies and efficiencies that will be possible with the instant availability of worldwide data and voice communications. Such communications can permit an industry or a country to manage itself much more efficiently. Decisions can be made more promptly and more confidently on the basis of information easily retrieved and correlated. And by thus quantifying more of the factors that go into a decision, instead of relying on business or political intuition, the risk of failure can be reduced and bolder, more effective decisions can be made

A simple example of what good communications can do is in the logistics of warehousing. If each warehouse must be self-sufficient in the area it serves, the total inventory requirement is much greater than when a number of warehouses supplement each other through well-coordinated communication. Slow-moving items in one location may be fast-movers in another—and stocks can be moved rapidly from one location to satisfy needs in another.

Thus the communications capability provided by satellites will make this a more peaceful, more enjoyable, more prosperous, and more efficient world.

Another facet of space exploration that is not appreciated by most of the world's public is the potential for substantially improving worldwide navigation even though the importance of excellence in navigation has been amply demonstrated throughout the history of mankind.

In the middle ages the first mariners to use a lodestone—or north-seeker—were able to sail in poor visibility when others could not—a telling advantage in commerce or in war. It was the invention not only of the magnetic compass but other navigation aids such as the quadrant and the mariner's astrolab which were prerequisite to the age of exploration in the 15th and 16th centuries. And the man who typifies that age as much as any of the famous explorers was one who never went to sea but who greatly aided the art of navigation—Prince Henry the Navigator.

There has been a steady increase in the need for improved navigation in our modern society as speeds increase and the movement of goods and people escalates. This movement has become so great that our sea lanes and our air lanes have become overcrowded. In order to fully utilize this capacity we need to establish position much more accurately, thus enabling us to utilize more vessels and aircraft with less spacing between them.

For example, if we can double the number of aircraft going across the ocean in a given air corridor, we can avoid the necessity of using longer and less economic routes to achieve the same capacity. Moreover, increased navigational accuracy reduces meandering by the ship or aircraft thus shortening the voyage and saving fuel.

Satellites were first proposed as an aid in providing position determination for ships in a story written by E. E. Hale in 1873 entitled, "The Brick Moon." Hale envisioned a system of four 200-foot diameter spherical satellites placed 4,000 nautical miles above the earth in circular polar orbits.

Although the scheme visualized by Hale was not practical, we do today have the technical capability to provide accurate navigation from space. Let's consider some of the benefits. The present world fleet of Boeing 747's amounts to 200 aircraft. If improved navigation can save one minute—one flying minute—out of every hour, the saving would amount to 10,000 flying hours per year for a saving of over $12 million. The fuel saved would provide the electrical energy requirements for a city of about ¾ million people per year.

Again the world's civil airlines flew nearly 4½ billion miles in 1972. If improved navigation could reduce that by one-sixtieth, it would mean 75 million fewer miles would have to be traveled to deliver the same number of passengers and same amount of freight. In fuel costs and in the number of aircraft required, this would mean a very substantial saving.

The FAA tells us that the air carrier delay costs in the United States were $157 million in 1969, and those will increase to over a billion dollars in 1982. Improved navigation can reduce those delay costs, to say nothing of the improvement that will take place in the dispositions of the air travelers. It is intolerable to contemplate the FAA's projection that the peak hour delays of 20 to 60 minutes at key terminals will increase to over two hours by 1982 unless substantial improvement is made in navigation.

On the oceans, forecasts of the increased traffic make it imperative that more accurate navigation methods be developed not only to facilitate the flow of goods and services but to avoid accidents.

Only seven years ago the total volume of petroleum transported by tanker was less than one billion tons per year. Ten years from now it is expected to exceed 13 trillion tons.

Even today we are witnessing unacceptable accident levels. During fiscal 1972 more than 1,300 vessels of more than 300 tons each were involved in collisions or groundings. The disastrous grounding of the *Torrey Canyon* in 1967 focused public attention on the rising danger from collision or stranding of vessels carrying hazardous materials. A major part of the solution lies in improved navigational accuracy. Already the *Queen Elizabeth II*, using navigational aid from NAVSAT, has obtained positional accuracy within the length of the vessel, or approximately 1,000 feet. Her captain has said that this increased navigational accuracy by satellite has meant a saving of $40,000 worth of fuel per year.

Even this kind of accuracy will doubtless improve with time. With such accuracy we can quickly see the possibilities, both in increased traffic and safety. In safety, in avoidance of delay, in the increased utilization of equipment, in reduced use of fuel and materials resources, savings can be effected.

Let's take just one small facet. The American Maritime Administration estimates that celestial position fixing involves 380 hours annually per ship. On a United States flag ship, this represents about $2,800. The commission has estimated that the yearly benefit that idealistically could be achieved by 1975, using automated satellite-derived navigation information, is between $600 thousand and $1.4 million for all U.S. ships.

In the world of pleasure boating and pleasure flying safety and economy can be substantially improved. Rescue operations of all kinds can be greatly facilitated by the ability to quickly and accurately locate the aircraft, ship, or exploration party that is in trouble.

In the realm of ecology, it may be possible to establish a system to rapidly and accurately locate forest fires in their early stages. Prompt action can be taken to extinguish them with resultant savings to our economy and to our environment.

In summary, it is my belief that the benefits to mankind from improved communications and navigation will prove to be far greater than all of the money expended to date on space programs. The story on communications benefits alone is imperative and should be readily saleable throughout the world. Our selling job will become ever easier as time goes by and coordinated efforts by Government and industry provide continually improving communications capability. People will be able to directly relate to space communication advantages. To Americans, the nightly weather forecast on television is not complete without a satellite picture of the weather formations. An increasing percentage of the world's population will have daily, tangible reminders of the benefits of space communication. The appeal of these improved communications can be universal and can be sold to all segments of our population from the loftiest philosophers and most dedicated scientists to the teenagers in Korea who want to watch the Rolling Stones.

The potential benefits from navigation are also very substantial. However, unlike communications, they are not available here and now. While we can do a good selling job in the abstract, it will take action to make the benefits real and thus to really convince the public. The first action which appears vitally needed is a government decision to establish an effective operating satellite navigation system. Industry must then provide the hardware and software that will give tangible benefits to a broad cross section of people from air travelers to weekend sailors and nature lovers.

In my opening comments, I indicated that in order to make it happen we needed to convince the public of the value of space investments through down-to-earth selling and through the development of the tangible benefits to which people can relate. Additional research and quantification would permit the formulation of a much harder hitting merchandising presentation than I have been able to present today. This association may wish to undertake a project of putting together the total story of space benefits—and translating them into languages that appeal to various elements of our population in earthly terms.

Even more important than a selling job is the active development of appropriate goods and services. Through our combined efforts, in concert with our governments, we can expand present capability and provide new benefits. Surely it is within our combined capability—let's take the necessary actions—let's make it happen.

NEW CITY GOVERNMENT FOR WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, today 15 of my colleagues on the District Committee and I have the privilege of introducing a clean bill, H.R. 9682, the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act.

After 6 months of intensive work by the Subcommittee on Government Operations, chaired by my distinguished colleague from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) and an additional month of extensive markup by the full committee, this bill represents a comprehensive proposal for major reforms in the operation of the District's government as well as providing self-government for the residents of the city.

The key provisions of H.R. 9682 are:

First. An elected Mayor and City Council composed of 13 members;

Second. Establishment of a high-level commission for the consideration of appointment of judges;

Third. Significant incorporation of many recommendations of the Nelsen Commission including:

Establishment of the National Capital Planning Commission as the central planning agency for the metropolitan area.

Transfer of the Redevelopment Land Agency and the National Capital Housing Authority to the city government.

Establishment of a comprehensive financial management system for all governmental operations.

Fourth. Provides a multiyear authorization in amounts appropriated by Congress for a lump-sum Federal payment.

Fifth. Grants to the city for the first time the authority to borrow funds outside of the Department of the Treasury.

Sixth. Prohibits the taxation of personal income of nonresidents—commuter tax.

While this bill grants to the city the power to control local problems and local issues, the bill affirms the constitutional power of Congress to legislate at any time with respect to the District of Columbia.

I am pleased to introduce this bill with the solid support of most of my colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee.

This support is occasioned by the hard work of the committee and the full and comprehensive analysis of all problems and issues which a self-determination measure initially encompasses. This bill is a result of much deliberation and compromise and it is my feeling that most points of view and alternatives have been aired and, to the extent possible, reflected in this piece of legislation.

I appeal to all Members of this House to examine closely this bill and am hopeful that such examination will lead to a respect for the theory and thrust of the bill and will lead to swift passage by this House.

ANNUAL MUSIC CAMP AT EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to share with my colleagues an article on the annual Stephen Collins Foster Music Camp held at Eastern Kentucky University. This account appeared in the London, Ky., Sentinel-Echo for July 12, 1973.

Camps, such as that held at Eastern, give young people an opportunity to learn a broad range of musical skills and to benefit from the expert advice of college-level instructors. Each participant is also given a chance to study that aspect of music most interesting to him, whether it be woodwind ensembles, brass, or percussion arrangements.

In sponsoring this 38th annual retreat, Eastern Kentucky University continues its fine record of public service. In challenging young minds, it helps create a greater interest in the quest for knowledge, and in showing high school age youth a glimpse at univeristy life, their entrance into the world of higher education will be made a little easier.

The article follows:

FOSTER MUSIC CAMPERS MIX WORK AND PLAY

(By Fawn Conley)

Summer is traditionally a time for kids to relax and recuperate from the rigors of school. But for the students who are attending the 38th annual Stephen Collins Foster Music Camp at Eastern Kentucky University, the classes and work are not quite over.

High school students from all over, including Hawaii and Germany, come to the camp to learn about music and work with college faculty members. Some say the camp isn't exactly what they expected, while others know how much work it was going to be.

The days for the campers start at 7 a.m., with reveille and a general clean-up of rooms. Breakfast is next at 7:30, but the real work starts at 8:30 when rehearsals begin for the band members.

After a two-and-a-half hour workout with camp director John C. Lawson, who is also an assistant professor of music at EKU, the students go to class, on a volunteer basis. The class is music fundamentals, or theory class, according to the campers.

"It used to be required," said Mr. Lawson, commenting in the class. "But we'd rather have a class of 12 interested students than 25 who were not," explaining why the class is no longer mandatory.

Tammy Moores, a sophomore-to-be at Richmond's Madison Central High School, says she goes because she is interested in music. A trumpet player, Miss Moores goes to all the classes because she hopes to major in music when she comes to college at EKU.

Although she had grown up hearing about the camp while living in Richmond, she was not really prepared for all the work that goes along with the camp. But, she says, "It's worth it. I'm learning a lot." Miss Moores also feels that the camp is a "lot more fun" than school.

The rest of a camper's day goes something like this: theory classes last for an hour-and-forty-five minutes, then there is a break for lunch.

After lunch it's back to work again with rehearsals for the small ensembles and the orchestra woodwind sectionals, on alternating days. The orchestra practices for an hour-and-a-half in the afternoon and then there is the chamber music group, for all who are interested in that sort of thing.

There is a little time for relaxation, however, from 3:30 to 5 in the afternoon. This time is scheduled for recreation, which could mean a trip to downtown Richmond with special permission, or a trip to the campus bookstore to look for an EKU sweatshirt or jersey to take home as a souvenir of a month of hard work.

Dinner comes next, with stage band rehearsals following that from 6 to 7:30 in the evening. Then, the evening program goes into effect, which includes everything from swimming parties to volleyball games with the music faculty, which the students won. There was also a softball game the first week, which the instructors won.

Other evening events include concerts, recitals or trips which the students are required to attend.

Saturdays are much the same as other days at the Foster Music Camp. There is no sleeping late for the orchestra or band who alternate early morning rehearsals every week. Whoever gets the early bid one week, gets to sleep an extra two hours the next week before going to rehearsal.

Usually summer means a chance for school aged kids to swim, get a good tan, play some tennis or just catch up on some much needed sleep. But for Foster Music Camp students summer means a chance to work with college professors, a chance to meet new people and a chance to learn about music.

FISH AND WILDLIFE PLANNING

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, presently the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act—title 16, section 1008—is worked in such a way in respect to giving planning consideration to fish, wildlife and the environment that it is like giving the fox veto authority over the installation of safeguarding mechanisms at the henhouse.

Typically, plan formulation under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act utilizes fish, wildlife and recreation benefits to help justify the project. However, actual projects again do not provide adequate access for these purposes.

I am introducing a bill that will give fish, wildlife and the environment equal consideration with other project objectives during plan formulation and will insure adequate public access to realize the benefits projected during project justification.

I include the full text of this bill in the record:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to incorporate construction and operation measures for the benefit of fish and wildlife resources in works of improvement authorized under that Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1008) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. (a) Construction and operation measures for the benefit of fish and wildlife resources shall be incorporated, in accordance with the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) in works of improvement authorized under this Act. The Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Fish and Game Agency of the State in which such project is located, shall jointly decide on the acceptance or rejection of measures proposed under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act for incorporation into works of improvement.

"(b) Access for fishing, hunting, and other outdoor recreation by the public to reservoirs constructed under this Act shall be provided to insure the maximization of project hunting, fishing, and other outdoor recreation benefits. Less than full public access may be provided in cases where the Secretary and the Secretary of Interior agree that limitation of such access is appropriate and reasonable in accordance with the purposes of this Act and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act."

A VICTIM NATION

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is both frightening and depressing to know that the June 30 estimates of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs figure heroin users now at 626,000 with an estimated cost of $18 million daily to support their addiction. Obviously this must and does lead to crime to support their habit. A special task force report this year submitted to the criminal law section of the American Bar Association and the Drug Abuse Council further concluded:

> The United States has the greatest concentration of heroin addicts in the world and represents the world's most lucrative market for all kinds of opiates.

Two years ago, the Foreign Affairs Committee, responsive as always to congressional concern, provided authority for the President to make the decision to cut off foreign assistance when recipient countries were found remiss in efforts to prevent the unlawful disposal of drugs produced in their country from reaching the United States. Under that amendment the President can cut off foreign aid when he determines that a country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs and other controlled substances—as defined by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention Control Act of 1970—produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to U.S. Government personnel or their dependents, or from entering the United States unlawfully.

Despite the intensity of our drug problem the President has never used this provision, which I believe is an important weapon in the fight to control drug abuse in the United States.

Perhaps some of you saw the newspaper article of a few weeks ago about the Afghan farmers who are harvesting a bumper crop of opium poppies on land newly developed, irrigated, with U.S. foreign aid. No, the money was not intended for that purpose, but that is where it went. The same article mentioned the lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Afghan Government in curbing the growth of the opium poppy or in pushing farmers, traffickers, and smugglers to cease this activity. Supposedly, a "threat" of the removal of foreign aid was transmitted. I do not think that a threat is enough and I think it is time we take decisive action. There are those in this country urging strong penalties for drug traffickers in the United States. I do not see how we can consider such action if we do not deal firmly with those countries which produce the basic ingredient, opium poppies, and then allow trafficking internationally.

The committee bill does offer a large dose of persuasion in the form of financial assistance to countries to help them combat the drug problem; the bill helps them isolate the disease and eliminate the crop that causes it in the amount of $50 million for international narcotics control in each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

But I do not believe that this is enough, it has not proven to be so far, and I believe that those Members of Congress whose constituents are daily victims of drug traffic will recognize the need for and support this legislation. What we have is a national problem, even though some areas of the country may escape the epidemic quality that drug abuse reaches in our large cities.

It seems to me that it is time for straight talking and straight thinking. We have offered these countries a large carrot in assistance and I believe we must back that up with an equally obvious stick. I would hope the President would act more forcefully.

Some will say that this will have no effect on those countries which do not receive foreign aid. That is certainly true, but hardly to the point since two-thirds of the "Golden Triangle," namely, Thailand and Laos both do receive foreign assistance and the Golden Triangle is a major source of opium.

I would ask why we should condone with foreign assistance funds the inability of countries to police illicit drug production, when the results of that failure are felt so severely here in the United States? Do we not encourage such apathy and inefficiency, not to say as we should also, corruption, by our accepting attitude?

Two years ago a gentleman from the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Department of Justice, made a statement I have not forgotten. He told the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that:

> The United States is a victim nation in the heroin traffic. With all the determination and resources of the Government, with all the support of the American people and our State and local police and courts, the problem can never be solved on a completely domestic basis.

And he was so right; we are still a victim nation and only decisive action will change that fact.

A staff survey team of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in January of this year issued a report dealing with United States and Southeast Asian countries efforts against the international drug trafficking. They recommend that the United States continue to "apply diplomatic and economic pressures at the highest levels of government in Southeast Asia to insure that there is no weakening of narcotics suppression efforts which have been started." They also recommended that where conclusive evidence showed high ranking or influential figures involved in narcotics, the U.S. Government should strongly urge those governments to prosecute such individuals more vigorously than has been the case in the past. And then they concluded:

> If these efforts are unsuccessful, the United States should terminate all economic and military assistance to that country.

That is exactly the stand I take today. If these countries do not stem the production and transportation of narcotic drugs, then foreign economic and military aid should be removed. Somehow we must quarantine the American people from further infection with a drug culture which destroys and wastes lives, ravages families, produces crime and corruption, and weakens our society.

FINDINGS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Crime, which was organized in May of 1969, has recently disbanded and issued its final reports. I would like to call the Members' attention to one of these reports, "Drugs in Our Schools."

I believe that drug abuse among our youth is one of the most important issues the committee investigated. In hearings held in New York, Miami, Chicago, Kansas City, San Francisco, and Los Angeles the committee heard testimony concerning the extent to which drugs are being bought, sold, and abused by children of our Nation's schools.

Testimony was heard from public school representatives, media representatives, police, personnel of drug abuse programs, representatives from court systems, students, and various medical, technical, scientific, and social science experts. Both witnesses and members of the committee have described the problem as one that demands the full cooperation of State, local, and Federal governments.

The severity of the drug abuse problem was identified in detail by the committee's examination. Findings show that youth who become involved in drugs come from every racial, religious, socioeconomic, and geographic segment of our society. While there are many reasons why young people experiment with drugs, the most important factors initially are probably peer pressure and curiosity. It seems that young people continue to take drugs because they like the pleasurable sensations that the drugs bring on.

While many young people experiment with drugs and do not become regular users, statistics show that an increasing number of our school-age youth are using large amounts of drugs on a regular basis. A survey sponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health, covering 25 schools located in different areas of the country, indicates that every major section of the country has a serious drug problem among its youth. The surveyed schools ranged from economically deprived inner-city schools to affluent suburban schools, with broad-based student bodies from all major racial, religious, and socioeconomic groups in the country.

According to a 1971 FBI report, narcotic arrests of young people under the age of 19 had increased 765 percent during the preceding 5-year period. In the preceding 3-year period, over 432,000 teenagers had been arrested for crimes involving drugs. In that period, drug arrests among young people increased from 109,000 per year to 172,000 per year. California was the only State in the Nation to show a decrease in youthful drug arrests in the 1969–71 period. In view of these statistics, the need for drug educational and rehabilitational programs became most evident to the members of the committee.

The overproduction of harmful drugs by drug manufacturers, as a factor contributing to drug abuse among young people, soon became a chief concern of the committee. Under investigation, the direct connection between overproduction by legitimate firms of amphetamines, barbiturates, tranquilizers, and other drugs, and the growing problem of drug abuse was revealed. Legitimate companies manufacture 90 percent of the drugs in the illegal market, and there are three to four times as many young people using amphetamines and barbiturates as there are using heroin.

For example, there are only two recognized desirable medical uses for amphetamines—the treatment of narcolespy and hyperkinesis in children, both rare diseases. While only 1 million doses per year are needed for the treatment of these diseases, there were 3 billion amphetamines produced and consumed in the country in 1969. In 1970, the committee introduced legislation to establish quotas on the production of amphetamines, and finally, in 1973 the Government forced manufacturers to cut back their production by 82 percent—even this cutback permits companies to produce a surplus of amphetamines.

Committee investigations revealed that barbiturate abuse is an even more serious problem. There were over 5 billion barbiturates produced in 1970—a 43 percent increase over the prior year. At this level of production, there are enough barbiturates produced to permit everyone in this country to commit suicide twice. As many as 30 percent of the students had used barbiturates in some of the schools studied.

Recently, the Justice Department has rescheduled nine barbiturates, having a high potential for abuse, from schedule III to the more strict controls of schedule II, thereby limiting the quantity that can be legally produced. The committee has further asked the Justice Department to require manufacturers to document an existing medical need for their production levels.

Committee investigation has also revealed a possible connection between drug advertising and drug abuse and has further determined that "there is sufficient reason for a thorough inquiry into the impact of advertising on drug abuse by the young."

Over $211 million is spent annually by drug manufacturers to convince the American public of the importance of drugs in their daily lives. One in every six television advertisements is a drug advertisement—the effect of this advertising on young people is undoubtedly substantial.

The Code Review Board of the National Association of Broadcasters has adopted new guidelines for drug advertising which will go into effect in September 1973. Regardless of the effectiveness of this effort at self-regulation, the committee has recommended that Congress monitor drug advertising to determine the extent to which it may in the future contribute to drug abuse.

In recognition of these problems, the committee has made the following initial and basic recommendations:

First, every school board in the country should develop a well conceived plan directed at ending drug abuse in the schools. Each school district should institute programs of instruction for its teachers whereby the teachers are thoroughly educated in the drug abuse problems germane to the school district and school at which the teacher is employed. In addition, there should be drug abuse counselors for every school which requires them.

Second, the Federal Government should provide funds to assist local school boards in establishing these programs for their schools.

Third, the Federal Government should force manufacturers to cut back their production of certain potentially harmful drugs.

Fourth, Congress should monitor the effectiveness of the voluntary advertising guidelines adopted by the radio and television industry.

Mr. Speaker, the committee's work has provided us with understanding of what is initially needed to begin combatting the drug abuse problem of young people, and further requires that Congress continue to investigate ways in which the Federal Government can aid the efforts of local communities. I urge all Members to give this problem of drug abuse among young people their full attention and consideration.

WESTERN UNION'S MESSAGE: LESS FOR MORE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have just written to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission and the Director of the Cost of Living Council urging them to halt an FCC-approved 25 to 100 percent increase in Western Union telegram and mailgram rates as extremely inflationary and totally unjustified.

A soon-to-be-released study of Western Union and the FCC by my office shows that the Commission has allowed Western Union service to deteriorate steadily in the face of ever-increasing rates and unkept promises for improved performance.

FCC held no public hearings on the latest rate hike, in which the company got everything it asked for. The following price increases were approved June 6 but because of the price freeze they will not go into effect until August 13:

First. 100 percent increase in the charge for messenger delivery of telegrams from $1.50 to $3.

Second. 50 percent increase in basic charge for overnight money orders from $2.65 to $3.95.

Third. 75 percent increase in basic overnight telegram charge from $1.70 to $3 and 100 percent increase in the charge for each additional word over 100 words 1.5 cents to 3 cents.

Fourth. 25 percent increase in charges for mailgrams from $1.60 to $2 for up to 100 words and from $.80 to $1 for each additional 100 words.

The FCC has totally failed to meet its public interest obligation to consumers. It is more concerned with the welfare of its wealthy client, Western Union, than with how that company serves the public. It has consistently ignored the mountain of complaints filed against the company and has totally overlooked Western Union's failure to meet its own speed-of-delivery standards.

Rather than penalize Western Union for consistently failing to meet its obligations to the public, the FCC has seen fit to reward it with eight rate increases during the past 10 years. If the new increases are permitted to go into effect, consumers will be paying $6.75 to send a telegram that cost only $2.10 just 10 years ago.

In return for the rate increase, the company has promised the FCC it would improve its speed-of-delivery telegram standards from the present 6 hours in most circumstances to 5 hours. FCC's own records show Western Union consistently fails to meet present standards and, therefore, cannot be expected to meet the new ones.

The planned rate increases only worsen a situation that is already deplorable. In view of the inflationary nature of these increases and the decreasing productivity and quality of service associated with Western Union and its telegram service, I have asked the Cost of Living Council to immediately cancel the increases and investigate their appropriateness. My letters to the FCC and the Cost of Living Council follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1973.

Hon. DEAN BURCH,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BURCH: I am writing to protest increases in the charges for Public Message Service and Mailgrams approved last month by the Commission. According to an FCC memorandum adopted June 6, 1973, Western Union will be permitted:

1. 100% increase in the charge for messenger delivery of messages in the Telegram and Overnight Telegram classifications from the present charge of $1.50 to $3.
2. 50% increase in the basic charge for Overnight Money Orders from $2.65 to $3.95.
3. 75% increase in the basic charge for Overnight Telegrams from $1.75 to $3 and a

100% increase in the charge for each additional word over 100 words from $.015 to $.03.

4. 25% increase in the charges for Mailgrams filed by telephone, tieline, or over the counter from the present $1.50 to $2 for 100 words or less and from $.80 to $1.00 for each additional 100 words or less.

In view of the deteriorating quality of Western Union service—documented by the FCC—and in light of the need to control inflation, I feel that these increases ranging from 25% to 100% are not justified. The FCC memorandum of June 6 calling for a one-hour reduction in the maximum time period for delivering or attempting to deliver telegrams and day money orders does not justify such increases. It has generally been the policy of the FCC to allow Western Union to set its own telegram speed-of-delivery standards, yet the company has consistently failed to meet even these liberal self-established requirements. Furthermore, the Commission has not taken firm action in recent years against Western Union for its failure to fulfill its promises of improved delivery service. In fact, rather than penalize poor service, the Commission has rewarded Western Union by approving higher rates and loose service standards. Thus, I do not feel that these latest company promises to improve the quality of delivery can be taken seriously nor do they justify increasing rates.

In considering an increase in charges for messenger delivery service, one must realize that all too frequently when messenger delivery has been specified by the customer, the telegram is merely telephoned to the recipient and then dropped in the mail by Western Union. The sender, unaware of this violation of Western Union tariffs, rarely receives the refund to which he is entitled. A 100% increase in the rate for messenger delivery service, therefore, only worsens a situation that is already deplorable.

In light of these factors I ask that the Commission immediately rescind these recently approved rates. Furthermore, I request that any consideration of rate increases await completion of the Commission study of domestic telegraph speed of delivery service recently announced in the Federal Register of July 16.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1973.

Hon. JOHN T. DUNLOP,
Director, Cost of Living Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DUNLOP: I am writing to urge that the Council halt a 25–100% increase in Western Union's rates scheduled to go into effect at the end of the current price freeze, on August 13.

On April 18, 1973, the Western Union Telegraph Company filed revised tariff schedules seeking to raise the rates for the company's Mailgram and Public Message Services. The new rates were promptly approved by the FCC and were scheduled to become effective June 17, 1973. However, due to the imposition of the post-Phase III price freeze, the newly revised tariffs will not become effective until August 13, 1973.

Such drastic increases are extremely inflationary and thus contradict the President's intentions as reflected in his Phase IV program. Furthermore the quality of service offered by Western Union has deteriorated steadily in the face of ever-increasing rates and unkept promises for improved performance. Ample evidence of the deterioration can be found in the increasing numbers of complaints against Western Union filed with the various federal and state regulatory agencies. Yet the FCC allows the telegraph company to establish its own speed of delivery standards without penalizing Western Union for its failure to meet these standards. The FCC has also allowed Western Union to close or curtail a vast number of telegram offices and to curtail sharply office hours.

In view of Western Union's decreasing productivity and rapidly diminishing quality of service, the actual price increase to the company is greater than the approved increase. In any event, the increases are totally unjustified and inflationary.

The revised tariff schedules provide for:

1. 100% increase in the charge for messenger delivery of messages in the Telegram and Overnight Telegram classifications from the present charge of $1.50 to $3.

2. 50% increase in the basic charge for Overnight Money Orders from $2.65 to $3.95.

3. 75% increase in the basic charge for Overnight Telegrams from $1.70 to $3 and a 100% increase in the charge for each additional word over 100 words from $.015 to $.03.

4. 25% increase in the charges for Mailgram filed by telephone, tieline, or over the counter from the present $1.60 to $2 for 100 words or less and from $.80 to $1.00 for each additional 100 words or less.

I request that the Council suspend these recently approved rate revisions and investigate their appropriateness.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Member of Congress.

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to report to my colleagues the results of our 13th annual questionnaire conducted recently throughout the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan. I am very pleased with the great interest that was shown by the 14,625 persons who used this convenient way to express their views on issues of major national importance.

I am very grateful also to the weekly and daily newspapers throughout the district for their wonderful cooperation in devoting considerable space to the questionnaire. This fine cooperation assured us that every resident of the Eighth District would have the chance to vote in this questionnaire, through either a special mailing or our newspapers.

I think it is of particular interest to note the results of the question dealing with aid to North Vietnam. Ninety-two percent of those who participated opposed such aid and I think this is a good indication of sentiment on this issue throughout the country.

Participants were overwhelmingly in favor of capital punishment—84 percent—a fact which I think reflects the great concern of Americans over the growing problem of crime.

Besides having the standard format of questions, this year's questionnaire provided space for constituents to give me legislative ideas and suggestions for ways of serving them better in Congress. Many persons took advantage of this opportunity to give a wide range of suggestions and ideas from tax reform to automobile safety standards.

Complete questionnaire results are as follows:

TABULATION OF 1973 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

[In percent]

Do you favor—

1. United States assistance for the post-war reconstruction of North Vietnam?

	Yes	*No*
Arenac County	8	92
Bay County	11	89
Huron County	7	93
Lapeer County	4	96
Saginaw County	10	90
Sanilac County	6	94
Tuscola County	6	94
Total Eighth District	8	92

2. Legislation to prevent the President from committing U.S. troops to combat more than 30 days without Congressional approval?

Arenac County	79	21
Bay County	79	21
Huron County	69	31
Lapeer County	77	23
Saginaw County	74	26
Sanilac County	87	13
Tuscola County	75	25
Total Eighth District	76	24

3. Amnesty for draft evaders living abroad if they perform several years of public work upon their return?

Arenac County	39	61
Bay County	40	60
Huron County	21	79
Lapeer County	27	73
Saginaw County	32	68
Sanilac County	39	61
Tuscola County	27	73
Total Eighth District	33	67

4. Stronger wage and price controls?

Arenac County	93	7
Bay County	90	10
Huron County	83	17
Lapeer County	75	25
Saginaw County	84	16
Sanilac County	82	18
Tuscola County	79	21
Total Eighth District	83	17

5. President's refusal to spend funds appropriated by Congress when *he* believes they are excessive?

Arenac County	64	36
Bay County	67	33
Huron County	74	26
Lapeer County	68	32
Saginaw County	66	34
Sanilac County	74	26
Tuscola County	66	34
Total Eighth District	67	33

6. Federal health insurance program financed by employer-employee contributions?

Arenac County	30	70
Bay County	52	48
Huron County	58	42
Lapeer County	52	48
Saginaw County	45	55
Sanilac County	49	51
Tuscola County	46	54
Total Eighth District	47	53

7. Federal funding assistance to state and local programs which provide day care centers for children of working mothers?

Arenac County	30	70
Bay County	30	70
Huron County	31	69
Lapeer County	27	73
Saginaw County	37	63
Sanilac County	29	71
Tuscola County	27	73
Total Eighth District	31	69

8. Administration's decision to transfer most of the Office of Economic Opportunity programs and discontinue OEO?

Arenac County	79	21
Bay County	74	26
Huron County	67	33

Lapeer County	79	21
Saginaw County	79	21
Sanilac County	72	28
Tuscola County	74	26
Total Eighth District	75	26

9. Federal aid to private and parochial schools?

Arenac County	58	42
Bay County	40	60
Huron County	45	55
Lapeer County	28	72
Saginaw County	40	60
Sanilac County	35	65
Tuscola County	23	77
Total Eighth District	36	64

10. Issuance of food stamps to striking workers?

Arenac County	21	79
Bay County	25	75
Huron County	14	86
Lapeer County	28	72
Saginaw County	15	85
Sanilac County	15	85
Tuscola County	22	78
Total Eighth District	19	81

11. Capital punishment for certain major crimes?

Arenac County	70	30
Bay County	86	14
Huron County	88	12
Lapeer County	87	13
Saginaw County	83	17
Sanilac County	86	14
Tuscola County	82	18
Total Eighth District	84	16

12. Legalization of marijuana?

Arenac County	8	92
Bay County	10	90
Huron County	5	95
Lapeer County	16	84
Saginaw County	16	84
Sanilac County	14	86
Tuscola County	5	95
Total Eighth District	13	87

13. Legislation that would allow news reporters to keep their sources of information confidential?

Arenac County	53	47
Bay County	69	31
Huron County	57	43
Lapeer County	66	34
Saginaw County	58	42
Sanilac County	60	40
Tuscola County	60	40
Total Eighth District	61	39

14. Present operations of the United States Postal Service?

Arenac County	21	79
Bay County	33	67
Huron County	33	67
Lapeer County	24	76
Saginaw County	48	52
Sanilac County	37	63
Tuscola County	35	65
Total Eighth District	39	61

Total Number of Responses:

Arenac County	149	1
Bay County	2,778	19
Huron County	1,316	9
Lapeer County	1,169	8
Saginaw County	5,849	40
Sanilac County	1,754	12
Tuscola County	1,608	11
Total Eighth District	14,623	

The Eighth Congressional District includes:

Arenac (City of Standish; Lincoln and Standish Townships);

Bay County (all but Gibson and Beaver Townships);

Huron County (all):

Lapeer County (all);

Saginaw County (all but Jonesfield, Richland, Lakefield, Fremont, Marion, Brant, Chapin, Brady, St. Charles, Chesaning, Albee, Maple Grove, Taymouth, and Birch Run Townships);

Sanilac County (all but Buel, Fremont, and Worth Townships);

Tuscola County (all but Arbela Township).

SENATOR KENNEDY'S FINE LEGISLATIVE LEADERSHIP

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Americans are familiar with the fine legislative leadership provided in the previous 92d Congress by the chairman of the Senate Health Subcommittee—Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

I have a feeling that not many of our citizens are aware of Senator KENNEDY's superb legislative leadership and record—and this is unfortunate. I personally believe that he does not get the public credit he deserves for his legislative achievements in the health care field.

Perhaps the main reason Senator KENNEDY fails to receive the credit he has earned is his almost legendary personality—one that almost obscures his excellent legislative record. To my surprise and disappointment, I have heard many people say, "Sure, TED KENNEDY has a great personality, but what has he done in the Senate?"

Mr. Speaker, I have followed the impressive legislative work of Senator KENNEDY, because I serve on the House Labor-HEW Subcommittee on Appropriations.

So to those who are not familiar with the exceptional leadership and accomplishments of Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, I submit for the record some of the bills he authored during the previous Congress that were signed into law. The legislative record of the Massachusetts Senator—especially in health care—shows that he has done a great deal in the Senate for the American people.

Senator KENNEDY was chief sponsor of these health care bills that are now the law of the land—laws that help millions of people:

The new effort to conquer cancer.

Research and training in digestive diseases.

Aid to medical and dental schools.

A nutrition program to help the elderly.

Expanded education and training of nurses.

Maternal and child health care.

Attacking heart, lung, and blood diseases.

Funds to control communicable diseases.

Preventing the closing of public service hospitals.

Providing medical services to areas suffering from medical manpower shortages.

There were other bills Senator KENNEDY introduced as main sponsor that were enacted, but the ones listed above were the major ones in health care. This is really distinguished leadership.

He is, of course, chief sponsor in the Senate of the Health Security Act—his main legislative interest. Senator KENNEDY has spoken out—in the Senate and throughout the country—on the importance of enacting national health insurance.

Legislation sponsored by Senator KENNEDY—and Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS in the House—is desperately needed in America, because health coverage is now inadequate and costs continue to soar. It is incredible and disgraceful that America—the wealthiest and most resourceful nation in the world—ranks so poorly in longevity. U.S. male life expectancy ranks 25th in the world, with American females listed 11th. We should be first in health. Our health care system is in urgent need of revamping.

Senator KENNEDY's strong interest in health care continues to be evident in the present Congress. Just a few of his 1973 activities as chairman of the Health Subcommittee include inquiries into the new but hazardous field of psychosurgery; the fight to continue several major health programs, from hospital construction to community mental health centers; Health Maintenance Organizations—prepaid medical care plans; and unauthorized sterilization financed by Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, Senator KENNEDY is a dedicated and effective chairman and is highly respected by his colleagues for his efforts and record. I am happy that his work is gradually being recognized by others as well.

For example, in the book by Stewart Alsop, "The Center: People and Power in Political Washington," KENNEDY was called one of the Senate's "very able Members." Early this year, Time magazine reported the following on Senator KENNEDY: "His colleagues say he is a far abler Senator than is generally known." And that conservative but respected Republican Senator from Kansas, ROBERT J. DOLE, then Republican National Committee chairman, called EDWARD KENNEDY, "an outstanding Senator" on the TV program, "Face the Nation," December 17, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I salute EDWARD M. KENNEDY, who is truly "an outstanding Senator."

POWERPLANT LICENSING

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill containing several amendments to the Federal Power Act which are designed to give Federal environmental agencies the ability to influence on behalf of resources conservation and environmental protection the design, construction, and operation of power generating plants in the United States.

Hydroelectric powerplants have been subject to such influence since 1920. Electric plants fueled by nuclear energy were made subject to such environmental influence by the recent decision of the

Federal district court in the Calvert Cliffs case.

The Federal Power Commission and the Atomic Energy Commission are now authorized to require that their licenses make modifications or additions to electric generating plant construction and operation plans in order to minimize adverse effects on the environment and to take maximum advantage of opportunities provided by such installations to enhance fish and wildlife resources and other aspects of the environment. The two Commissions are authorized and directed too seek review by Federal and State agencies on projects proposed for licensing and to solicit their recommendations on environmental matters.

In contrast no such licensing procedure is required for thermal electric powerplants using coal, oil, sawdust, gas, or other nonnuclear fuels.

The principal direct adverse environmental effects from nonnuclear thermal plants are air and water pollution. Moreover, some of them are located on filled wetlands, which in their natural condition support fish and wildlife of value. Also, many of them pull fish and other aquatic organisms into their cooling water systems, causing heavy losses.

This bill will offer several advantages over the present situation. It would unify environmental control over construction of nonnuclear plants—rather than having one agency concerned with air pollution and another agency concerned with some other facet of environmental protection.

Thermal pollution from nonnuclear powerplants is serious. Numerous instances of enormous fish kills at thermal powerplants have been recorded. Yet the Federal Government now has no direct way through which it can insist that thermal powerplants using nonnuclear fuels are designed, constructed, and operated so as to avoid thermal pollution.

A requirement for Federal licensing of nonnuclear thermal electric plants would put such plants on a comparable basis with nuclear and hydroelectric plants from the standpoint of Federal requirement for environmental protection measures.

I include the full text of this bill in the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Federal Power Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 3(11) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791, et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"(11) 'project' means—

"(A) a complete unit of improvement or development, consisting of—

"(i) a power house, all water conduits, all dams and appurtenant works and structures (including navigation structures) which are a part of said unit, and all storage, diverting, or forebay reservoirs directly connected therewith, or

"(ii) a nonnuclear thermal power plant and any appurtenances thereto, and

"(B) the primary line or lines transmitting power therefrom to the point of junction with the distribution system or with the interconnected primary transmission system, all miscellaneous structures used and useful in connection with said unit or any part thereof, and all water-rights, rights-of-way, ditches, dams, reservoirs, lands, or interest in lands the use and occupancy of which are necessary or appropriate in the maintenance and operation of such unit;".

(b) Section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (16) and inserting "; and", and by adding at the end of such paragraph the following:

"(17) 'nonnuclear thermal power plant' means a thermal power generating plant utilizing nonnuclear fuel."

SEC. 2. Section 4(e) of the Federal Power Act is amended by striking out all that precedes the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) to issue or deny licenses to citizens of the United States, any association of such citizens, any corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any State, or any State or municipality, for construction, operation, and maintenance of—

"(1) nonnuclear thermal power plants,

"(2) dams, water conduits, reservoirs, and hydroelectric power houses, and

"(3) transmission lines, and other project works relating to facilities described in paragraph (1) or (2),

all as necessary or convenient for development, transmission, or utilization of (A) electric power which is or may be transmitted in interstate commerce and/or across any part of public lands and reservations of the United States (including the Territories), or (B) the surplus water or water power from any Government dam."

SEC. 3. Section 9 of the Federal Power Act is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) Satisfactory evidence that the proposed project works and the operation thereof will comply with all State and Federal laws on maintaining the quality of the environment, including specifically the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and regulations issued pursuant thereto, and that the operation of the project will not contribute to the pollution of air or water as such contribution is defined by appropriate State and Federal authorities."

SEC. 4. Section 10(c) of the Federal Power Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(c)",

(2) by striking out "for the purposes of navigation and",

(3) by striking out "shall so maintain and operate said works as not to impair navigation", and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) That the licensee shall maintain and operate hydroelectric projects works so as not to impair navigation."

SEC. 5. Section 14 of the Federal Power Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) This section shall not apply to any project which consists principally of a nonnuclear thermal powerplant and its appurtenant works."

SEC. 6. Section 18 of the Federal Power Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 18. (a) The Commission shall require the construction, maintenance, and operation by a licensee at its own expense of such lights and signals as may be directed by the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

"(b) The Commission shall require the construction, maintenance, and operation by a licensee at its own expense of such fishways as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

"(c) The operations of any navigation facilities which may be constructed as a part of any dam or diversion structure built under this Act, whether at the expense of the licensee hereunder or of the United States, shall at all times be controlled by such reasonable rules and regulations in the interest of navigation, including the control of the level of the pool caused by such dam or diversion structure, as may be made from time to time by the Secretary of the Army and for willful failure to comply with any such rule or regulation such licensee shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished as provided in section 316 hereof.

"(d) The Commission shall require the incorporation in the construction and operation of a project by a licensee at its own expense of such measures, facilities and equipment for the control of air pollution as may be prescribed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in accordance with the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857 et seq., as amended)."

SERVICE FOR CONSTITUENTS—NOT MORE SALARY

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call on the House to reject S. 1989 and to send a message back to the people of America that we, in this body, are going to set an example in the battle against inflation. We do not need a salary increase now, nor do the high officials in the executive branch. We do need to fight inflation, and if we turn this down we may help establish credibility in Government and confidence in our leadership.

There are many weaknesses in the "commission" formula of salary increases in S. 1989. If a salary increase is justified, the Congress should vote it on a straight up or down vote, rather than hiding behind a commission recommendation which can be slipped through to become effective unless we take some unusual action to block it.

Further, it seems self-serving for Representatives and Senators to vote to permit a salary increase during our present term of office. We knew what the salary was when we ran for office, and I will bet none of us ran on a platform of "Elect me, and I'll raise my salary." Any change in salary made by the Congress should become effective at the start of the next Congress.

Now, I do not imply that the job of Congressman is not important or not demanding. It is. Most of us work very hard to serve our constituency. Some adjustments are long overdue which would improve the effectiveness of our service to our districts. There are inequities as compared with other efficiently run operations.

For example, the $3,000 limitation on costs of maintaining a second home in Washington, D.C., for income tax purposes is archaic and unfair. It should be adjusted to the actual costs incurred, just as anyone else would receive if sent to represent his business interests.

The effectiveness of our offices could be improved with a little more money for staff, equipment, supplies, and services.

We need these things to do a better job. Not more salary. Not now.

YONKERS, N.Y., CENTENNIAL

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the great city of Yonkers, N.Y. recently celebrated its 100th anniversary. On the occasion of that celebration Mr. Oxie Reichler, editor emeritus of the Yonkers Herald Statesman, has written an article entitled "Why I like Yonkers" which appeared in the Centennial brochure. It is a very well done piece, and I would like to have it appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point so that others throughout the country may have this opportunity to learn about Yonkers:

WHY I LIKE YONKERS

Let me tell you why I like Yonkers very much.

This is a good time and place for such an explanation—during these last few ceremonial hours at the Yonkers Raceway—as we conclude a whole year of celebrating our Centennial as a City.

There is a "commencement time" air today for our nearly quarter-million residents, for obviously, in a way, we are "graduating," after one hundred years of pursuing municipal efforts and "studies." Like the "graduates," we go forth to confront dramatic new prospects of civic adventure.

I feel qualified to communicate these comments about our city and its people, not only as a 43-year resident but because my work for a couple of generations kept me at a post where I could constantly observe and record the life of Our Yonkers—its politics and government, its assets and liabilities, its births and deaths, its saints and sinners, its schools and houses of worship, its service clubs and thousands of other organizations, its workers and employers, its commuters and professional people, its centers of culture, of health and of social services—and its thousands of wonderful volunteers in a myriad of community causes, without whom Yonkers could not have grown so well.

I greatly admire Yonkers because of its exciting and entertaining history, because of the constant and sometimes recordbreaking growth and achievements despite enormous obstacles—successes accomplished mostly because of what has been thought and planned and shared and done by the men and women of our community in the last 100 years—and during at least two and one-half centuries before that.

Yonkers, a wonderful town, is in the midst of a great transformation. As it often has been.

Here was an Indian paradise from the time King David ruled over ancient Israel (some 3,000 years ago) until the White Man set foot here in 1646.

Do you know that some insist it was Yonkers Indians who sold Manhattan Island to Peter Minuit, district manager for the Dutch West India Company, on that June day in 1626? And that neither gold nor wampum was involved in the deal, but that the trade was for many chests of brightly colored cloth, beads and trinkets valued at 60 guilders, or five pounds sterling?

I like to remember that Yonkers was a sprawling unincorporated area until it became a town in 1788, when the United States of America was only a dozen years old. In 1855 Yonkers became one of the most attractive incorporated villages in the East—geographically huge, because the Village of Yonkers extended all the way down into the Bronx to the banks of the Harlem River!

As you know, Yonkers became a city on June 1, 1872—a third-class city. To please the State Legislature in Albany, so we could get that city charter we wanted, we had to surrender all the Bronx part of Yonkers, which soon thereafter became part of the City of New York.

As we conclude our Year of Centennial, we may well speculate whether our children and grandchildren will want to celebrate another Yonkers-entennial 35 years hence in 2008. At that time, our community will have functioned for one hundred years as a second-class city, a charter we got from the Legislature in Albany in 1908.

Yonkers has demonstrated that it is the only larger city in the state that has been growing in population every year for over a quarter-century. Many years ago we had outraced Syracuse industrially. A few years ago, Yonkers sprang ahead of Syracuse in population and ours is now the fourth largest city in the Empire State (63rd in the USA)—exceeded in the state, according to the latest census, only by New York City, Buffalo and Rochester.

(It is possible—don't laugh, for we certainly have room enough in our 28 square miles—that one day we will more than quadruple our present population and become a first-class city like New York. That requires one million souls within our boundaries.)

Yonkers is great, in my book, because of its innumerable resources, a city with a wealth of large and small industries; a city of some 2,500 large and small wholesale and retail businesses (including world-famous stores like Wanamaker's, Gimbel's and S. Klein); a city with hundreds of professional centers large and small; a community with scores of public and private halls of education, ranging from nursery schools to colleges; a city with many dozens of spiritual centers.

I like to live in Yonkers because we have a standard of living far above that of the national average.

I find civic pride in the fact that we have nearly 70,000 households, with per household income reportedly well over $15,000, an increase of 25 per cent above the $12,000 figure provided by the 1970 federal census. Moreover, Yonkers eats well, spending about one-fourth of its outlays in food stores.

Yonkers is land and buildings, plus the facilities required, but—mostly—Yonkers is people. Living here are an extraordinairly large number of highly educated persons with important executive or similar assignments in noted organizations—physicians and surgeons, teachers, engineers, architects, writers, bankers and lawyers. By the way, it was to Yonkers that the first lawyer in New York State, came, away back there in 1648. He was the young lord (Jonkheer) from whom our city got its name, Adriaen van der Donck.

Among the factors that are heading Yonkers into the great transformation I have mentioned are the State Arterial which will open our downtown shopping areas to those sections in our city's east and northeast, and points beyond. Another bright development in the cards is the rebuilding of the Getty Square district as an ultra-modern retail market extending into South Yonkers and the Riverdale border. Just ahead, also, is the extensive development of the Otis Elevator complex, with housing accommodations, and other industrial expansions along the riverfront and—for light industry—in the Hudson River Country Club properties. Moreover, there is in prospect the City Hall-Library construction, and also considerable other cultural and educational projects.

Do you realize that the Yonkers we like has a government corporation that is in the billion-dollar class, with an annual "business" in excess of $100 million. In a sense, every man, woman and child living here is a member—even a trustee—of this vast operation. The kind of government and politics, the kind of public service that is provided, the degree of economy by which this "business" buys a dollar's worth of material or service for each dollar spent—all this depends directly upon the interest displayed and the activity resorted to by each citizen. Yes, we can have a Yonkers paradise if and when we truly and collectively want to have such a lovely and prosperous hometown.

I am happy because I foresee substantial progress toward this goal. I believe that our active Chamber of Commerce, and also our zealous Junior Chamber of Commerce (Jaycees), will be even more influential and effective, guiding business and industrial and community progress. I predict a renewed and reinvigorated civic organization, with strong nonpartisan leadership, that will guide politics and government into channels of maximum service without fear of economic woes or municipal bankruptcy. One of the special reasons I have come to admire Yonkers is that I have seen such organizations develop and serve, under the leadership of men and women who are or have been wise and courageous, civically, politically, governmentally, socially, culturally, economically, professionally, and spiritually.

Through all its history, Yonkers has had a quota of doomsayers.

Many have despaired of our community and its future—sometimes (as in the Civil War) advocating that Yonkers pull out of the United States and operate its own "federal government." In good and bad times, we have heard the wails and moans of the Gloomy Guses, recommending that we don sackcloth and ashes over our dark civic fate, which they assured us was hopeless. Well, the joykillers have always been disappointed—and I expect they always will be.

Indeed, I find Yonkers wonderful in the way that it confounds the pessimists, and the way in which it adjusts to disaster. Once Yonkers had a great hat factory, producing men's headgear. It died, but Yonkers attracted a number of other industries to replace it.

Until a generation ago, Yonkers had the biggest rug and carpet manufactory anywhere—Alexander Smith & Sons—but in the middle of a crippling strike it closed its doors and moved South. Yonkers promptly filled the buildings with dozens of fine and various industries, most of them still flourishing and much expanded.

Similarly, Yonkers weathered contamination of our splendid water supply—by keeping cool heads and boiling the water till the matter was cleared up. The Herald Statesman printed a Sunday Morning extra, and delivered it free to every doorstep in Yonkers (subscriber or not) with a gigantic headline: Boil Your Water. It was the paper that got Yonkers to keep its cool.

We have had our share of minor and major disasters—natural ones (floods, tremors, building collapse, etc.) and manmade (wars, depression, bank closings, scandals).

Yonkers, dependably and admirably, emerged from each light or serious catastrophe stronger and better.

Let those who have little hope for or confidence in Yonkers and its future realize that many of the world's largest banking houses believe that Yonkers has a rosy future, and they are investing many millions of dollars here. They have no doubts about our city and its prospects. They expect us to grow every day in every way.

You'll find no Gloomy Gus, no doomsayer, in any of these banking operations or their executives, institutions serving Yonkers with from one to a dozen branch banks each—financial houses like (alphabetically) the Bank of Commerce, Bank of New York, Chase Manhattan, Chemical Bank, County Trust, First National City, Fourth Federal Savings & Loan, Hudson Valley National, Manufacturers Hanover, Marine Midland, National Bank of North America, National of Westchester, Peoples Savings, Westchester Federal Savings & Loan, Yonkers Savings, and Yonkers Savings & Loan.

These financial institutions—some in Yonkers for over a century, some eager newcomers—have researched Yonkers thoroughly. They have put their investments right here, where we are.

Moreover, the commercial banks manifest their confidence in Yonkers over and above their investments of money and construction of facilities. When the City of Yonkers or other local government agencies want to borrow money, these banks fall all over one another to compete for the business—and as a result Yonkers enjoys low interest rates, often lower than many another community of our size or larger.

I like Yonkers because, in virtually every area of activity (except perhaps public attention to politics and government) Yonkers residents manifest consistently imaginative attitudes, pride in their personal fields, and an ardent attitude in their avocations. That is why it is such a warm and good feeling to be part of a thriving and progressive Yonkers, where there is easy access to the massive assets of culture-rich Westchester County and also the gerat metropolis to the South, including all the adult playgrounds in the up-county and upstate neighborhoods. And some day, I hope, we shall have a strong and influential citywide civic organization, which will generate such attitudes and talents to gird our politics and government!

All of us in Yonkers are properly proud of our recreational facilities—our city and county parks like Untermeyer Tibbetts Brook and Dunwoodie and many smaller ones providing all kinds of sports, including golf, tennis, basketball, baseball, swimming, skating and boating. And we have Yonkers Raceway, one of the largest and best-equipped harness-racing tracks in the world.

Yonkers is admirable for its distinguished homes, fine apartment houses, private and public housing recently completed or in process.

There are so many reasons to like Yonkers—ranging from the delight that Yonkers school children learn to read so much more effectively than elsewhere, to the happy tidings that we generate many beauty contest winners at local, county and state levels—and youthful marble champions, too!

There are broader and more general reasons to like Yonkers. It is both a thriving and populous city and an attractive suburban community, replete with many small village-type areas like Crestwood, Armour Villa, Park Hill and McLean Heights.

I love our riverfront—and like to speculate how one day it may be transformed, over its entire four and one-half miles, into a combination of marinas and parks, winding paths and boardwalk for strolling, as well as a Port of Yonkers to serve much river and ocean traffic.

As it is, we share with thousands upon thousands of visitors, the every-day beauty of the rolling and lordly Hudson and its ships, plus the breath-taking view of the Palisades on the New Jersey shore—a scene almost without compare except along Canada's Saguenay River and among Sweden's and Norway's magnificent fjords.

I like Yonkers because of its hills and dales, its fine residential areas, the bustling business and industrial sections. I like our ultra-modern clusters of retail stores that attract thousands of shoppers from great distances, including Riverdale and Woodlawn in the Bronx and communities also to the east and north, even from Rockland County.

For me, among the more glowing places in Yonkers are our Houses of History, which we can display proudly and lovingly to our families and to all our personal or business visitors. For example, I like to walk by or visit our historic shrines—like St. John's Episcopal Church in Getty Square, where George Washington knelt in prayer.

It's historically gratifying to visit our Manor Hall, near the riverfront where Washington Avenue begins. It was built in 1682 and is the oldest building still standing in all Westchester. Washington frequent visited the Philipse family before the Revolutionary War, and for a time in the last century it served as our City Hall. It's now a state-operated shrine.

Thanks to the Yonkers Historical Society and its dedicated leaders, the Sherwood House at 340 Tuckahoe Rd. has been preserved and restored. It depicts how Yonkers lived two centuries ago. A typical farmhouse of that era, it is one of the few pre-Revolutionary structures still standing in the metropolitan area. By the way, the Sherwood House became the home in 1800 of Yonkers' first medical doctor! Any resident can be helpful in its further restoration as one of our precious Houses of History.

I like to stroll at North Broadway and Shonnard Place, realizing that the first golf game in America was played at that point in 1888, when St. Andrew's Golf Club was located there. I like to visit the Hudson River Museum in Trevor Park, on Warburton Avenue, and to spend a wonderful hour in its Planetarium, one of the finest in the East.

It is a pleasure to visit the Yonkers Sports Hall of Fame at 285 Nepperhan Avenue, where our Yonkers champions in almost every sport are enthroned, with suitable memorabilia. And I like to stroll at the south city line on Riverdale Avenue, near the Seton School, aware that the famous Samuel Clemens (Mark Twain) used to live and stroll thereabouts too, and that some of America's first popular motion pictures were produced in that section.

Another enjoyable walk is in the area of 544 North Broadway, where Edwin H. Armstrong (who in youth had lived at 1032 Warburton Avenue) developed his invention of static-free broadcasting—Frequency Modulation (FM), which not only improved radio broadcasting and reception tremendously, but provides us with the bell-like clarity of voice and music on our television sets.

Walk or drive high in the Dunwoodie section (overlooking Central Park Avenue near the Cross County Parkway) and observe the broadcasting tower at the Dunwoodie Seminary, from which daily lessons are sent by television into all the parochial schools in the Catholic Archdiocese of New York.

Whenever I pass any of the many Otis Elevator Company buildings along the Hudson (or notice the name Otis on an elevator anywhere in the Nation or overseas) I think with civic pride of the fact that we have here the largest elevator and escalator factory in the world. More than that it was here in Yonkers in 1852 that Elisha Graves Otis invented the first safe elevator.

The Otis story is something for teachers to tell their pupils in the classroom. Tall and bearded Mr. Otis, then 41 years old and in chronically poor health, had been poor and a business failure. As a master mechanic for the Yonkers Bedstead Manufacturing Company, he had provided a number of bright ideas for his boss, Josiah Maize. Now his special problem was to develop a hoist to lift heavy equipment to the upper floor. Hoists were not new. Even the Romans had them. But all had a built-in flaw. If the rope or suspension cable broke, the hoist and everything and everyone on it plunged to the ground.

Mr. Otis came up with the idea that a good, tough, steel wagon spring, meshing with a ratchet, might do the trick. If the rope gave way, the spring ends would catch and hold, he suggested. He made the improvement and it worked—but for many months it was not acceptable to hoist users until he demonstrated his invention at a Crystal Palace exhibition in New York—hoisting himself to the ceiling on a platform and ordering the rope cut. It was cut, and the wagon spring snapped into place in the ratchets. The platform remained aloft. Mr. Otis doffed his hat and told the crowd, "All safe, gentlemen! All safe!" Otis elevators were then widely demanded.

How could Mr. Otis even dream—a century and a quarter ago—that this Yonkers invention would enable vast cities to spring up toward the sky instead of spreading to the horizon? How could he foresee that this Yonkers-born idea would make possible an Empire State Building 1,250 feet above the street or the even-higher twin structures of the World Trade Center in lower Manhattan?

Another important Yonkers invention was made on Nepperhan Avenue at the Ethyl Corporation, where Dr. Graham Edgar developed the Octane Scale, which measures the anti-knock quality of gasoline. This scale is in use all over the world, even in the Soviet Union and in the People's Republic of China.

Also on our riverfront is the Refined Syrups & Sugars division of the world-famous Corn Products Company. I like to consider with satisfaction that almost any dish or packet of ice cream "has a little Yonkers in it," Flosweet liquid sugar.

When I behold any one of the several plants here of the Phelps Dodge Cable and Wire Co.—especially the Habirshaw unit on the riverfront near the foot of Main Street—I recall the manufacture of what may have been the greatest secret weapon of all, contributing to our victory in World War II against Germany. In that plant (a former sugar refinery) Habirshaw built—in utter secrecy—a hollow cable that was 65 miles long. It was shipped under heavy escort across the Atlantic, and the cable was laid across the English Channel in the dead of night. When Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower invaded the Normandy coast of France (Operation Pluto), this Yonkers cable provided him with one million gallons of fuel a day for his armies, his armada of ships and his fleets of planes.

Another Habirshaw-built "weapon" of that nature has permitted all of us on the American Continent to sleep without fear of surprise missile attacks. A cable of styroflex, this one 3,000 miles long, is strung across the Arctic wastes—from Hudson's Bay in Canada to the tip of Alaska. It is called the DEW Line (Distant Early Warning) to give our government and our people time to respond when and if war should break out again.

Sometimes, when I'm walking or riding in Sunnyside Drive, it is easy to imagine the golden voice of Madame Schumann-Heink, world-famous opera star, who lived there and who occasionally gave "free concerts" for students and teachers at School Three on

Hamilton Avenue, which her children attended.

The other day, when Mrs. Richard M. Nixon was observing her 60th birthday anniversary, it gave me a bit of civic pride to recall that she spent some years here and that she has relatives here, including the real estate man and a leading Republican, Edward O. Sullivan Jr.

When afoot or in a car on Park Hill Avenue, it is pleasant to notice the attractive home of Justice Anthony J. Cerrato at No. 179 and to realize that in that structure and on those grounds, for many years, lived the noted actor Richard Bennett and his talented daughters—Constance, Barbara and Joan. And not far from there on Park Hill stands a mansion where the widely known "Father Divine" ruled over the faithful of his cult.

Yes, it is possible to arrange a guided tour that would pass the homes of many distinguished Americans, some living, some dead, whose fame spread far beyond their hometown—folks like Sid Caesar, Art Carney, Morey Amsterdam, Anne Bancroft, Ella Fitzgerald, William C. Handy, Gene Krupa, Jerome Kern, Geoffrey O'Hara, Charles P. Steinmetz, Leo Baekeland, Samuel Tilden, Samuel Untermeyer, Gen. Joseph W. (Vinegar Joe) Stilwell, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, former Mayor and Congressman JOHN E. ANDRUS, and on and on, a roll call that can stir patriotic pride in any Yonkers heart.

Another brightly shining facet of Yonkers is our complex of cultural interests, to which large numbers of people devote themselves with deep understanding and skilled enthusiasm. These participate in music, literature, painting and related arts, and also the dance and the drama.

I recall how, some years ago, after a brief refresher course in higher mathematics, I discovered that Yonkers rated as the second most cultural community in the Nation, on the basis of its magazine reading—outclassed only by Denver.

My joy in Yonkers is rooted especially in our daily newspaper, The Herald Statesman, on which I was privileged to serve for nearly four decades. It is a journal of high repute, familiar to those in journalism and its fringes everywhere, even overseas on the Continent and in the Orient. The Herald Statesman is a frequent prize-winner. It is interestingly written, courageously edited, attractively illustrated, and it provides the press leadership that a progressive city badly needs. When traveling, match our Yonkers paper with that of any other family paper in the state or nation, and readily perceive that Yonkers is being unusually well-served. It is Yonkers' largest retailer, with more than 50,000 individual transactions each publishing day. It meets fully the needs of readers, and of display and classified advertisers. And readers are provided with extraordinarily dependable delivery service by an army of young independent merchants, each serving the public and also building a financial foundation for his personal career.

A year ago, when our Yonkers Centennial Year began, I publicly recommended that—in addition to the various municipal ceremonies, flag-raisings, dedications, concerts, parties and other programs and projects—we do something personal and special.

I suggested that every man and woman in Yonkers, and every boy and girl too, celebrate individually in three simple ways. I suggested:

First, say something nice about Yonkers every day—better yet, several times a day—at home and while away from home.

Second, write something nice about Yonkers every day—to as many people, businesses, institutions and organizations as you can.

Third, do something nice for Yonkers, even though it is something for yourself—like keeping your lawn neat, growing some flowers, planting a tree, sweeping a sidewalk, painting the house, making your business attractive inside and out, stimulating courtesy and thoughtfulness among associates and staffs—by personal example. Be a volunteer in any good cause. Support worthy causes financially. Serve in public office.

It didn't sound like much—that each of us determine, for a whole year, to say, write and do something nice for Yonkers. But many persons in Yonkers liked the idea and did just that. And Rep. Peter Peyser printed my idea in the Congressional Record, it had a national audience too. Yonkers is the gainer.

Such a civic program is good and useful, not only during our Centennial Year but for every day in every year during our tomorrows. We all have something constructive to offer for our century-old city. It's one way to make civic dreams come true!

LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, recently the League of United Latin American Citizens—known universally as the LULAC's—adopted a resolution recognizing and supporting the Secretary of Labor and the national migrant worker program.

Knowing of the good work done by the LULAC's—done historically before anybody else was emphasizing interest in this area of the Spanish surnamed—I spread this resolution on the RECORD so that all my colleagues on the House floor might read what the LULAC's have done and what they wish to do to continue the all important effort in seeking to assist the migrant.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The League of United Latin American Citizens has sought full equality of job opportunity for all Americans, and

Whereas, The Migrant Farmworker has suffered from the greatest widespread unemployment, underemployment and poverty of any particular group in our Nation, and with the impact of technology which continues to drastically reduce opportunities for migratory farm work, and

Whereas, The Migrant Farmworker is ill equipped with marketable job skills for any other meaningful employment and far too few attempts are being made to assist them, and

Whereas, The Migrant Farmworker moves through a number of states and regional jurisdictions, state and local governments are unable to meet their needs, and

Whereas, The Secretary of Labor earmarked $20 million from the National FY 71-72 MDTA unapportioned account to train Migrant Farmworkers in marketable job skills beyond farm work, which created the National Migrant Worker Program within the national office of the Department of Labor and local training program operations throughout the United States, and

Whereas, This training has assisted Migrant Farmworkers obtain skills and permanent year 'round employment, and

Whereas, The earmarked $200 million were not fully used for the National Migrant Worker Program and those funds used have been exhausted and no new funds were earmarked for the continuation of this all-important effort,

Therefore be it resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be requested to continue and enlarge the National Migrant Worker Program as a national project which has had a significant impact on those in our society neglected the most and in the greatest need, our Migrant Farmworkers, and

Be it further resolved, That this resolution be distributed by our local LULAC councils to all Congressmen and Senators whose districts fall within any Migrant Farmworker area.

Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be recognized and commended for his actions in assisting in the plight of the Migrant Farmworker,

Which we hereby bestow according to the tenets of the League of United Latin American Citizens assembled in the 44th Annual National Convention, the 23rd of June, 1973, in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

MR. GORDON FULCHER

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Texas recently lost one of their finest and most respected public servants, Mr. Gordon Fulcher. He passed away while working into the night on the business of the Texas Water Quality Board, where he has served as chairman since 1968.

I first became friends with Gordon in the 1930's when he was the editor of the Austin American-Statesman. He added a tremendous amount of character to the State Capitol's newspaper, and his guidance was reflected in every public stand the paper took.

It is no overstatement to say that every important civic and political achievement of the time bore the mark of Gordon Fulcher's wisdom. I especially recall his support of the Lake Buchanan Dam project near Austin and his continuing leadership in making the Lower Colorado River Authority one of the Nation's finest water management systems.

During these years, I came to know Gordon's twinkling personality and his dominant voice in public affairs. It was then that we passed the first of many fine evenings trading political reminiscences and stories. He became one of my most valued friends and associates, and I know President Johnson often sought his advice.

Gordon left the newspaper business in 1946 to devote nearly 20 years to his land development interests, but in 1962 he came back to Texas and bought the Atlanta Citizen-Journal. Once again his influence was reflected by a newspaper's pages, and the Citizen-Journal became one of Texas' leading weekly publications.

In 1968, Gov. John Connally asked Gordon to assume the chairmanship of the Texas Water Quality Board. Though he was nearly 60, his instincts led him to accept that tough, sometimes unpopular position, and under his leadership the board took decisive action to clean up Texas waters.

Gordon felt that Texas could handle her own pollution problems without extensive Federal help, and his firm, even-handed treatment of polluters made Texas a leader in developing state environmental programs.

Somehow, Gordon also found time to establish the Texas Star, a Sunday newspaper supplement that became a focal point for statewide issues and reached millions of readers. Economic pressures which claim so many publications also forced the Star to suspend operation, although Gordon was working to revive the Star at the time of his death.

Personally, I will miss Gordon Fulcher as I could few men. His visits always meant midnight story swapping and some of the most stimulating exchanges of ideas I have ever encountered. His advice was always well-reasoned and pointed, and you knew Gordon's only interest was in the people.

The extent to which Texans will miss Gordon Fulcher is reflected in the many public statements and editorials issued upon his death, and I would like to conclude with some of these remarks about a rare and truly good man.

Atty. Gen. John Hill:

I feel a sense of personal loss; I've lost a friend, a man I had learned to know from working with him, an intelligent, dedicated, hardworking, colorful individual.

Lt. Gov. Bill Hobby:

He gave unselfishly of himself to a tough job, and the whole state is in his debt.

Hugh Yantis, executive director of Texas Water Quality Board:

His forceful approach was a very great factor in the progress we have made in cleaning up the state's waters.

Sam Wood, editor of the Austin American-Statesman, memorialized the former editor of the capitol city newspaper as "one of the top newspapermen in the State."

Waco News-Tribune:

A major goal for Chairman Fulcher was to prove that Texas can handle its own pollution problems rather than helpless turning to federal authority to clean up its lakes and streams and wells. This meant double burden on Fulcher and his colleagues, prodding local governments and industries on the one hand, while dealing with federal regulators on the other. Undoubtedly, the strain of this unpaid service to Texas hastened Mr. Fulcher's final heart seizure.

THE 30TH INTERNATIONAL PARIS AIR SHOW

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have received a report on the 30th International Paris Air Show based on the attendance of several members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Their observations and conclusions merit the attention of my colleagues, the executive department, and the public:

THE 30TH INTERNATIONAL PARIS AIR SHOW

Several Members and staff of the Committee on Science and Astronautics attended the Thirtieth International Paris Air Show, from May 27 to June 1. As in previous years, the major purposes were (1) viewing current aerospace technology, both foreign and domestic; (2) viewing both flight and static demonstrations; (3) discussing and reviewing the current state-of-the-art in various technologies with representatives of the international aeronautics and astronautics industrial community, journalists, and government officials; (4) assessing the relative positions of the United States and other countries in the fields of aviation and space; (5) assessing major trends and problem areas.

OVERVIEW

The 1973 Air Show provided an impressive demonstration of foreign capabilities—but a closer look suggests that our international competition is much less optimistic about the future in certain fields than two years ago.

It is evident that the Paris Air Show is regarded as the major event of its kind; it affords an unparalleled opportunity to demonstrate hardware, assess competition, create and strengthen business relationships, and perhaps most important, create sales opportunities.

Other indicators are also useful in assessing the value of the Air Show. International goodwill is one example. Another factor is international image. Finally, despite the attendant costs and problems involved in international air show participation, major U.S. manufacturers continue to be strong in their praise of the benefits of the Paris Air Show, and the shows at Farnborough, England and Hanover, Germany. Additionally, many are positive in their outlook concerning future shows in Tokyo, Japan and Sao Paulo, Brazil.

The comments of U.S. participants are noteworthy because of the disadvantages of U.S. exhibitors in comparison with their foreign counterparts. In military aviation, for example, there are the Department of Defense rules regarding aircraft bailment to manufacturers for air show purposes. In the case of the Lockheed C-5A, the $750,000 fee required by the Defense Department led to a decision by Lockheed not to show the aircraft. Additionally, there is no provision for formal U.S. government support on the flight line and neither the Department of Commerce nor the Department of Transportation provides relief in the form of support services. This situation is in stark contrast to the cooperation, financial and logistics support and encouragement offered by foreign governments to their own exhibitors for both military and civil areospace products.

Approximately 571,000 visitors from all over the world attended the Paris Air Show, of whom 42,000 were registered business visitors. There were 624 companies from 20 countries participating; approximately 150 U.S. firms exhibited their products, 75 of which had displays in the American pavilion.

The American Embassy in Paris reported on the results achieved by the 75 firms exhibiting in the U.S. pavilion: About $57,000,000 in sales—immediate and 12-month projections.

The primary objective of more than two-thirds of the exhibitors was to gain exposure to new business prospects and ninety-five percent of the exhibitors accomplished this objective. In total, there were 67 representation agreements signed plus an additional 227 agency agreements under negotiation at the close of the Show.

MEMBERS VIEWS

Rep. John W. Davis (D.-Ga.) expressed his views as follows: "The Europeans seem to be making dramatic progress in the area of developing quiet short take off and landing aircraft which could hold from 25 to 75 passengers. I think there is now, and will be over the next decade or so, a large market in the United States for such aircraft, and I am convinced that current American efforts are at too low a level to meet the challenge posed by this European initiative.

The European companies are not hampered by anti-trust laws and their developmental effort as to new aircraft is heavily subsidized by government funds. With the constraints of anti-trust legislation in the United States, American aircraft manufacturers are not free to band together in a joint research and development enterprise. Too, government support in the form of funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is at a bare bones level. The Paris Air Show strengthened a belief I already had formed to the effect that it is time for NASA to redouble its efforts in aeronautics and that funding should be generously increased for the development of STOL aircraft with quiet engines and low pollution."

The reactions and views of Rep. Larry Winn (R.-Kan.) were stated in these words. He said, "On every count, the show represented a mind-boggling showcase of advanced technology in a wide variety of fields including aerospace, electronics, metallurgy, and communications. The display of aircraft and avionics, aviation subsystems and components, spacecraft and space hardware, and air traffic control equipment showed not only a vast range of current capabilities but also dramatic previews of the future in many fields.

The U.S. continues to appear to be the major force in the international aerospace market. Clearly, however, the USSR and European nations are narrowing the lead in aerospace technology which this country has so long enjoyed. But I am unwilling to ascribe this strictly to a cutback in Federal R&D or a stagnation in technological excellence. Rather, I see our lead being narrowed due to a much more complicated set of reasons which include a tougher international marketplace, substantial foreign government support for their industries, and high levels of European and Japanese technical excellence.

Finally, it is my conclusion that in spite of the many claims regarding the relative decline of U.S. R&D, the U.S. continues to be the dominant force in the fields of aviation and space. Even in areas where there is a gap, there is every evidence that our foreign competition will not go unchallenged. Designs for the DC-10-Twin and the 7X7 are being pursued to "combat" the A300-B. Even our abandonment of the SST Program need not spell disaster if in fact we continue an aggressive program of research."

Rep. Barry Goldwater (R.-Calif.) concluded that while "the U.S. is a world leader in aviation because of its past investment in research and development and its industrial capability, our lead is by no means assured." He said, "American industry needs to be more competitive and innovative—the international aerospace market is going to be tougher in the future." But the U.S. Government can't remain aloof; better arrangements for financing export sales must be established. "In short," Mr. Goldwater said, "the U.S.

government must be an active partner with industry—without taking over as has been done in some other countries."

According to Rep. Paul Cronin (R.-Mass.) the Apollo/Soyuz exhibit and the joint appearance of the Soviet cosmonauts and the Apollo 17 astronauts marked a positive step forward in the emerging U.S.-Soviet detente. He said, "The very evident cooperation between the U.S. and Soviet Union in the space program is a worthwhile contribution to future relations between our countries."

Mr. Cronin found it valuable to see the exhibits of firms from his district (AVCO and Raytheon) and pointed out that "sales resulting from company participation in such shows as the Paris Show are not only beneficial to Massachusetts but to the U.S. economy. Aerospace exports are vital to helping solve our balance of payments problem."

The broad range of foreign technological capabilities also impressed Mr. Cronin who concluded, "We are not the only nation in the world with advanced technology. We've got to realize the world is a more competitive place and that to maintain our position we must combine innovation with continued investment in research and development."

Rep. Marvin L. Esch (R.-Mich.) reported that, "The U.S. House of Representatives' trip to the Paris Air Show was highlighted by the meeting between the Soviet cosmonauts and the United States Apollo 17 astronauts.

The visit to the Soviet Space Pavilion and extensive meetings with the Soviet space scientists and cosmonauts highlight the great desire of the Soviet Union to work cooperatively in space. Strikingly symbolic was the joint U.S.-USSR Pavilion which contained the model of the Apollo/Soyuz 1975 joint mission. Leaving all technical considerations aside, one cannot overstate the significance of the political and social implications of that display in Western Europe. Equally significant is the current desire by the Eastern community to move ahead cooperatively in their own space effort and the willingness of their personnel to work with NASA for mutually beneficial achievements in this decade."

Concerning the aviation aspects of the Air Show, Mr. Esch said, "As a member of the U.S. delegation, I was particularly struck by the increasing challenge of the European community to our aerospace industry in general and our aircraft and avionics companies in particular. While visiting and meeting with diversified exhibitors, my perception was that while other countries are supportive of their industry and most desirous to encourage the development and export of civilian aircraft and related support equipment, the U.S. has yet to develop an effective, realistic policy for sustaining our industrial group."

Mr. Esch concluded that, "That is a matter which Congress must address itself to in the near future. If our nation is to maintain leadership in this field we must develop a new vehicle for the delivering of services and encouraging our industrial groups so that that they may effectively compete in the world market in the next decade."

HIGHLIGHTS OF EXHIBITS AND FLIGHTS DEMONSTRATIONS

Space

1. One of the major attractions at the Show was a pavilion containing a full scale representation of a U.S. Apollo Command/Service Module linked with a Soviet Soyuz spacecraft. The Apollo/Soyuz exhibit was located near the main entrance to the Show grounds where it was a clearly visible symbol of the growing political detente between the United States and the Soviet Union. Less apparent, but very real, is the extent to which American and Soviet technical people have been able to cooperate in joint planning and in making major changes in their respective spacecraft in preparing for the planned 1975 joint rendezvous, docking and research mission. Approximately 400,000 visitors observed this exhibit which was described in French, English and Russian.

2. The Soviet space exhibit was a masterful example of the soft-sell; many booklets were available in both French and English. Carefully emphasized were the international aspects of their program; on each major spacecraft component was painted the flag of the nation that had made it. Among their exhibits was a full-sized replica of the Lunokhod-2, an eight-wheeled unmanned lunar vehicle. Also included in their exhibits were full scale replicas of research, applications and planetary satellites—about equally divided in emphasis.

3. In contrast, the U.S. space exhibits were far more limited, and examples of many of our accomplishments were missing. There was a full-scale model of the Lunar Rover, and a partial model of the SKYLAB, but most of the other U.S. exhibits were small scale models.

4. Cooperative efforts characterized important segments of the German and French space activities at the Show. The German programs showed particular emphasis on having both U.S. and European partners, whereas the French cooperative efforts tended to be more European oriented. Specific examples Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Bolhm (MBB) in conjunction with NASA for launch in 1975; and the Franco-German Symphonie communications satellite now tentatively scheduled for launch in early 1975.

AVIATION

New entries

1. Among the new aircraft appearing at the Paris Air Show for the first time were the following major entries:

Grumman F–14 Tomcat Fighter from the U.S.

German-Dutch VFW–Fokker 614, 40-seat twin-engine transport.

Saab-Scania SK–37, two seat trainer from Sweden—a version of the AJ–37 Viggen Fighter.

French Dassault-Breguet Falcon 30, small transport and the Falcon 10 corporate aircraft.

Airbus Industrie A–300B, 260-seat wide-body, twin-engine transport.

Soviet production version of the TU–144 Supersonic Transport.

2. A large number of new aircraft designs, new aircraft concepts and proposals were shown and discussed at the Show. They range across the spectrum in payload and type; some are merely preliminary paper designs at the discussion stage while others were announced as intentions to proceed with development. These included the following:

Boeing's proposed 7X7 family—from a long range, four engine aircraft to a short haul twin-jet.

Two new French Aerospatiale designs in the 30-passenger and 70-passenger class.

The French Dassault-Breguet Mirage G8A—the proposed French Air Force fighter for the 1980's.

The British Short SD3–30 Turboprop Transport, a 30-passenger aircraft.

An Italian design by Renaldo Piaggio; a 30-passenger turboprop transport.

U.S. aircraft

3. Major U.S. aircraft entries in the Paris Air Show were the Navy's Grumman F–14A Tomcat Fighter, a World Airways Boeing 747 Convertible (either passenger or cargo capability) and the Northrop F–5 Freedom Fighter. The F–14 performed in a stunning series of flight demonstrations at low levels despite low hanging clouds during much of the Show. The F–5 demonstrated its brilliant versatility and showed why such a large number of these aircraft have been exported to other nations and why about 450 of the successor F–5E aircraft were sold prior to first flight test of the prototype. The Boeing 747 Convertible was one of the dominating features of the flight line, although visits by the public were restricted. Lockheed's L–1011 was represented by a British Court charter aircraft which flew into Le Bourget several times during the Show—as a vivid example of U.S. penetration of the European market.

McDonnell-Douglas was active in pressing for a DC–10 twin jet. Important to the McDonnell-Douglas marketing effort is an indication of a continuing shift to short to medium range aircraft in coming years in Europe. McDonnell-Douglas did not show a DC–10 but did arrange for one of its buyers—UTA—to schedule one of its tri-jets for a short period static display.

Foreign aircraft

4. A major Soviet aircraft entry in the Air Show was the TU–144 Supersonic Transport. Despite its fatal crash, for as yet unannounced reasons, the TU–144 seen and flown at Paris was a substantially different and greatly improved airplane from previously seen prototypes. The consensus of informed observers is that the TU–144 is being aimed directly at the world market. Committee Members who went through the airplane were impressed by its "commercial appearance."

5. Under the leadership of Britain's Ministry of Aerospace and Shipping and its articulate Minister, Michael Heseltine, more than 100 British companies teamed at the Show to present an airframe and electronics capability image that, although directed at various European partnerships, was aimed at selling Britain as having a national industry capable of providing a wide range of research and production on an international basis. Britain, however, showed little new in aircraft.

6. Flight demonstrations of the French-British Concorde reflect a more aggressive marketing effort. In addition to the demonstration flights for the audience at the Air Show, trips were made by the Concorde for airline customers with airline-style service at Mach 2. Members of the press, and other visitors including some Members of the U.S. Congress were invited on some of the demonstration flights.

7. As a major entry by the European aerospace industry, a first appearance at the Paris Air Show was made by the Airbus Industrie A–300B Transport. Flying at the Show, the A–300B was visible evidence that the Europeans are driving hard to compete with the Americans. Despite its apparent technical solidity, the aircraft is not doing well economically: as of the time of the Show in early June, only 13 orders had been placed (none in North America) and no new orders had been booked in the previous 6 months. One explanation may be that the planned 250 to 260 passenger payload does not correspond to the high standard of comfort provided by the 747, the L–1011 and the DC–10.

8. Continuing the trends of previous shows, more general aviation, business and commuter aircraft, and helicopters were placed on display by many nations. Virtually every participating country at the Show had at least one type of general aviation or commuter aircraft to display.

9. The objective of reducing noise levels for all types of aircraft was apparent in every aspect of the Show from discussions to flight demonstrations. The subject of noise has a place of prominence that it is certain to maintain in the future. The developing marketing strategies for all types of commercial aircraft are incorporating noise considerations as central selling points.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The biannual Paris Air Show continues to be the dominant international marketing forum in aviation and space technology. By offering a broad variety of the latest and best in aerospace technology, it provides not only a convenient marketplace for buyers and sellers, but also a place where government officials and others associated with aviation and space may acquire information and insights highly important to their effective performance.

2. The U.S. continues to be the leading factor in the world aerospace market—with a U.S. export value of $3.8 billion in 1972. The largest part of these exports goes to Western Europe. From another point of view which is disturbing to the Europeans, while 30 percent of the *non-communist world's* aerospace products are purchased by the Western European nations, only 9 percent are produced there. In contrast, the U.S. produces almost 90 percent.

3. With regard to Europe's space efforts, the situation parallels that of the aviation industry. Europe has now abandoned the Europa II launch vehicle. France is seeking partners to join in development of the L-3S as the primary European launch vehicle. In the meantime, however, the rather limited European space funding has been tentatively diverted to a large extent by the recent agreement to participate in the development of the $300 million Sortie Module for use with the U.S. Space Shuttle. It is significant that this decision will result in a much greater U.S. launch capability in relation to our foreign competition.

This problem is further compounded by the recent U.S. dollar devaluation and the greater inflation rate in Europe. These factors have combined with the result that American product prices have been reduced, in effect, approximately 20 to 30 percent in the past year or so.

6. In a perceptive editorial, Robert Hotz of *Aviation Week and Space Technology* analyzed the European aerospace problem this way:

First, Europe has not organized as a market to support the industry alliances it has achieved at the technical level. The captive markets created by each European consortium are still too small.

Second, European aerospace has concentrated so much on developing new lines of technically advanced hardware that it has badly neglected its marketing and sales capability. European marketeers are discovering too late that many of their products, while fine flying machines, just miss most of the operating airlines requirements. There was a veritable snowstorm of "paper" airplanes emanating from European manufacturers that emphasize this tendency to produce hardware without much thought as to where and how it can be sold. One observer described it as "technology in search of a market". Another factor is the heavy constant overhead that European aerospace firms are forced to carry.

Third, the competition is getting tougher. U.S. industry has learned some major new lessons in productivity, product development and the vital need for exports. European sales teams are not used to the kind of rough and tumble game that Boeing, Lockheed and McDonnell-Douglas have been playing against each other for decades. They tend to interpret it as some kind of American plot.

7. As repeatedly stated in speeches and private discussions at the Air Show, senior European officials recognize the above problems—particularly the need for an integrated European aerospace industry and an integrated market. The Europeans are searching for an effective means of establishing multination development and production programs that can compete effectively with U.S. hardware. Thus far no clear answers have emerged: knowledgeable industry officials agree that even efficient consortiums may not provide the full solution for the Europeans to compete successfully. The European industry, the officials agree, must somehow be honed down to a reasonable size despite various objections.

Overall, the establishment of an integrated European aerospace industry within the framework of the European Economic Community remains a tenuous proposition still largely dependent on legal restructuring of companies, a still vague airline interest in European sources for equipment replacement, the melding of divergent national interests and the future of the Anglo-French Concorde Supersonic Transport.

8. An emerging feature of the international aerospace market which will have significant effects on the U.S. position in the future is that many foreign nations are now demanding some kind of quid pro quo rather than making conventional outright purchases of U.S. aircraft and products. This quid pro quo takes the form of joint ventures, associations, or industrial offsets with the end result being that U.S. developed technology sometimes is exported only to appear later as competition to U.S. goods. Yet, there are no easy answers to this complex question; the various ramifications of "technology exports" will be prominent in major international business and governmental negotiations on trade for at least the remainder of this decade.

9. While the European problems are clearly visible, those facing the U.S. are more difficult to define with precision. We must be on guard against deluding ourselves that because we have been dominant in the aerospace marketplace since the end of World War II, this condition will continue indefinitely with no effort on our part. The ground avionics field is a vivid example of what happens when superior European technology is meshed with superior organization and is backed firmly by government. The growing French strength in air traffic control systems is beyond question.

10. As seen by members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics who attended the Air Show, the U.S. should take the following actions:

(a) U.S. industry needs to be more competitive and innovative.

(b) Substantial public and private investment in research and development must continue.

(c) Better financing arrangements for financing export sales must be developed.

(d) The Federal Government must be an active partner with industry and support it—without taking control. Sound, realistic policies to accomplish this must be developed.

(e) Cooperative efforts with the Soviet Union and others must be continued, but these efforts must be balanced with other national interests based on the U.S. remaining a strong competitor in the international market.

(f) A new look should be taken at our anti-trust legislation which takes into account the changing world competitive environment: more cooperation between U.S. firms may be required.

THERMAL LOADING ACT OF 1973

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce a bill that can be cited as the "Thermal Loading Act of 1973." The objective of the bill is to place the burden of proof on a power company to justify not building a cooling tower, rather than on the environmental agency to prove why one is needed. The advantage is that power companies would clearly understand that cooling towers are required on all thermal electric plants—either nuclear-fired or fossil fuel-fired. Fossil fuel-fired powerplants are not required to have an FPC permit, and therefore environmental considerations are not necessarily given high priority.

I believe that power companies would welcome this act, since all would be under the same cost burden and they would avoid many construction delays. At the same time, environmentalists would have fewer problems in connection with such projects. Beyond that, this bill would avert substantial environmental damage in the future.

I include that full text of this bill in the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill to require persons building powerplants which use public waters to operate cooling towers, unless they can demonstrate that there is no need for such towers, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Thermal Loading Act of 1973".

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who operates any facility for the generation of electrical energy which uses or diverts waters shall install and use adequate cooling towers or other closed systems of cooling such waters before they are returned to the body of water from which they were derived.

(b) The Federal Power Commission, with respect to nuclear powered generating facilities, and the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to fossil fuel powered generating facilities, may, upon application, except any person from the requirements of section 2 of this Act if such person can show to the Commission or to the Secretary, as the case may be, that the discharge or effluents from such generating facility would not cause damage to functioning ecosystems.

SEC. 3. Any person who violates any provision of this Act shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not longer than six month, or both.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act, the term "damage" means the substantial impairment of the natural functions of an existing ecosystem which is deemed by the Secretary to be clothed with an actual or potential public interest.

SEC. 5. This Act will apply to any generating facility which is constructed or begins operation on and after the end of the six-month period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

CORNELL PRESIDENT SPEAKS ABOUT GRADUATE EDUCATION

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year Dr. Dale Corson, president of Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., addressed himself to the challenges facing graduate education in the United States.

Dr. Corson, a distinguished educator and outstanding university president, spoke very pointedly about many of the problems faced by those responsible for quality graduate education.

Because Dr. Corson speaks in some detail about the relationship between graduate education and the Federal Government, it seems appropriate that his remarks edited for the RECORD be shared with the House of Representatives:

GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH—A STRATEGY FOR THE 1970'S

(By Dale R. Corson)

INTRODUCTION

The situation was never so good.

Enrollment in graduate education is now over a million students, up from 420,000 ten years ago. Some 390,000 of these are full-time pre-doctorals, compared with 150,000 in 1962.

Federal dollars available for academic research are fairly stable at somewhat under $2 billion per year. NSF annual funding is running at more than $600 million. The research component of the total NIH budget is scheduled to rise from $1.47 billion in FY-72 to $1.48 billion in FY-73 ~ud $1.52 billion in FY-74.

Net growth in this whole picture has slowed greatly, but after the hectic expansion of the 60's, it is welcome to have a breather.

We don't want too many Ph.D.s anyway, since the teaching market has slacked off.

Market forces will do a good job of providing the right amount and mix of manpower, provided government subsidies don't intrude. If some students have to work harder to secure an advanced education, there is nothing wrong with that.

All of these statements bear the curse of partial truth. And we certainly haven't had any notable success in marshalling convincing rebuttals.

CURRENT FEDERAL POLICY

Now for some additional facts.

Graduate Student Support. Full-time graduate students supported by Federal fellowships and traineeships in 1967 numbered 51,000, or 17% of the total. Today the number is 17,000 and the percentage is 4.6%.

Most notable is the cutback in NIH fellowship and training grants, which will drop by $60 million over fiscal years 1973 and '74, on the way to being phased out altogether.

NSF support for graduate students was $20 million in FY-1972 and is phasing down to $9 million in FY-1974.

There were 32,000 NDEA Title IV Graduate Fellowships awarded two years ago. Last year there were 2,000 and this year there are none.

Research Support. In research, there is a fundamental change in emphasis brought about by an order-of-magnitude increase in the pressure for quick results. Mission-oriented research is king. NSF has had to pick up fundamental research formerly sponsored by others.

The evidence for the shift in emphasis comes up daily. Grants are giving way to contracts, with targeted goals and month-by-month progress reviews. The detailed Request for Proposals leads the way to these contracts. Problem-solving interdisciplinary research is the route to the end of the rainbow.

Disciplinary research, the training of younger minds, where do they fit in?

New Agencies. The effect is compounded by several new agencies with limited traditions in research, DOT, HUD, EPA—all are under political pressure to produce quick results.

New Priorities. What we see is a major shift in priorities. The Administration is worried, and rightly so, about economic stability and control of inflation. It is worried, and rightly so, about our loss of international leadership in the high-technology industries. Some reaction to these pressures is inevitable and desirable.

EFFECTS

The Swinging Pendulum. I believe the pendulum is swinging dangerously too far. Investment in the future is taking a back seat. Graduate education has emerged at the very bottom of the priority list.

We built up a lot of programs in the '60's to meet the Federal Government's direct request or indirect financial stimulation, and now we are stuck with the machinery we created, including tenured professors on the payroll. The fluctuations in national policy have been far more rapid than the response time of a system which cherishes and depends upon long-term stability of programs and faculty.

Options For Supporting Graduate Students. The cutback in direct graduate support is certain to cause hardship or undesirable results in one or more of the following ways:

1. The universities pick up the check.
2. The students pick up the check. (Perhaps some of them can. We are soon going to find out.)
3. The student population will decline in those areas which in the past were identified as meriting special support to serve future public needs.

We may, however reluctantly, find ourselves increasingly driven to some kind of means test for graduate student financial aid.

Minority Students. There is a special irony in the case of minority students. They have been encouraged to come to our institutions. Now significant numbers are prepared to attend graduate school, just at the critical moment when financial help is drying up.

At Cornell, minority students are now receiving 35% of the University's total unrestricted aid funds for graduate students. We do not see how we can expand this aid further without outside assistance.

Neutral or Positive Consequences. Not all the internal effects of the external decisions are necessarily bad. Some are neutral, or at least hard to assess.

One likely consequence is an increase in the professional master's degree. We need to ask ourselves whether we like this phenomenon and what we ought to be doing to shape it or adjust to it.

If the newly announced recommendations of the Commission on Government Procurement are adopted, each institution may be able to enter into a single "master" contractual arrangement with the lead agency sponsoring research on that campus, with the terms applying to all the research sponsored by all Federal entities. We do not yet know whether this will be put into practice.

Another vague shape on the horizon is Senator Kennedy's legislation to establish a NASA for civilian technology. If it comes about, it may change the rules of the ball game.

ARGUMENTS AND REBUTTALS

We have tried to convince the Federal decision-makers of the error of their ways. So far to no avail.

Let me give you an example. Congressman Howard Robison wrote to Secretary Weinberger on behalf of the Title VI Language and Area Studies program, pointing out the damage which would be done by HEW's complete withdrawal. Secretary Weinberger's response states:

"We are hopeful that in the present situation Cornell University will determine that the value of its international programs is so fundamental to the University's basic mission that it will be able to continue the core activities as part of the priority concerns of its ongoing academic efforts."

So there you have it. We must go it alone. And we could, on this one program, if it weren't for the other demands created by Federal withdrawal.

Meaningful Response. Despite the frustrations, a necessary part of the strategy is to keep pressing the soundest possible rebuttals to every Federal argument which we believe ill-conceived. We have no chance to change anything if we argue that the present situation is hard on academic administrators, or budgets, or professors, or even students.

We have to talk meaningfully in terms of the national welfare, especially for the future.

Our most creative minds are a resource we can hardly afford to waste. The problems of achieving a better society are a challenge greater than Sputnik. Intellect—educated, creative intellect—should be at the highest premium in our history.

Manpower Forecasting. Argument about manpower needs is powerful, but tricky. We are not likely to know for sure about shortages until it is already too late.

We can point out that manpower forecasts have been notoriously unreliable in the past. In the late 1950's and early 1960's, the need for scientists and engineers was overstated. A temporary oversupply has led to the unwarranted conclusion that we can cut back on the new input.

Meanwhile, we ought to be working to improve the reliability of forecasting.

Manpower Pool. Our best hope is to develop further the point that social utility arises out of the general pool of highly trained manpower. Selective support for certain categories such as the health related professions should continue. A stable and moderate level of funding, without the sharp peaks and valleys of the past, is what we need.

Federal Responsibility? One of the arguments of the Federal establishment is that the matters we are discussing are not properly its responsibility. Private initiative prevail.

The Federal position is invalid, in my judgment, with regard to minority graduate students. Where will we get the minority professionals we need so badly? This is too big a problem for the universities to handle financially, and too important to the Nation to see it go by default.

Federal responsibility for assuring our future supply of creative manpower seems to me inescapable. Otherwise it is like deferred maintenance—saving money in the short run at high future cost.

Secretary Weinberger has pointed to the imperative need to be able to stop things; I agree, but we have the right to ask for some limitation on the rate of decline. If it makes defense to drop the Federal responsibility it would be only reasonable and fair to give notice of intent.

In research, we need to keep Federal focus on the notion that our priorities should be guided by promising *leads* as much as by *needs*.

We must stress institution building as the only way to assure pay-off in the long run. Universities do not perform well in a 100-yard dash. It's in the two-mile race that we score our points.

Revenue sharing. Another answer we are given is that revenue sharing will pick up the slack, and we should turn our attention to our State capitols. I see no chance in New York that a single cent can be obtained from this source.

Concentration of Resources. Something else we must advocate is the need to concentrate resources where it will do the most good.

During the middle 1960's we supported new centers of excellence, with geographic dispersion. This was an admirable objective but we do not seem to have the political or economic stamina to succeed. We will have to put some of these goals aside until another day.

The problem is illustrated by forecasts that doctoral output will decline at the top 60 institutions over the next few years accompanied by an increase in the output of other universities.

We have to find a way to make the point that quality in graduate education should be the major Federal objective in the 1970's rather than expansion of output as was the case in the '60's.

ALTERNATIVES TO FEDERAL SUPPORT

We need to think about possible alternatives to Federal support and I have mentioned two: the institution and the student.

Industry is another, but I do not hold out much hope here. Stockholders resolutions opposing charitable donations are appearing on the proxy statements this year.

Foundations. We have been urged to call the attention of the major private foundations to our plight. Well and good, and I hope they will respond. But we cannot expect any major replacement of the loss of Federal support. Some foundation executives believe universities incapable of responding effectively to the challenges of present day social and technological problems.

Graduate Research Assistantships. A final alternative is to rely on university-based research, with its need for assistantships, as the key to support of graduate education. This, some believe, will automatically channel the students in the right direction.

As with so many of the arguments we are running up against, this one is partly true, but its has its weaknesses.

Unfortunately, every funding path one follows seems to lead back to a diverse program of direct Federal support of graduate education through training grants, traineeships, and fellowships.

INTERNAL MEASURES

If we are to convince others that universities have an important role to play, there are some things we need to do internally.

Efficiency. We must demonstrate that we are reasonably efficient in the use of facilities and equipment.

Problem-oriented Research. We must rely less on the traditional disciplines and put more emphasis on interdisciplinary centers and research teams. Such efforts have not always been successful, but we need to keep trying. I would like to prove that a university can deal with the "real" problems of society effectively.

Creation of a Record. We need to get our own house in order and to agree on what we want to accomplish. In the present climate, progress will be slow and patience and perseverance will be at a premium. We need to "create a record"—to respond to the present high-priority social and technological objectives, to lay a groundwork of convincing argument, not just for this year, this Congress and this Administration, but for the years and Congresses and Administrations to come.

OBJECTIVES

Objectives I suggest we focus on include these:

A stable pool of highly trained manpower

Selective emphasis on fields of visible social utility

Opportunity for the disadvantaged

Opportunity for the most creative minds

Concentration of resources on the best programs and departments.

Improvement in our manpower forecasting ability

A powerful University-based basic research capability

Continuing review of research and manpower policy from outside the Federal Government

Avoidance of crippling collapse in support

ADVOCACY

To get all this done, we need to push every button on the console and use every channel of communication. And we need to consider whether we are adequately organized to carry this out.

No longer is there a Science Advisor in the White House, nor a President's Advisory Committee, nor an Office of Science and Technology.

Some of this former role has been taken over by the Director of the National Science Foundation. How are we going to provide him with systematic input on our views and problems? Should we seek on our own to establish a mechanism for collecting and presenting our thoughts? Without such a mechanism, who is to judge the success and quality of the new thrusts the Federal Government is making?

Another channel we must keep open is with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

We must find ways to convince the newer agencies like DOT and EPA that some form of university orientation and graduate support must be built into their programs from the very beginning.

Any contacts we can make directly with the White House and the Office of Management and Budget should be pursued. So should our regular contacts with the members and committees of the Congress. Systematic cultivation of Congressional staff personnel is a vital investment in the future.

We must make every possible use of the associations of higher education and the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering.

Professional societies presumably see the same problems that we do and we ought to lose no opportunity to exchange views and to make common cause.

There is an additional possible aproach we should consider. In a world where the emphasis is increasingly on results, on applications, on mission-oriented research, I think we ought to engage some of the people in that end of the business to be our spokesmen for basic research and the development of educated manpower.

I believe it is possible to identify some distinguished industrial leaders who understand the complex relationships between research and application who also have ready access to the present power structure of the Federal government.

THE ULTIMATE GOAL

As a final word, I should like to repeat the thought that we keep constantly before us the fact that the goal we serve is the ultimate naional welfare, and not the narrow special interests of the higher education community. If this doesn't come across in the presentations we make—if we talk only about hardships for students and professors and academic budgets—we aren't going to make it.

NATIONAL STUDENT LOBBY URGES CONTINUATION OF BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, biomedical research is one of the most important areas of research being conducted today in the United States or throughout the world. Its achievements have, through the years, saved lives and helped millions to a healthier life. The Nixon administration's decision to phase out training grants to students would seriously damage our future research capability.

Last week, the National Student Lobby testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Health Education in favor of a substantial appropriation for a continuation of the biomedical research program. Ms. Fran Reibman, the associate director of the lobby, offered some persuasive testimony regarding not only the negative impact of the contemplated phaseout on medical science; but the devastating waste in human potential it will cause.

Because her testimony highlights the human as well as the scientific value of the NIH fellowship program, I recommend it to all my colleagues:

TESTIMONY OF THE NATIONAL STUDENT LOBBY

Mr. Chairman, we would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify here today. We appear on behalf of the National Student Lobby and the Graduate Student Association, SUNY at Buffalo in opposition to the impending phase-out of the National Institutes of Health Training Grants and Fellowships.

Today, we are well aware of the potential damage to our nation that develops when our natural resources are taken for granted, however, it would appear that we do not learn from our mistakes. We are here this afternoon not to remind you that our forests, natural fuel, and waters are in jeopardy, but to speak of the imminent stifling of our most precious natural resource, Our Mind Power. Has it not become clear to us that "A Mind Is A Terrible Thing To Waste?"

THE NEED FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

The Administration has taken the position that the "need for a greater number of trained biomedical research scientists has passed . . . ," and that the supply of researchers will soon exceed the demand. Furthermore, they argue that this oversupply will lead to a situation of unemployment.[1] These arguments are not consistent with the projections of the NIH Reports[2] that state that by 1983 we will need 112,360 Doctoral biomedical scientists, as compared with 66,800 scientists in 1971; accordingly we question the justification for eliminating this program. The President's Science Advisory Committee has stated that "The implication that we are training a surplus of biomedical Ph.D.'s appears unfounded, at least to the panel. All but 1.3% of these Ph.D.'s graduating in 1968 and 1969 found positions in which they are appropriately utilizing their graduate education . . ."[3] Furthermore, we must realize that with every new advance made a broad range of research opportunities is created, expanding the potential job market. It is rather obvious that the Nixon Administration has rejected the advice of a panel which it created.

The Administration has proposed a new system of contracting as an alternative to fellowships and training grants. We consider this system inadequate, as it will tend to restrict students to specific projects and force students to work only with their assigned professors. The contract system has already been proven ineffective in Europe and would turn research in this country back to an apprenticeship system. Contract research along with training grant cutbacks is an expression of "We know all there is to know." When will we begin to recognize the fact that many of our major breakthroughs in science have been discovered through basic research, conducted in areas not even focused on.

The weakness in the proposed contracting system is that it is equivalent to having charged the National Cancer Institute to cure cancer in 1946, long before we had knowledge of the structure of DNA. This system is also a reflection of the contract system in the U.S.S.R., where genetics was completely ignored because Lysenko, the man at the top, did not believe in genetic theory. Experience has made it crystal clear that a research picture directed from the top can be short sighted and ultimately disasterous. The latest function of this system might be to delay any major breakthrough in curing cancer, heart disease, or other health menaces for years.

THE NEED FOR EXPANDED FUNDING FOR FELLOWSHIPS AND TRAINING GRANTS

We would like to call your attention to a basic point, that we believe the Administration and the Office of Management and Budget appear to be oblivious to; research, whether publicly or privately funded; whether on the Masters, pre- or post-Doctoral level is a full time job. Research grants are not a charitable handout, in fact, in a great many instances students working in Laboratories, hospitals, and clinics are a source of cheap labor, (what research scientist in his right mind would work for $3,200 or less). According to Nobel Laureate Dr. James Watson, researchers between the ages of 25 and 35 are in their peak periods for creative research. Are we going to throw away these young minds, because the OMB deems these grants unnecessary?

In his testimony before the House Sub-Committee on Public Health and Environment, Dr. Zapp stated that, "The program, does not target funds on needy or disadvantaged students." He went on to state "Beneficiaries of research training support—whether M.D. or Ph. D.'s—are generally qualified for jobs with substantial income potential. Such persons are generally able to afford the costs of loans and other general financial assistance for their education as an investment in their own future . . ." This statement was evidently made with complete disregard of the PSAC report or the findings of the Bureau of Social Science Research.

We question the rationale behind Dr. Zapp's argument. The BSSR survey found that most students could not finance their own education, nor could their families substantially contribute, and their loans could not be substituted for stipends without negative consequences.[4] Let us not cloud this issue by introducing dubious arguments pertaining to discrimination or the status of disadvantaged students. In fact, without this program, study in this area would be restricted to only the affluent. This program is open to all students who meet the academic requirements regardless of their social or economic backgrounds.

The economic payoffs that Dr. Zapp alludes to are illusory. In 1970 the average Ph.D. with a doctorate in bio-science earned $16,000.[5] Obviously, full-time bio-medical research is not a lucrative field. Yet the advances made by R&D's over recent years have saved billions of dollars in health care[6] and provided billions of dollars to the pharmaceutical industry.

Let us consider the fact that without basic research there is no medical science. Have we found so many answers that we have no more questions, or do we want to hide our heads in the sand and hope that the maladies that now afflict us will go away? Are we willing to place research on the wholesale market and sell it to the highest bidder?

In reply to a letter from the Director of the OST, the Chairman of the President's Cancer Panel stated: "It is my opinion that fellowships and training grants, assuming proper selection and wise administration are essential if we are to carry out the mandate of the President and Congress in the National Cancer Act of 1971 . . . there are certain areas where sufficient numbers of highly skilled bio-medical scientists do not exist today and are essential. We need fellowships and training grants to attract the brightest scientists to programs."

In a letter to President Nixon, dated January 25, 1973, the President's Cancer Panel stated the following: "Most bio-medical scientists and the National Cancer Advisory Board are concerned we spend too little on basic research and too much applying present care, when it is inadaquate."

Considering the aforementioned statements, we cannot understand why no new training grants or fellowships have been awarded since January 27, 1973. What happened to the $42,603,000 that went unspent in research training programs, or the $105,293,000 that was not spent in other research programs? If we consider that the pressure for more research increases in proportion to the rapidly rising health care costs, then, we can only assume that these funds were unjustifiably impounded in an effort to present the public with a picture of how the Administration has effectively saved money. Ultimately, the cose of these training grants and fellowships cannot be measured in terms of money, they must be measured in terms of saving human lives.

CONCLUDING RECOMMENDATIONS

To date, there is no truly accurate way to project the number of bio-scientists that will be needed in the future; we must rely on the past to predict the future. In the early 1950's when penicillin was discovered we had no way of knowing that new strains of bacteria would appear that would be immune to it. However, these new strains of bacteria created a new field of research positions. With every answer a new question arises, answers that lead to new and more complex questions. We are forced to work on the assumption that our projections are understatements.

The theory of oversupply that the Administration postulates is unfounded. The ratio of R&D's must be increased in relation to health care costs or medical technology will be severely handicapped. The situation of unemployment that the Administration is projecting must be viewed as a direct result of the vast cuts in funding to Medical Schools, Clinics, Nursing Programs, and Laboritories. Unemployment in bio-medical research is not an indication of oversupply, rather, it is an indictment against the Administration for its shortsighted economic policies in the area of research and medical technology.

In conclusion, we believe that phasing out this program would serve only to divert young, original minds to other more lucrative fields. We therefore respectfully suggest that the 1974 Budget appropriate $152,996,000 for Research training programs, and add to that amount $42,503,000 from last year's funds.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Administration Press Release on the 1974 Budget.

[2] The Training Programs of the Institutes of the National Institutes of Health, Fiscal Year 1974, Volume I.

[3] President's Science Advisory Committee, Scientific and Educational Basis for Improving Health, Report of the Panel on Biological and Medical Science of the President's Science Advisory Committee . . . Office of Science and Technology, 1972.

[4] The Bureau of Social Research, Inc. of Washington, D.C. Questionnaire Responses.

[5] Subcommittee on Public Health and Enviroment, Hearings, March 20, 22, 23, 1973, page 25.

[6] The Journal of Laboratory and Clinical Medicine, Vol. 79, March 1972, Number 3 . . . Editorial "The Dollar Benefits of Biomedical Research: A Cost Analysis, by. H. H. Fudenberg, Professor of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco.

Tables:

Table 36, Vol. I, NIH Fiscal Year Report, 1974.

Table 28, Vol. I, NIH Fiscal Year Report, 1974.

TABLE 36.—DEMAND FOR DOCTORAL BIOMEDICAL SCIENTISTS: ESTIMATED ACTUAL FISCAL YEAR 1971 AND PROJECTED TO FISCAL YEAR 1983

[In thousands]

Fiscal year ending June of—	Nature of demand: Total	Replacement	New	Demand on biomedical-science manpower pool for—: All activities	Research	Teaching	Clinical service	Administrative, etc.
Estimated actual: 1971	6.8	2.3	4.5	66.8	30.20	19.20	7.20	10.20
Projected:								
1972	6.7	2.5	4.2	70.98	32.25	20.22	7.66	10.85
1973	6.92	2.65	4.27	75.25	34.51	21.11	8.11	11.82

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 36.—DEMAND FOR DOCTORAL BIOMEDICAL SCIENTISTS: ESTIMATED ACTUAL FISCAL YEAR 1971 AND PROJECTED TO FISCAL YEAR 1983—Continued

[In thousands]

Fiscal year ending June of—	Nature of demand: Total	Replacement	New	Demand on biomedical-science manpower pool for—: All activities	Research	Teaching	Clinical service	Administrative, etc.
Projected—Continued								
1974	7.02	2.81	4.21	79.46	36.93	21.82	8.53	12.18
1975	7.10	2.97	4.13	83.59	39.33	22.49	8.94	12.83
1976	7.07	3.13	3.94	87.53	41.69	23.06	9.33	13.45
1977	7.09	3.27	3.82	91.35	43.98	23.60	9.72	14.05
1978	7.08	3.42	3.66	95.01	46.18	24.10	10.11	14.62
1979	7.04	3.55	3.49	98.50	48.26	24.59	10.49	15.16
1980	6.98	3.68	3.30	101.80	50.19	25.06	10.88	10.67
1981	7.19	3.81	3.38	105.18	52.19	25.52	11.28	16.19
1982	7.45	3.93	3.52	108.70	54.28	25.98	11.70	16.74
1983	7.73	4.07	3.66	112.36	56.45	26.46	12.14	17.31

Sources: Annex tables D-1 and E-1.

TABLE 28.—FAMILY PROFILE OF NIH TRAINEES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1970 [1]

Characteristics	Training level: Predoctoral	Postdoctoral: Ph.D.	M.D.
Marital status, current:			
Single (percent)	41	19	13
Married	56	78	86
Other status	3	3	1
Total number of dependents:			
None	58	35	18
1	21	22	15
2 or more	21	43	67
Number of dependent children:			
None	74	49	24
1	14	26	20
2 or more	12	25	56
Occupation of father:			
Unskilled labor or farm worker	5	6	3
Skilled, semiskilled operative	22	23	11
Technical or semiprofessional worker	5	4	2
Salesman or clerical worker	8	11	10
Proprietor, manager, business executive, or official	26	24	31
M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M	6	6	17
Teacher, college professor, other educator.	7	7	6
Other professional	16	15	16
Other	5	5	3
Father's highest education level:			
Less than high school graduate	19	23	17
High school graduate	23	25	18
Some college	17	16	15
College graduate	17	15	17
Postgraduate study	23	20	34
Parent's income at trainee's graduation from college:			
Less than $5,000	9	14	9
$5,000 to $9,999	33	37	26
$10,000 to $14,999	28	25	23
$15,000 or more	30	24	41
Median	$10,785	$9,885	$13,090

[1] Based on a population of 4,758 for NIH predoctoral trainees, 811 for NIH postdoctoral Ph.D. trainees, and 1,198 for NIH postdoctoral M.D. trainees. Student trainees questionnaire, items 11, 13, 15, 16, and 17.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 9286

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of H.R. 9286 on July 31, I intend to offer for consideration the following amendment:

On page 15, after line 9, insert the following: "It is the sense of the Congress that the durability of the NATO Allied Command is vital to our national interest and that United States support for it should include basing not less than two full-strength army divisions in Europe for at least five years."

TRANSPORTATION AND THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the corporate business interests which control most of the energy sources today, both in our Nation and abroad, are currently engaged in a massive effort to persuade us that they, and they alone, know what is good for the people of the world. They tell us, on television and in newspapers, that they are working to solve the energy crisis which has been thrust upon them by environmentalists and others who have prevented them from taking the steps which they intended to take. With their massive advertising budgets they are attempting to convince us that all we need do is stop regulating them so much, and all will be well.

I have dealt with such nonsense several times in other remarks on the floor, as you well know, Mr. Speaker. I have said that we cannot rely on those whose main concern is profit to protect the public interest, and many others have said it before me.

But today I would like to take just a few minutes to enter in the RECORD a study by George W. Brown—no relation to me, the name similarity is merely coincidental—a professional transportation consultant who has reached the same conclusion, and gone beyond that obvious statement to propose specific measures which deserve consideration by this body in our deliberations about transportation and the energy crisis.

Dr. Brown, who has a BA degree in general science, a MS degree in metallurgy and chemistry and a Ph. D. in physiology, presented his paper at the Connecticut Conference On Transportation on May 16 of this year.

I submit his analysis for the RECORD at this point:

TRANSPORTATION AND THE ENERGY CRISIS

(By George W. Brown, Ph. D.)

Energy, atmosphere, water, and land are man's most precious assets, requiring prudent management to insure the longest possible lifetime for mankind on planet earth. The saddest law of the universe, the second law of thermodynamics, states that eventually the earth will die. Significantly, the second laws deals with energy, proving the fact that wherever free energy is converted to work or heat a certain amount is irretrievably lost, no matter how perfect the conversion system. Man can exist within the confines of this sad law for several million years or he can squander his irreplaceable energy reserves, as we have been doing for the past 20 years in the United States, and shorten his survival time to a few hundred years, or less.

The present American transportation system is a major factor for the World's serious depletion of energy reserves, fouling of the atmosphere, and destruction of the land. Our technologists have created, and continue to create, a transportation system requiring an individual who must move from one place to another to either drive an automobile on roads and streets created for its use, or fly on jet aircraft. Both modes of travel are designed to maximize fuel and atmospheric consumption. Furthermore, our Society has become structured in such a way as to demand the maximum daily movement of a maximum number of people. As if this weren't enough, we are now in the midst of the process of maximizing the consumption of fuel, air, and land required to move our worldly goods. From 1965 to 1970 we have increased the tonnage of freight moved on the highways 99.3%.[1]

In terms of human values we can state that the American Transportation System is the largest technological failure the world has ever seen. During 1970 the motor vehicle portion of this system was directly responsible for taking the lives of 54,700 people while injuring an additional 3.6 million.[2] A conservative cost estimate for killing and injuring these citizens is 13.6 billion dollars.[3] Twenty five per cent of the registered motor vehicles in the United States were involved in accidents during 1970.[4] One wonders why these yearly costs do not cause rational men responsible for transportation planning to recognize the failure of the system. Their sole response is to blame the users of the system for its failure.

In addition to its direct human life and dollar cost, our transportation system is devouring untenable amounts of irreplaceable energy resources. Sooner or later men will come to recognize that available energy is the most precious commodity on this earth. Without energy, money and possessions are worthless. Each of us requires about 3000 Calories in food energy each day,[5] and we need to recognize the caloric requirements of our transportation systems. Of course the sources of energy are different for transportation and for living. The energy required for our transportation systems is *not* replaceable while the energy we consume as food is largely replaceable. In other words, the well *will* run dry for transportation energy. It is only the timing that is in doubt. Therefore, let us consider our transportation energy consumption in human equivalents. During 1970 our automobile population in the United States consumed 65.6 billion gallons of gasoline [1]. The average energy content of a gallon of gasoline is 32,144 Calories.[6] Therefore, the 1970 road and street usage of gasoline to run only our automobiles consumed sufficient en-

Footnotes at end of article.

ergy to feed 1.93 billion humans a 3000 Calorie per day diet for one year. If we disregard light, medium, and heavy single unit trucks, and consider only semitrailer and trailer trucks, utilized in the main to supplant rail freight shipments, we find that this category of heavy trucks consumed 8.4 billion gallons of diesel fuel during 1970[1]. Diesel fuel energy content averages 36,263 Calories per gallon[6], and the human caloric equivalent for 1970 was enough energy to feed 277 million people for one year. Domestic air travel in the United States during 1970 required 6.9 billion gallons of fuel[7], enough calories to feed a 3000 Calorie per day diet to 230.3 million people for a year. The tragedy associated with this profligate consumption of energy is, we are not getting a good transportation system in return for our extravagance. Passenger, freight, and mail movements are becoming progressively less efficient as the dollar costs for the services escalate even more than the general inflation trends.

Government agencies cannot be relied upon to make rational predictions regarding energy reserves or the effect of transport decisions on future consumption. By 1969 the United States, with only 5.7% of the World's population, was consuming 29.9% of the World's crude oil production. In energy terms, our motor vehicles consumed 16 times as many calories as was required to feed our entire human population. In spite of the implications for petroleum shortages inherent in this enormous consumption of fuel, a petroleum geologist representing the U.S. Geological Survey (at a meeting called by the Governor of Iowa to discuss environmental problems) in December 1970 stated there was no possibility of petroleum shortages in the United States for the forseeable future. Upon closer questioning regarding the source of his predictions he admitted that his assurances were based upon statements submitted by the major oil corporations. As late as the Spring of 1971 Secretary Volpe of the U.S. Department of Transportation was enthusiastically supporting the concept of a subsidy for the creation of an American fleet of SST's with admitted fuel consumptions of at least 15,000 gallons per hour. The idea that World oil reserves might not be able to sustain the additional strain implied by an SST transport system was considered a frivoulous argument advanced by eco-freaks. Yet the winter of 1972 found farmers unable to obtain fuel for grain drying and public institutions unable to obtain fuel oil for heating purposes. It is obvious that government information regarding the exact status of the present energy crisis cannot be relied upon, particularly when the oil corporations are allowed to treat oil reserve information as confidential. It is equally obvious that our extravagant consumption of petroleum products in support of an obsolete transportation system cannot continue without dire consequences.

In the long run drastic changes will have to be made in our transportation systems and replaceable fuel energy sources will have to be developed. For the immediate future, transportation planning must be oriented to human needs rather than to corporate or machine needs. Any transport system utilizes resources, and the primary resources which have great significance for human needs are energy, atmosphere, and land. In order to impress upon planners the vital cost of transport modes a "human equivalent" scale for air, land, and energy consumption is required. Three thousand Calories is a reasonable daily requirement for food energy for one human. Therefore, a 3000 Calorie Unit can be treated as one "human equivalent" for energy consumption. One adult engaged in normal activities will have a respiratory exchange of about 26,000 cubic inches per hour.[8] Thus, 26,000 cubic inches of air can be treated as one "human equivalent" for atmopheric consumption. It appears reasonable to suggest that one half acre of land per person is required for housing and agriculture to support a population base, so ½ acre can be designated a land "human equivalent."

Footnotes at end of article.

Utilizing a human equivalent scale, based on these concepts, we can visualize the costs inherent in transporting 360 passengers 500 miles by air, automobile, or train. A B–747 jet, fully loaded, could make this 500 mile trip in 1.1 hrs., with a fuel consumption of 3,911 gallons[7] and requiring 25,600 acres of land for two safe landing fields. The human equivalent for fuel is 46,700; land use—51,200; atmospheric consumption—2,409,000 for a total human equivalent scale value related to energy, land, and atmospheric consumption, of 2,506,900. Ninety automobiles, carrying four passengers each, could transport the 360 passengers 500 miles via freeways in 10 hours with a fuel consumption of 3,316 gallons.[1] The human equivalent for fuel is 40,330; land use—56,000; and atmospheric consumption—1,642,500 for a total equivalent scale value of 1,728,830. One train would transport the 360 passengers 500 miles in 8.3 hours with a fuel consumption of 1,238 gallons.[9] The human equivalent for fuel is 14,965; for land use—12,121; and for atmospheric consumption 723,627 producing a total equivalent scale value of 750,713. Thus it is readily apparent that the transportation systems selected for heavy subsidy were the most destructive choices, when due concern is given for the use of our irreplaceable resources of energy, land, and atmosphere. It is also apparent that continued expansion of air and automotive transport modes cannot continue. The notion that we can continue an absolute 4.5 million vehicle per year expansion of our motor vehicle population if only exhaust emissions are controlled, at the expense of greater fuel consumption and larger sized engines, is a cruel hoax, accomplishing nothing but diverting our attention from the fact that our transportation systems are failing.

Rational action must be taken *now* to provide time in the immediate future for the planning and development of long term tenable transportation systems. Some immediate actions required are:

1. Prohibit the construction of one more square inch of rural or urban freeways. We must recognize that the automobile is essentially a low speed transportation device suitable for moving people and goods from thinly populated areas to junctions on high density traffic corridors. Paved road surfaces are required in these rural areas, and they have been neglected in order to concentrate on rural and urban freeway construction. Under no circumstances should the use of automotive transport be planned for high speed, high traffic density, long distance movements or for urban commuter transportation.

2. Discontinue the costly and inefficient attempts to promote emission controls. Instead of these standards, the DOT could place mandatory limitations on the size of engines for all new automobiles and set national rural speed limits of 50 MPH. One hundred cubic inch displacement engines are now available in passenger automobiles which give better than 30 miles per gallon fuel consumption. If these limitations had applied to the automobiles in use during 1970 the fuel saved in that one year would have been 36 billion gallons.[1]

3. Tax presently available automobiles and trucks at a rate commensurate with their fuel consumption and road damage potential. This would accelerate the existing trend toward smaller, more economical cars, and put heavy freight shipments back on the railroads. If the freight shipped in semi-trailer and trailer trucks during 1970 had been diverted to the railroads we would have saved 2.4 billion of disesel fuel,[1,10] enough to heat 1.2 million homes for one year in the Northern portions of the country.

4. Remove all public subsidy for airline operations and require all flights to carry a full passenger load or cancel. The small percentage of citizens demanding airline service should be required to bear the full dollar cost for this extravagant use of resources. If during 1970 the airlines had been forced to cut services commensurate with full passenger loads, we would have saved 4.2 billion gallons of fuel.[7]

5. Provide major subsidy for rail freight, passenger, and urban mass transit construction and operations. At the present time rail transportation offers the greatest potential for conservation of vital resources in both urban and rural environments. Therefore, an effort at least as great as that now devoted to highway and street programs should be directed toward creating an efficient rail transit system.

6. Modify all urban renewal programs to provide housing, school, and recreational areas adjacent to business areas. We can no longer afford the concept that we must move entire segments of the population twice a day because some irrational technologists decreed it was possible.

7. Drastically reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of our communication systems. Considerable transportation energy could be conserved by lowered cost for telephone use and development of low cost closed circuit television.

For the long term future we must begin now to develop replaceable energy resources. This is what the Atomic Energy Commission would have us believe they are doing when they promote nuclear power. As might be expected from a Commission born in secrecy and dedicated to the concept of maintaining an impenetrable lead curtain around their operations, AEC promises of unlimited sources of energy are largely illusory. Sources of fuel for their present generation of reactors are very limited, the prospects for an ultimate fusion reactor are dim, and the public health hazard inherent in following the nuclear rainbow is so great that the resources of the U.S. Treasury are required to provide liability insurance for nuclear plants.[1] Fortunately, there are promising leads for the development of replaceable energy resources. It is estimated that solar heating and cooling of a home in Massachusetts can be accomplished for a total investment of $3,000.[12] Given this same collector system and a method for energy conversion and storage we would be well on the way toward a mobile power source. Electrified municipal transit systems are feasible in many of our cities if we use the water power sources available. My home town has two dams on a river where electrical power used to be generated. Both have been deactivated. One could easily run an area wide transit system. Refuse from our larger cities can be used as a valuable source of "methane, a highly suitable fuel for propulsion systems. Wind power is likely to again be taken seriously. A new 10,000 ton sailing passenger vessel is due to be launched late in 1973 to provide luxurious accommodations for transoceanic passages at speeds comparable to other ocean liners. A 17,000 ton sailing freighter has also been designed in Hamburg, Germany.[13]

The need for immediate and long term revision of transportation and energy policies is urgent. Yet we see private Corporations gaining absolute control over all sources of fossil fuel energy as well as uranium ore. Accompanying this is the trend toward corporate farming and control of the food cycle. Thus, corporate control of the Calorie, man's most precious commodity, already exists for fossile fuels, and is rapidly becoming a reality for food energy. The public must gain a voice in the control of energy expenditure before present policies destroy all of us. Experience has demonstrated that the creation of another government agency or groups of agencies won't get the job done. The Federal Department of Transportation was created to bring about an integrated rational transportation policy and we have seen nothing but a proliferation of old mistakes.

Democracy must be injected into the decision making process. We must devise a Public Advocate system [14]. The system would require that a paid public advocate would have the right and duty to argue for the Public's position before all decision making bodies. For example, a State Highway Commission could not make a decision based on their staff's recommendations until they had heard the Public Advocate's presentation. Energy, atmosphere and land use policies directly affect the lives of all citizens. It is a public scandal of major dimensions when we allow Corporate interests, in collusion with governmental entities, to have dictatorial power concerning the use of these resources. Granting eminent domain power to highway interests and utility corporations without a referendum for the citizens affected should not be tolerated. Absolute control of the World's energy reserves cannot be entrusted to the oil corporations without public veto power at the Board level. People all over the World are beginning to recognize these evils and demanding democratic decision making processes. In the United States we call this citizen criticism the consumer or environmental movement, and minor concessions to public participation are beginning to appear. So far, the concessions are primarily cosmetic. Governmental Agencies and private corporations exhibit a deep distrust of the public. New media coverage of policy decisions affecting the public welfare is often superficial and hostile to public interests. Recently, in response to public clamor for representation, regional planning commissions have been directed to form citizen advisory committees to 'aid in the planning process'. Naturally, no money was provided the citizen advisory committees for professional help to create a citizen advocate position, nor were the advisory committees allowed a decisive vote at meetings of the entire planning commission. When some of these citizen advisory committees devoted the time and found voluntary help necessary to develop rational regional transportation plans, the parent planning commissions simply abolished the rebellious advisory committees and formed new committees with membership more likely to conform with established polcy of unlimited growth of the automotive transport sector. In depth news media coverage of this type of outrageous behavior on the part of Public Officials and Agencies is almost nonexistent. We must create a Democratic system to protect us from special interest policy decisions. There is no better use of public funds than expenditures directed toward providing paid Public Advocates to forcefully present the public interest position in opposition to vested interests before all corporate and governmental agencies where decisions affecting the welfare of citizens are made. Such proceedings must receive complete, accurate, in depth news media coverage. Hopefully our institutions will respond in a constructive manner to this type of public interest pressure. If they will, irate citizens will eventually revolt against dictatorial control over vital resources.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Highway Statistics, 1970*, U.S. Department of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration, pp. 52 & 54.

[2] *Accident Facts*, 1971 Edition, National Safety Council, pp. 2 & 3.

[3] *Accident Facts*, 1971 Edition, National Safety Council, p. 5.

[4] *Accident Facts*, 1971 Edition, National Safety Council, p. 40.

[5] *Human Physiology*, 3rd Edition, Winton & Bayliss, p. 219.

[6] *Handbook of Chemistry & Physics*, 40th Edition, Chemical Rubber Publishing Company, p. 1908.

[7] *Aircraft Operating Cost & Performance Report, Aug., 1971*, Civil Aeronautics Board.

[8] *Human Physiology*, 3rd Edition, Winton & Bayliss, p. 132.

[9] *Environment*, April, 1972, p. 16.

[10] *Environment*, April, 1972, p. 19.

[11] See *Price-Anderson Act*.

[12] Paul Rapaport, Scientist, RCA Laboratories & Paul Schmidt, Chief Staff Scientist, Honeywell Corporation on NBC *Today* Program, 3/28/73.

[13] *Popular Science*, June, 1971, pp. 48 & 49.

[14] *Environment, Economics & Institutions*, Presentation to 14th Conference, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Omaha, Nebraska, 6/8/71, Irving K. Fox, Professor of Regional Planning, University of Wisconsin.

ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS—59TH OHIO STATE CONVENTION

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 28, 1973, I had the pleasure of addressing the 59th Ohio State Convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians which was held in North Jackson, Ohio. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mary E. Murphy, who was chosen Irish Woman of Mahoning County 1973, and Judge Joseph E. O'Neill, who was chosen Mahoning County's Irishman of the Year 1973.

In my remarks, I related the story about nine Irishmen who were sentenced to hang for treason by Queen Victoria. Instead, they were banished from their homeland, only to become outstanding leaders in their adopted countries. So, too, have countless Irish immigrants in America and throughout the world become leaders in the perpetual struggle for liberty, equality, and justice.

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

ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS—59TH OHIO STATE CONVENTION

PREAMBLE TO OUR CONSTITUTION

It is hereby declared and decreed, that the purpose of this Organization, the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America is:

(1) To promote friendship, unity and Christian charity among its members.

(2) To uphold and sustain loyalty to the government of the United States of America, by the members of this Organization living here in America, or whatever government under which its members may be citizens.

(3) To aid and advance by all legitimate means the aspirations and endeavors of the Irish people for complete and absolute independence.

(4) And to foster the ideals and cultivate the history and traditions of the Irish race throughout the world.

Its membership is confined exclusively to practical Catholics of Irish blood or descent, who are citizens of the United States or who have declared their intentions to become citizens of the United States, and to citizens of the commonwealth of Canada or of any other Democratic government on the Western Hemisphere.

Its work embraces every lawful demand of Christian friendship and fraternity between its members and the protection of all dependent on them. Under its Constitution, provision is made for the care of the sick and infirm among the membership and for the protection of widows and orphans in accordance with the dictates of Christian fraternity.

Hon. Charles J. Carney, Congressman, U.S. House of Representatives. 19th Ohio Congressional District.

Charles J. Carney has served as Ohio Senator for 20 years, and is now serving his second full term as U.S. Congressman for the 19th Ohio Congressional District. He has authored many bills while serving in the Ohio Senate and now takes an active part in nine major committees in Congress. Carney is a well known Catholic laymen and has served with many civic and fraternal organizations.

Ohio's only county board wishes you a successful and enjoyable convention.

MAHONING COUNTY BOARD

Rev. Thomas Kelly, Chaplain
David P. McGuire, President.
Joseph Nalley, Sr., Vice President.
Charles V. Byrne, Treasurer.
Thomas Reilley, Recording Secretary.
Thomas Cox, Financial Secretary.

Division No. 5

Rev. Timothy O'Neil, Chaplain.
Edward F. Donlin, President.
John Franken, Jr., Vice-President.
Timothy Franken, Recording Secretary.
John F. Hynes, Financial Secretary.
Robert W. Hartwig, Treasurer.
Patrick Leonard, Marshall.
James Miller, Jr., Sentinel.
Joseph Nalley, Jr., Past President.

Division No. 7

Rev. Thomas Kelly, Chaplain.
Thomas Reilley, President.
Ronald Skowron, Vice-President.
Richard McGuire, Recording Secretary.
David McGuire, Financial Secretary.
Steve McLaughlin, Treasurer.
Thomas Cox, Marshall.
Robert Barry, Sentinel.
Jerry Bogan, Past President.

OHIO ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS STATE BOARD

Rev. John J. Cunningham, Chaplain.
John E. McSorley, President.
David P. McGuire, Vice-President.
Steve Donnelly, Secretary.
John J. Holt, Treasurer.
Walter, Carmendy, Chr. Irish Missions.
William P. Berry, Chr. Catholic Action.
George A. Hunter, Chr. Immigration.
Lawrence T. Purdy, Organizer.
Alexander Hamilton, Historian.
James D. Kelly, Chr. Press & Publicity.
Michael J. Killgallen, Immed. Past President.

Compliments of Judge Joseph E. O'Neill, 7th District Court of Appeals, Mahoning County's Irishman of the Year—1973.

Irish Woman of Mahoning County—1973, Mary E. Murphy, welcomes you in the most traditional gaelic greeting "dia is Muire stob uilig"—may God and Mary bless you all.

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

Joseph Nally, Jr., Chairman, AOH Arrangements.

Peg Bannon, Chairman, LAAOH Arrangements.

Mary Ann Murphy, Secretary.

Reception committee

Charles V. Byrne, Delores Cummings, Mary Murphy, John B. Carney.

Banquet

Dick McGuire and Alice Orosz.

Registration

Ronald Skowron, Joan Mauerman, Terri Mullins.

Program book

Tom Reilley, Joe Nalley, Sr., Catherine Crawford.

Greetings

Marge Egan, Marcie McGuire, Donald Skowron.

Publicity

James Kelly, Mary Murphy, William Holt.

Decorations

Mahoning County LAAOH.

Entertainment

Edward Donlin.

PATRONS

Bud J. Fares.
Ralph C. Vitullo.
Atty. Michael L. Flynn.
Mr. & Mrs.Stephen J. Benish.
James W. Tarbet.
Mr. & Mrs. Edgar Cumisky.
David R. White.
Atty. James M. Modarelli, Jr.
Robert McDermott.
Mike Senich.
Liberty Bail Bonding.
"Tucker" DiBernardi.
Francis Gallagher.
William G. Glaros.
Jack Sulligan.
Atty. Jack Branigan Jones.
James M. McBride.
Jimmies' Lounge.
James M. Cooney.
Edie Rogers.
Mr. & Mrs. Tim Mulholland.
Charles Dolan Family.
Atty. William D. Keast.
Eugene J. Callan Family.
Rosemary Durkin.
Atty. Ben K. Kelly.
Atty. Jos. A. Modarelli.
Atty. Don L. Hanni.
The Ringside Hostesses.
"Mae and Mary" (Nez).
Rick Marino-Marino Cab, Niles.
Jack Lynch, Jr.
John "Irish" Lyden.
Judge & Mrs. Frank X. Kryzan.
Acme Bonding Co.
Magre C. Currie, Warren, O.
Norman "Nick" Johnson.
Judge & Mrs. John J. Leskovyanski.
Bill Reardon.
Don Lyden.
Howard Kelly.
Andy Polovischak.
Charles John McCarthy.
Jack & Lucille Harris.
Jack Harrison.
Charles F. McCullion.
Armeni Family—Joe & Gloria.
Mr. & Mrs. David Ifft.
Bill Palowitz.
Mr. & Mrs. Medro White.
Mrs. Marguerite McGuire.
Mr. & Mrs. Donald Rudolph.
Mr. & Mrs. Philip E. McGuire.
Mr. & Mrs. Richard E. McGuire.
Mr. & Mrs. Norman Newell.
Mr. & Mrs. John W. Nelson.
Mr. & Mrs. Andrew Aurilio.
Willy Mulgrew.
Ricky Mattes.
Mr. & Mrs. Robert Barry.
Mr. & Mrs. James Cahill.
Mr. & Mrs. W. J. Peake, III.
W. J. Peake, Jr.
Donald Higgins.
Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Lozano.
Aurelia Sheridan.
Peg Jarvis.
Jim White.
Cathy White.
Honey Crawford.
Betty Kelly.
Rose & Tom Bonham.
Larry & Dee Cummings.
Mr. & Mrs. Joseph Bannon.
Alice & Frank Orosz.
Marge & Jess Eagan.
Marlene & Mickey Murphy.
Mary Ann Murphy.
Bill Holt.
Charlie Byrne.
J. T. McNally, Jr.
Bart McCullion.
Helen F. Gorman.
John McCabe.
Ralph, Peggy, Matthew McDonough.
Ralph & Barb McDonough.
Kennedy's Jug, Niles-Canfield Road.
Mr. & Mrs. Thomas P. Reilley.
Sean Brendan Reilley.
Joe & Peg Nalley.
Sr. Mary Lee Nalley.
Leo & Patty Dempsey.
Tim & Patty Drummond.
Pat & Nancy Nalley.
Bill Grady.
Jerry Bogan.
Don Miller.
Don Skowron.
John Cockrane.
Stephen J. McLaughlin.
Mr. & Mrs. Edgar J. Cumiskey.
Susie McGuire.
Martha Horvat.
Ange Macarato.
Myron Wile.
Mr. & Mrs. D. M. Dunn.
Mr. & Mrs. J. W. Maher.
Al Kopnitsky, Jr.
Joe Damelic.
Mr. & Mrs. Robert Barry.
Mr. & Mrs. James Cahill.

THEY CHEATED THE HANGMAN

The crowd ceased its growling and became ominously silent as the nine young men came tramping across the cobblestone street which led from the prison to the courthouse. They were leaders of the young Ireland disorders, convicted of treason against the queen, and they were surrounded by soldiers and chained together like common felons. The year was 1848. The penalty for their crime was death.

Except for her majesty's officials and the prisoners, the courtroom was empty. These men must be dealt with firmly; the spirit of rebellion which they represented must be scotched without further delay. The presiding judge cleared his throat and began:

"Patrick Donahue, Charles Duffy, Thomas McGee, John Mitchell, Thomas Meagher, Terence McManus, Michael Ireland, Morris Lyene and Richard O'Gorman, you have been tried and found guilty of treason against the crown. Have you anything to say before the court passes sentence?"

Thomas Meagher had been chosen by the group to be their spokesman. It was a warm spring day and the windows of the court were open. He knew that the crowd, which stood silently outside, could hear him.

Meagher's statement to the court was delivered in clear, ringing tones which carried out to the crowd, as the judge well knew.

"Your lordship," he said, "this is our first offense, but not our last. If you can find it possible to be easy with us this once, sir, we pledge our word as gentlemen that we will do better next time. And the next time we will not be fools enough to get caught."

A roar of applause poured in from the crowd outside. The irate judge flushed crimson and banged his gavel for order. He promptly sentenced them to be hanged to death.

The story of the nine young Irish leaders spread around the world and caught the popular fancy. Protests engulfed the British Government, and Queen Victoria found it inadvisable to carry out the death sentence on these courageous young men. Instead, she ordered the sentence commuted to life imprisonment in the penal colonies of what was then the wild and uninviting land of Australia.

They were just what Australia needed; the men and the moment had arrived together. Patriots and fearless, they soon bade farewell to the penal colony and turned their undeniable talents to more fruitful pursuits.

John Mitchell made his way to the United States and had a brilliant career in the politics of New York State; his son became Mayor of New York City. Tom McGee rose swiftly to become an esteemed member of the Canadian House of Commons. Thomas McManus and Patrick Donahue became brigadier Generals in the Union Armies during the Civil War. Richard O'Gorman became the Governor-General of Newfoundland. Tom Meagher became governor of Montana.

Three of the original nine spun their careers in the land to which they had been exiled. Morris Lyene served as a brilliant Attorney-General of Australia, winning many a legal tilt against the British Barristers, and Lyene was succeeded in that office by his old fellow-prisoner, Michael Ireland.

Bitterest pill of all for Queen Victoria came in 1871 when she found herself dealing with the newly elected prime minister of Australia, Mr. Charles Duffy. To her amazement and distress, the Queen learned that this was the same Charles Duffy who had been exiled for high treason twenty-three years before. When the records of the other eight compatriots of Duffy were brought to the Queen, she seemed pleased. Perhaps she realized at last that by cheating the hangman she had enriched humanity.

OUTSTANDING NATIONAL 4-H LEADER FROM KENTUCKY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to congratulate Mrs. Stella Wethington upon her recent recognition as one of four outstanding 4-H leaders in America.

As many of my colleagues know, the 4-H organization has rendered valuable service to our Nation. The "Head, Heart, Hands, Health" philosophy behind 4-H has channeled the energies of America's youth into constructive projects for the benefit of their local communities.

Mrs. Wethington's association with 4-H spans some 25 years. During those years, she has received numerous awards for her outstanding club work. An expert in organization and administration, her talents are in great demand at leadership conferences on the local, State, and national levels.

Groups sponsored by Mrs. Wethington are consistently among the outstanding clubs in the Commonwealth.

The zeal she displays in her pursuit of 4-H work is infectious. Her enthusiasm has helped in spreading the message of 4-H—"To Make the Best Better."

I congratulate Mrs. Stella Wethington upon her selection. It is my belief that in giving so unselfishly to the youth of Kentucky and to the 4-H Clubs of that State, she has accomplished her goal to make the world a better place in which to live.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article written in tribute to her career in 4-H Club work.

CASEY 4-H LEADER IS AMONG FOUR TO GET NATIONAL RECOGNITION

LIBERTY (Spl.).—"If I had to give up 4-H, I don't know what I'd do—it's been such a part of me," says Stella Wethington, a Casey County, Kentucky 4-H leader who has devoted much of her time to 4-H for the past 25 years. Her influence in 4-H has extended from the county level throughout the Southern Region of the United States, culminating with her selection this week as one of the outstanding 4-H leaders in the country.

Stella will be one of four adult 4-H volunteer leaders recognized for their contributions to 4-H Friday night, during the National 4-H Conference in Washington, D.C. She thus becomes part of a select group of eight leaders so honored nationally, for this annual award to leaders was initiated only last year.

Although Stella was never a 4-H member herself, you could almost call her one, for she says she had to learn right along with the children she led. Her 4-H involvement began with a trip to 4-H camp with local youth the summer before she actually decided to be a leader. The next spring, her oldest daughter and several other little girls in the community asked her to be their 4-H project leader and teach them how to make an apron. "I didn't know how to make an apron," she remembers, "but when a child asks you to help, you can't say no. I went to the county extension office and got project books—and made an apron before I taught the children." And she continued to first learn herself and then help the young people in her community with projects—from clothing and foods to electricity and agricultural projects, demonstrations, public speaking, talent shows, and all their other 4-H activities.

Creston, where Stella and her husband, Earl, operate the local store and post office, is a small rural community seven miles from the county seat town of Liberty. Until 10 years ago, Creston children attended a two-room elementary school there and, for more than 14 years, Stella worked with most of these youngsters—about 70 each year—as their 4-H leader, helping them with all their 4-H programs. She also was leader for the community's Teenage 4-H Club.

"You get a group of 4-H'ers together, and someone to work with them, and they can accomplish anything they want to," she says, recalling how the Creston 4-H'ers raised money for electric wiring and other improvements in the local school. She also tells with pride of their outstanding safety program, one of the first in that part of the state for 4-H'ers. The club was so active that they were selected county champion club 10 of the 14 years before the school was consolidated and the club organization changed.

Since then, Stella has worked with all 4-H Clubs in Casey County, helping especially with recreation. "That's another thing I've learned through 4-H," she says. "When I first started as a leader, I knew I had two feet but didn't know what to do with them except walk. I wanted to learn something special that I could help the children with so I started going to recreation workshops, buying books and records, and learning simple recreation programs I could teach the children." Stella is now in demand to help with recreation programs for 4-H and many other groups throughout Casey County and in many counties nearby. And, for the past two years, she has been asked to conduct the recreation program at the Southern Regional 4-H Leader Forum at Rock Eagle, Ga.

Stella attended the first Regional Leader Forum there in 1968 and her enthusiasm helped spark a similar Leader Forum for Kentucky and she has served on the planning committee for the state Leader Forums that have been held since then.

She feels that such leaders' meetings are invaluable training for 4-H leaders and believes that the Kentucky 4-H Leaders Council, organized in 1954, has done much for the 4-H program in the state. Stella was a member of the State Council when it was organized, serving for six years then; was selected again, in 1965, to represent her area 4-H Council on the state Council; and has been a member since then. Elected president of this state group in January, she has also served as vice president and secretary.

Stella has been a member of her county 4-H Council since she became a 4-H leader and has held all the offices, except treasurer, in this organization. And Casey County has selected her one of their representatives on the Lake Cumberland Area 4-H Council every year since it was organized in 1954. She has served as both president and secretary of the area Council. She has also worked with other 4-H councils in the state and has helped a nearby county organize a county 4-H council for the first time.

Although a grandmother, Stella has young ideas—and is known throughout the state for her enthusiasm for 4-H and for her ability to give objective assistance on any 4-H plans and programs. Unlike those leaders whose interest in 4-H fades when their children grow up, Stella's 4-H leadership has never faltered—even though her youngest daughter's last year in 4-H was 1958 (all three of her daughters were active 4-H'ers and two of them were 4-H Congress delegates). Stella has gone as a leader to most state 4-H conferences held at the University of Kentucky since her leader role began; works with local 4-H'ers at the State Fair; has written many articles on 4-H for her local newspaper; helps plan and conduct the area 4-H Convention for 4-H'ers in the Lake Cumberland Area; and travels many miles each year—in her own area and in other parts of the state—to judge at 4-H Variety (talent) Shows and 4-H Fairs.

Stella has gone to 4-H camp with her county group every year but one since she has been a leader and feels camping is one of the best things 4-H offers children. She is one of her county's two representatives on the planning council for Lake Cumberland 4-H Center, the camping facility now being developed in that section of the state, and has been county chairman of the general fund-raising campaign for the Center—her county has already met its quota.

Despite her work as a storekeeper and assistant postmaster and her numerous 4-H activities, Stella finds time to be very active in her church—she serves on the Official Board; has been youth superintendent and is now an assistant teacher; has been a member of the Hospital Board for years; has been president of her county Homemakers organization, although she has now given up her Homemakers Club work to devote more time to 4-H and church youth; and, for 22 years, has helped with County Health Department clinics at the local schools. Last year, the Liberty and Casey County School Association presented her with a trophy for outstanding leadership, recognizing all her work with the county's youth.

"What I really like best about 4-H are the lasting friendships you make with 4-H'ers and adults from near and far," she says. Not only do 4-H'ers from her own county come to Stella as a friend as well as a leader, but those from other counties ask her advice, too. She has many 4-H friends throughout the state and still corresponds with three of the five International Farm Youth Exchanges to whom her family has been host. She values, too, the friendships made at regional and national events. As a result of her first trip to the Regional 4-H Leader forum, Stella was invited to represent Kentucky leaders at the Mississippi State Convention and was also introduced to the Mississippi legislature during her visit there.

Like 4-H members, Stella considers her trip to National 4-H Congress in Chicago the highlight of her "4-H career"—she was chosen by the state 4-H Leaders Council to represent them and accompany Kentucky's delegation in 1970. At this event, she was chosen to represent all the nation's 4-H leaders at the head table during the Ford Motor Company's Achievement Banquet.

UNILATERAL U.S. TROOP REDUCTIONS FROM EUROPE: WHAT IT MIGHT MEAN?

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, if during the debate of H.R. 9286, authorizing military appropriations for fiscal year 1974, we are to base our discussion of unilateral troop withdrawal on something more than utopian visions and chimerical expectations I think it is important that we consider this very complex issue from as many focal points as possible. I am, consequently, attaching some articles which I believe will serve to further this upcoming debate.

In a Newsweek article of June 25, 1973, M. Arnaud de Borchgrave points to some of the dangers facing the NATO partnership. Victor Zorza, in a commentary in Monitor, June 27, 1973, discusses the loss of U.S. credibility in Europe, as well as some of the fears being expressed by our European allies. West German Defense Minister, Helmut Schmidt, and British Defense Minister, Lord Carrington, in an interview with Vision also express the opinions of their respective governments with respect to European defense policy.

The articles follow:

[From Newsweek, June 25, 1973]

WESTERN EUROPE'S DRIFT TOWARD NEUTRALISM

(By Arnaud de Borchgrave)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[From the Monitor, June 27, 1973]

EUROPE FEELS UNITED STATES-SOVIET SQUEEZE

(By Victor Zorza)

While Russian eyes were smiling at Mr. Nixon, there was a glint of steel in the looks the Kremlin was casting at Europe. Moscow is telling the Europeans that they had better accommodate themselves to the arrangement between the big two, or else they will be left out in the cold.

The Kremlin is not saying this openly, in formal diplomatic notes or even in its newspapers, but by hints and innuendo. While it has not had a bad word to say about the Nixon administration for many months past, it has reserved its harshest criticism for "aggressive NATO circles" in Europe which, it complains, want to slow down the rapid warming up in the relations between Washington and Moscow. What's more, the Kremlin is right.

When Secretary of State William Rogers arrived in Copenhagen for a NATO council meeting earlier this month, the fears of his European colleagues threatened to get out of hand. Mr. Rogers seems to have been taken by surprise, for he had to depart from the prepared text of his opening remarks to reassure them that the United States did not intend to make a big-power deal with the Kremlin at their expense. Even the French seemed mollified, and American officials congratulated themselves on how well they had handled an explosive situation.

But as soon as French Foreign Minister Michel Jobert returned to Paris he denounced "the temptations of the superpowers to settle through their discussions the division of world responsibilities." He deplored Europe's dependence on the U.S. for nuclear protection, and Washington's insistence that the Europeans must pay for this with trade concessions. He came close to saying that the U.S. was operating a nuclear protection racket, and that the agreements between Washington and Moscow might add to their own security while detracting from the security of Europe.

The French are no longer alone in their suspicions, although the other European leaders are less willing to speak as bluntly—or as honestly—to the Americans. U.S. officials can no longer rely on the European allies to say exactly what is on their mind. A reliable administration source concedes that there is an increasing uneasiness—all the more insidious for rarely being made explicit—that superpower diplomacy might "sacrifice the interests of traditional allies."

The remark was made by none other than Henry Kissinger. But his proposal that the U.S. and Europe should renegotiate the terms of the nuclear protection arrangement gave rise to even more suspicion. Europe, Dr. Kissinger suggested, should strengthen its conventional forces so that it should be able to manage without American nuclear weapons in the early stages of a conflict. This would, of course, also enable the U.S. to withdraw some of its own troops from Europe.

European governments are convinced that Mr. Nixon will order a troop withdrawal, though perhaps of only 10 percent to start with, for internal political reasons. Dr. Kissinger reassures them that the negotiations he proposes "are not a subterfuge to withdraw U.S. forces regardless of consequences," but they don't altogether believe this. They see the impending Vienna conference on European troops cuts as being designed, at least in part, to enable both the U.S. and the Soviet Union to withdraw some of their troops from Europe.

Partial withdrawal would be in the interest of both the U.S. and the Soviet Union, but it would still leave Europe in the shadow of Russia's massive conventional forces, though with a less rapid recourse to American nuclear help if the new arrangement proposed by Dr. Kissinger comes into being.

For the U.S., the slowing down of the nuclear response mechanism in Europe is part of the global arrangement with the Soviet Union designed to protect the two superpowers from being drawn into a mutually destructive conflict by the interests of their clients. When the White House and the Kremlin worked hard to achieve a stand-off of this kind in Vietnam and in the Middle East, Europe applauded their success. Now that Europe's own turn has come, as it was bound to, the Europeans complain.

But they have a remedy which was denied to the Vietnamese and the Arabs. They can put together an independent European nuclear deterrent, made up of British and French components. There are signs that this is being seriously considered. The formidable political obstacles which prevented this in the past could be rapidly swept aside by the growing European fear that the Americans are no longer to be trusted for protection, and that the Russians are poised to exploit Europe's feeling of insecurity for their own ends.

HELMUT SCHMIDT, WEST GERMAN DEFENSE MINISTER

Vision: To what extent and in what ways would closer integration of western European defence efforts be desirable in view of possible US troop reductions in Europe?

Helmut Schmidt: First of all, it has to be remembered that the question of withdrawing US forces stationed in Europe has been under discussion for years—especially within the United States. But in fact such withdrawals are not an item on the political agenda of the Washington administration. On the contrary, the US government has confirmed it will not reduce its troop levels in Europe so long as the other side does not take equivalent measures.

Irrespective of this, however, a closer integration of west European defence efforts is indeed desirable, and in the last two years we have made noteworthy progress in this direction. European cooperation in the security field is bound to give added strength to the European alliance. It cannot be a substitute for the presence of American troops in Europe, but it can lighten the US burden and make the European defence contribution more effective.

In the light of previous experience, practical results are more important than perfect institutions. One practical result is the "Eurogroup" of ministers—unfortunately at the moment without France—which can harmonise and coordinate defence policies. One example of a successful Eurogroup initiative was the setting up of the European Defence Intensification Programme (EDIP) for NATO, which is intended to make it easier for the Americans to maintain their presence in Europe. It could serve as a model for future European cooperation in the defence sector.

Naturally though, better European defence coordination in the future will depend on the speed of progress in the political unification of western Europe.

Vision: What would you consider the political and strategic value of a joint European arms procurement agency?

Schmidt: Such an agency—if it were set up—would, in my opinion, be more of political than strategic value. Military cooperation cannot set the pace for political unification, it must go hand in hand with it.

I do not mean that in formulating their security policy the members of the enlarged EEC should wait for any spectacular results which might be achieved in the next five or ten years on the way to political union. We can start studying now what kind of joint European security policy could be set up and how soon.

There are some flaws in present cooperation, which could possibly be corrected through a joint arms procurement agency. I think, for instance, that greater standardisation of arms and equipment can be achieved through more collaboration between the different national arms industries. Also, it is surely an anachronism in today's Europe and today's NATO to have vehicles and tanks from four NATO members stationed in the same NATO area, and using the same kind of fuel, but independently serviced by four separate supply lines.

Vision: Would it contribute to western Europe's security if a nuclear force were set up based on the existing French and British deterrents?

Schmidt: I have never thought much of attempts to complicate the economic and political unification of Europe by discussions on the usefulness of a common European nuclear force. In my opinion, such a nuclear force can only become a subject for discussion once European political unity is a reality. The process of economic and political unification alone already entails enough problems.

Once political unity has been achieved, Europe will certainly examine what new defence efforts are needed, in the light of the European and world security situation obtaining at the time. But nobody can say today what direction any new decisions might take.

LORD CARRINGTON, BRITISH DEFENCE MINISTER

Vision: Britain is insisting on the need for greater military cooperation among European countries. Is this necessary at a time of greater detente and when negotiations might start with the Warsaw Pact?

Lord Carrington: The British government is convinced that western Europe must assume a larger share of the responsibility for its own defence. The improved military capability which this implies can be achieved only by closer defence collaboration between the European members of NATO.

At a time when the Warsaw Pact's expenditure on defence is growing, while that of NATO countries is static or declining, there is no conflict between this essentially long-term policy and NATO's long standing aim of reducing tension between East and West. On the contrary, I believe that the prospects of achieving genuine detente and a reduction of East-West force levels depend ultimately on the Warsaw Pact powers being convinced that our determination to defend our territory and our ideals cannot be undermined either by pressures from without or erosion from within.

I do not deny that there are practical problems involved here but I am convinced of the validity of NATO's corporate belief that effective defence is the precondition of genuine detente.

Vision: There is no Europe without France, and France does not want to join NATO. Does this mean there is no chance of a compromise?

Carrington: Let us be quite clear that France is a member of the North Atlantic Alliance and has been ever since the North Atlantic Alliance Treaty was signed on April 4, 1949. The French decision of March 1966 involved withdrawal from the integrated military structure of NATO, not from the Alliance itself.

France is also a leading member of the European Communities which Britain now proposes to join, and already there is a very wide range of collaborative equipment projects (the Concorde and the Jaguar are only two examples) in which France and Britain are jointly involved. In fact we run more of these collaborative projects with the French than with any of our other allies.

The fact is therefore that the kind of compromise you mention already exists. There are the closest links between France and NATO and between France and individual members of NATO and my belief is that these will continue to be developed.

Vision: Many Europeans believe that a European initiative would accelerate an American pull back. Do you share this feeling?

Carrington: Certainly not. Leading members of the United States Administration (and in particular President Nixon himself) have made it very clear that their undertaking to maintain and if necessary improve the level of their forces in Europe is dependent on us Europeans making reciprocal efforts to improve our military capabilities. As I have said, practical measures of European collaboration may be the best way of achieving this improved capability.

No one doubts that the defence of western Europe is an important strategic requirement of the United States and to that extent their military presence here is self-interested. But it seems to me that unless the Western Europeans are seen to be taking their own defence seriously and making a fair contribution to achieving it, the US Administration would have the greatest difficulty in justifying their present European policy to their Congressional and other critics, and indeed might have to review the realism and the validity of that policy. However much the United States may wish to preserve the integrity of western Europe they can hardly hope to do so without the wholehearted commitment to it of the western Europeans themselves.

Vision: What will be the first steps in a renewed effort to increase European military cooperation?

Carrington: The first steps have already been taken. We are all members of NATO and work together to improve our military cohesion and capability through its network of committees and working parties. In addition there are numerous bilateral and trilateral contacts between the European nations, covering a wide range of activities from military staff talks to collaborative equipment projects. This year incidentally I am the chairman of the Eurogroup of defence ministers which has as one of its primary aims the encouragement of collaborative European defence efforts. And I am sure that that these endeavours will be given extra impetus and a new sense of urgency by the enlargement of the EEC.

It is the sum total of all these efforts rather than any spectacular new initiative which is most likely to bring about more effective European defence collaboration.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TRADE AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the trade and technical schools in this country are doing a very important job. The Congress should, I think, encourage them in the work they are doing. We can also, I believe, help them in that work by challenging them to do better. Recently Congressman JOHN DELLENBACK spoke to the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools. I believe Congressman DELLENBACK'S remarks should be shared with my colleagues. I therefore include them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all may read them. Mr. DELLENBACK'S speech follows, preceded by a letter to the association from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 6, 1973.

My warmest greetings go out to the delegates at this Ninth Annual Conference of the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools.

The complexities and challenges of modern living have placed new demands on this Nation's education system. With your high professional, ethical and qualitative standards, you are helping America meet these demands by helping students find a socially productive and personally rewarding life in the areas of trade and technology. Through the achievements of these individuals your members immeasurably advance the economic strength and vitality of our society.

I wish you a most successful and rewarding conference.

RICHARD NIXON.

NATTS ANNUAL CONFERENCE PRESENTATION BY HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

I do appreciate the chance to be here with you tonight. I was asked earlier today whether I would be sure to make a copy of my talk available, and I was reminded of one of the reasons why I've always been afraid of prepared talks—ones that had been written out for you, as I suspect happens too often, in Washington, by one's staff. You know, the story is told about a Senator, who at one time was in Washington, and he had a staff that he used regularly to write all his speeches. And he was really a terrible guy to work for. There was nothing much that a staff could do that was really pleasing to him, and no matter what they'd put out in the way of efforts, he'd always find something wrong.

And he was a very ambitious man, politically, and he really hoped that the Senate would not be his final resting place, so far as political office was concerned. Finally he had the forum that he was really looking for. It was to be before a large group of people, some 3,000 or so, personally present, and in addition to that, he was to be on nationwide radio and nationwide television, and he thought this was really the time for *the* speech.

And as was customary with him, he called his speech writer in and lashed into him, and first raked him up one side and down the other side, and tore him apart, and then finally told him that he wanted this speech, and he wanted a real speech that would set the people agog with being impressed what a great speech-maker he was, and he just lashed him and sent him out of the office.

Well he was due to go that night to the occasion, but the speech-writers somehow didn't quite have the speech ready for him, and he kept waiting for it, and he didn't get it and he didn't get it, and finally as he was just having to go, as he was starting out the door, the speech writer handed him the speech and said, "Here it is, Senator. You're on your way." And he didn't get a chance to read it in the car as he went, and he got up before the audience, and he started into the speech.

And it was really a pretty well done speech. He was really winding up, and he got to the stage where he was saying, "Now there are five particular points by which I have lived all my life. These five points have been engraved in my mind, and never will I forget them. They're the sort of thing that one should build his life upon. They're the sort of thing I've always built my life on. They're the sort of guiding principles by which this nation should live. They are—"

And he flipped the page, and there it said, "Get yourself out of this one, you S.O.B."

(Laughter and applause.)

So I've always made it a point to at least look down the pages, if anybody has ever written a speech. But as a matter of fact, that isn't—as you'll soon be aware—what I'm dealing with tonight.

I do appreciate the chance to share with you extemporaneously some of the things that I feel about this particular group, and about the broader sweep of type of education that you represent, and some of the Congressional involvement with education in general, and this particular part of education in particular.

You know, I think that basically, private vocational schools in the scheme of things, legislatively speaking, and I say this against six years in the state legislature where we dealt with educational problems, and now into the seventh year of dealing on a Congressional level with educational problems, that private vocational schools are still relatively little known.

Now there are advantages to this, and there are disadvantages to this, but I think that basically it's a thing that you've—in the past—been struggling with. For years, as we've legislated, we've tended to deal with the traditional higher education. We've dealt with four-year degree granting institutions. We've dealt with graduate study. We've dealt with all of the facets that go with traditional higher education, research, et cetera, et cetera.

But in my opinion, in the field of education, the hottest properties right now, and I'm talking from a legislator's standpoint, are probably community colleges. Now these are your cousins, really. These are the cousins, it seems to me, that have very real similarities to private proprietary, vocational, trade, technical, call it what you will. But to proprietary education, community college is a real cousin. There are areas where they've broken ground for you. And there are areas where, it seems to me, that you've broken ground for them.

Certainly it is that the Congress in the last several years, however, has broken out of the shell of dealing just with the traditional higher education. We've even gotten past the phase of just talking in terms of higher education. And we've substituted in the higher education amendments, or in the—technically, the Education Amendments of 1972, we've substituted the phrase "post-secondary" education in a series of places.

No longer are we going to be dealing with 2600-2700 institutions. I'm persuaded that from now on, to a very significant degree, the Congress when it legislates in this field, is going to be dealing with the—and you know the figure better than I, perhaps—it's tough to get a hold on what the figure is—but it's perhaps nine or ten thousand, or maybe even more, institutions, because if you get past the traditional "higher education" or 2600 or 2700, as close as we can get the figure, into the field that you occupy such a significant potential role in, a present and growing role in, you're dealing with many, many thousands.

Now, at the forefront of these, as best I can get the statistics, and I was reading Belitsky's book to try to add to my knowledge in this particular field. At the forefront we have the trade and technical schools. We have here something like 43 percent of the schools—I think his figures were, or 42 percent of the schools, and something like 53 percent of those who, at the time he was gathering his statistics, were involved in this particular field. I think that the Federal concern rises from a series of things.

It arises from an interest in diversity in education. It arises from a real desire to have access for students, which means—as we see the word in the Finance Committee, as we've been studying it—it means every person having the right to have available to him or her access to some post-secondary education for which he or she is qualified.

Now you see, there are lots of words in there that open the door wide for proprietary education. I think higher education is a part of that, but it's only a part of it. We are clearly in a situation where we want to be sure that young people have a choice, and when we went into a program like the basic opportunity grant program, we were reaching for a choice, not on the part of the institutions, to determine, any more than has been traditionally the case, whom they will have as their students, but a choice on the part of the students. So that a young person, or an older person, because when we talk post-secondary education—as you know—we're going way beyond the traditional high school graduate. We're talking about every individual having access, having choice, making the determination of where it is that he or she wants to go.

I think that we are getting away, finally, slowly, and it's awfully hard, from the social stereotype that if anybody has got it, if they're really well-qualified, they're going to go on and get a B.A. or a B.S. degree. They're going to go on to a four year institution. And only, somehow, if they don't really have it, if they're second class citizens, somehow, then do they go on to some kind of post-secondary education. This isn't the way it should be, and it is the way that it has been, in my mind, largely because parents—the social situation, has sort of ingrained this in young people. And when you talk to a young person, at least in years gone by, it's been a question if they really have done well in high school, the question has been where are you going on to get your further education? And it's been sort of expected that they will produce the name of some college or unversity, and that's what every well qualified young person has had as the ideal.

And I think that we're getting away from this. I think that we're getting away from the social stigma. We're getting away—and here it is, you see, that I say you and community colleges are cousins, because community colleges have helped to break down that stigma. Have helped to—by having first class education as we do with community colleges in my state of Oregon—we are having the ground broken so that young people can make a viable, understandable choice between alternative roads. Not between a first class education and a second class education, but between different *kinds* of education. And it's a thing in which you clearly also fit. Where you are the ones who are helping, as you move forward further and further, doing a better and better job, wtih the education to which you've devoted yourselves, you're helping break down that stigma. And I think that Congress sees this, and I think this is part of the reason we are having expanding federal concern in this particular area.

And as we break that barrier, and as we look at the modern society with its complexities and its needs, we're seeing that there's more and more need for good first class occupational education. The Congress is becoming aware of this. And I think as we become aware of this, we're going to find that legislation reflects that awareness.

Now I'm here today, and I got the invitation some months ago, because of the fact that I'm convinced as part of the law-making groups on the federal level, that this is an important, and steadily growing in its importance, segment of post-secondary education. And to have the chance to meet and talk with you, even briefly, was a significant move for me. I was glad to do it, as a reflection of what I feel is important in your group. And I'm here secondly because also one of the real frustrations you find in the Congress is that while you're expected to know everything that you ought to know, when you go to legislate, if you're honest with yourself, you know you don't. You know that we are the supreme generalists. We're supposed to hit the floor and vote on all sorts of legislation, authoritatively, not just maybe, but yes or no. On the ground that it's good legislation or bad legislation, which presupposes that we know what it's all about. And not only we know what that bill's all about, but we know what the facts are that underlie that bill, and we can make a sound determination of whether it's good or bad.

And I'm frank to admit to you that even though I've been a teacher, even though I've wrestled with education problems on my state legislative level, even though ever since I've been in the Congress I've been on the Education Committee, and have wrestled with problems now for going on seven years, I don't know everything I should know. I constantly run out of time to pick up all the information that I should have. And so the second reason I'm here today is to try to help add to the fund of information that I ought to have, if I'm going to legislate soundly.

And it was with this in mind that I asked that a chance be set up for me today to go out and see—not all of the schools in this area, although I wish there'd been time for that, but at least some of them. And so they picked out as representative schools three of the ones in the area, and I spent the afternoon doing that. And I'm grateful for having had a chance, to see the Bryman Schools, and I'm appreciative of Jay Olins making that possible and being with us. To see the Control Data Institute, and for Earl Burk helping with that. I'm grateful. And I then had a chance to see the Academy of Trades, and Tom Edwards and Pat Patterson were helpful in that. And I'm grateful.

Because here, having a chance to see these schools, I was impressed by a series of things. And they added to the impressions that I had before, about this kind of education that you represent. I was impressed by—and I could dwell at length on each one of these things, but let me just tick off some of them. I was impressed by relevancy, and that's a much overused word these days, and yet it's critically important. That education, if you're going to waste your time on it, or spend your time on it, if the student is going to invest his or her time and dollars, it must be relevant. It can't be just something esoteric that'll somehow leave them no worse off than when they started. But it must be relevant to what it is they're going to do.

I saw interest. As I looked around the classrooms that we had a chance to see, or around the shop where people were working, I was impressed by the fact that I say nobody looking bored. I saw nobody looking out the window, or dreaming and whiling away time. There was real demonstrated active interest in what each of these basically young, but some not so young people, were doing.

I saw what I thought was flexibility in the chance of not really being locked in, even when, in one of the schools, we were dealing with text that was printed, or at least a booklet of the general course content. It was a looseleaf book, subject to being changed. And I think that too often, in postsecondary education, people get locked in, and when the professor gives the same lecture he's given before and before and before and before, and the same notes can be used from the father's class when the son takes the class some years later. And even though that isn't true generally in higher education, I saw flexibility in this kind of education in which you're involved.

And I see what looked like alert teachers without tenure. Teachers who were pouring themselves into what they were doing, and were extemporizing in what they were doing. I see in schools like yours success, measured in the marketplace, instead of just in the halls of academia by old standards, or by some objective curricula of somehow if you do this well you get a 95, and if you do that well you do a 70, but really, not being tied to what you're going to do with it afterward. It seems to me your success has to be measured in the marketplace, in lots of ways. Whether you can place your graduates, whether you can make a profit in what you do, and if you can't place your graduates, you're not going to make a profit. And so in the very real sense there's a measurement in the marketplace.

I see relatively small classes, and I see what more and more looks to me like high quality. Now, I'm a member, as was pointed out by Cliff of the Commission for the Study of the Financing of Post-Secondary Education. And I was going to go into some length on that, but I won't. Out of kindness to you, and out of the fact that that plane will leave, whether I'm aboard it or not.

But I'd say only this about what the Commission's in the process of studying. Here we have a 17 member presidential Commission. There are two members of the House on it, John Brademas of Indiana and I. There are two members of the Senate on it, and the other 13 members were appointed by the President from all branches of the business community, of the banking community, of the educational community, and basically, I'm impressed by the Commission.

We're looking at, and one of our first decisions was, because the language of the statute is ambiguous on this. Were we to study higher education financing? Or were we to study post-secondary education financing? And we made this decision, as the first hard decision that we made in the Commission—hard, not in the sense of difficult to make, but hard in the sense of that's what we were going to build the study on—we decided we were there to study the financing of post-secondary education, and it's with this in mind that we're going forward with what we're doing.

We'll take another opportunity, or you'll have a chance to read it somewhere, as to how the Commission is functioning. We've been meeting at least once a month, generally twice a month, ever since the beginning of this year. We're due to have our job done by the end of December, so that we can get the report to the President, and to the Congress, to see if we can move forward with legislation in this field.

What is it that the Congress is doing at the present time? Well it isn't going to be any major authorizing legislation, in my opinion, this year. In the Education Amendments of 1972 we made some long strides. We created such a complex bill, that when it came to the Conference Committee on which I served, you know, when the House passes one version of a bill and the Senate passes another version, and they don't quite meet, you don't have a law. What you have is two different almost pieces of legislation under the same number, and you have to appoint Senate conferees and House Conferees.

We had, in the bills that had been passed, more than 270 points of difference. Not 270 points in the bills, but 270 points that the Senate felt one way about and the House felt anoher way about. It took us a conference of two and a half months to hammer out those differences, and we finally did. And out came the Education Amendments of 1972.

The next year or so, in my opinion, is going to very largely be spent digesting, in the educational community, what it is that's been done. We have here things like the basic opportunity grant programs, that really is going to be extremely important to schools like yours. And if you be not already familiar with it, you know that—at least all of you know that most likely that it deals with a concept of a grant—not to schools, but of a grant to those who would be educated.

And in a situation like that, where a young person, or an older person who qualifies for this kind of a grant, can decide where he or she is going to spend it. What it does to schools like you, which can compete in the marketplace, and we have covered with BOG proprietary institutions, and we've covered part time students for the first time in this kind of grant legislation.

And it makes it possible for you, as the program grows and is implemented with more and more dollars, to set up what quality you can, and you know, that when you move forward, and you get the student. Now it's nowhere nearly funded. It basically reaches for a proposed grant of $1400.00 a year. It's not nearly fully funded this year. But we're going to be digesting what's going to be happening with BOG, and what's going to happen with supplemental education opportunity grants, how we're going to move forward with college work study, what we're going to do with national direct student loans, et cetera. And much of the year is going to be spent with that.

We've got some major problems with student loans. Question how's the secondary market going to work. Can students pay back large loans over the time that's provided in the legislation? A major concern for you all.

What about the default rate with student loans? And whether or not you're all familiar with this, you should be familiar, that one of the black eyes that you carry in the Congress—and this has come up in several times in Committee as we've discussed the whole loan concept, and whether or not the loan legislation that the federal government passes really should be available to proprietary institutions and their students. And the statistic that they keep throwing back in the face of some of us who feel that you should be covered by these loan programs, is that about three-quarters of the defaults today have been with loans to students attending proprietary institutions. I'm not arguing the point. I'm not arguing the justifications, or the reasons why. I'm merely saying to you, be alert to it, because that's one of the problems that exists at the present time so far as future legislation is concerned.

I think that another thing that's going to happen in these couple of years that lie immediately ahead is hopefully we're going to be able to launch, into real active being, the so-called 1202 commissions. May mean nothing to you. But what we provided for in the legislation was that there be state planning for education within the borders of each individual state, that each state should set up a commission to do this planning, and we provided that in that planning, there should not be representation just of traditional higher education. We provided that there should be representation of the broad sweep of post-secondary education, including again, proprietary schools. Because we feel that you should be cranked into this process, and you shouldn't be treated over here, when the rest of it is done over there.

A couple of brief comments, on where I think legislation—so far as appropriations, is going to go. This year, the appropriations committee stayed with the older programs. And I'm thinking now particularly about student aid, because that's probably the section of this type of financing that comes closest to fitting into your area of particular concentrated interest. And remember what we're talking about with the old programs were the national defense, now called the national direct student loans. The college work study, and what was the old education opportunity grants.

Now you all didn't care about the educational opportunity grants. You did care about college work study, and about national direct student loans, because your students were eligible for those. We, in addition to going forward with those two programs, and going forward with the educational opportunity grants, and creating the BOG, the Basic Opportunity Grants, we made those two additional programs also, covered by proprietary schools. Or students at your schools covered by them. So all four of them are basically now within your purview, the things that you're interested in. We move forward with financing, and the figures happen to be—for College Work Study, we appropriated $270 million, plus. For Direct Student Loans we appropriated $293 million. For Educational Opportunity Grants, $210 million. And then we began the basic opportunity grant with $122 million. So that the total appropriations in these fields are $895 million plus.

With proprietary schools involved all the way across the board.

Now what are we going to do in the 1974 appropriations? Nobody knows yet. The Appropriations Committee has been meeting on this, it hasn't yet finalized it. My own guess would be this. That we're going to look very hard at BOG to see how it works, and going to see how it works with schools like yours. We haven't had any experience with it yet, and my guess is that instead of making major changes in appropriation levels, we will probably go forward with the same level of college work study, we will go forward with the same level of national defense student loans, or national direct student loans, my guess is we will also go forward with the same level of supplemental educational opportunity grants.

But in this BOG program, the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program, because we're going to stay with the President's budget of $959 million, instead of $622 million for just this particular area of aid, probably the BOG program will go from $122 million, up to about $450 million. Which means a very considerable additional help for those students moving forward into this field.

It's going to be difficult. It's going to be difficult to make it work. We're probably going to have to limit it as we did this year. We limited it to first year students. Next year, because there isn't enough money there to fully fund it, we're probably going to limit it to first and second year students, would be my guess.

What about the task for private profit-seeking schools like yourselves? Seems to me that you've got at least five tasks. You've got the one of the gathering of more complete information about yourselves. We don't have that. And it's tough to get it from you. I think that some of you don't have it yourselves. Your associations don't have all they should have. I think you *must* gather that data, or else we're not going to be able to soundly build legislation on it.

Secondly, keep your standards high. You're going to be under pressures. There are going to be challenges to the accreditation process, in my opinion. We've cranked it into the legislation that accreditation is significant as to whether students will be able to get aid. I urge you to keep your standards high. Don't let them fold as there will be pressure to make them fold.

Thirdly, you've got to help lower that default rate that I talked about a minute ago. Fourthly, I would urge you to improve the mixing with the rest of post-secondary education. Things like the 1202 Commissions. I urge you not to be defensive, and the name of the association will remain anonymous, but I was deeply disturbed at one time, when before a Congressional Opinion Committee, and it was not your association that was involved, a representative of an association appeared to testify, and I was impressed all the way through that the testimony was defensive, instead of saying what it is you do. And what it is you do so very well. And there's much that you do, and do well. It was always attacking the rest of higher education, for the reasons that *they* didn't do this well, and *they* didn't do that well.

And in my mind, about 85 percent of the potential testimony was wasted, because it was attacking the foe—if there be a foe—and defensive, instead of telling your story. I would urge you *not* to be defensive. You'll have attacks on you, but you've got to mix, you've got to have a closer relationship with the rest of post-secondary education.

And lastly, I would urge you to stay flexible. Don't ossify too quickly. You're part of the cutting edge, right now. You're moving into the area, and it's a mixed blessing area, where you're no longer unknown. Where your role is going to be accepted more and more by legislatures, and by legislators. And there will be a tendency, as you move into this, to stop being the cutting edge, and become bureaucratic, and get to be ossified. I would urge you as much as you can not to do that. Stay flexible, because part of your promise, part of your great contribution, lies in that.

In my opinion, America's need for post-secondary education—is growing. Not declining. But it's also changing. The total need is different from the need within a given sector. The total need is growing, and the total need is changing. In the combination of that need, and that change, lies what seems to me like the combined challenge and opportunity for you and your schools and your sister schools, that are like unto you in other fields.

I am more optimistic than ever, after what I've been today, and what I've had a chance to hear today, and what I've had a chance to read today, that you are going to look at that need and that change, you're going to see it—not just as a challenge, but as a giant opportunity. And that you're going to rise to the occasion.

It's a real pleasure to have been here with you. I apologize for having to leave and not stay for the rest of the program, but it's been a very real pleasure. Thanks so much.

THE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY FOR EMPLOYEES ACT OF 1973

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Retirement Income Security For Employees Act of 1973. This bill is identical to S. 4 of the 93d Congress and is intended to rectify the unconscionable situation that affects millions of retirement-age Americans by revitalizing our Nation's organization of private pension plans.

In the past, studies have shown that these pension benefit plans have failed time after time in fulfilling their promise of retirement security, a circumstance mainly attributable to the corruption of a few and the mismanagement of many others. When a worker loses his pension, he is losing the single largest asset, other than social security, that he has built up after a lifetime of labor. If we now fail to provide meaningful reform to strengthen the income security for America's workers, the heartbreaking stories of unrealized hopes and dreams, of broken promises, and of the utter despair of old-age destitution will continue to belie the proposition that ours is a land of opportunity.

Private pension plans have undergone enormous expansion since the last world war, and today comprises the greatest fund of practically unmanaged assets in the United States. Presently, nearly half of the Nation's labor force, almost 35 million workers, are covered by 34,000 pension plans operating in this country. Yet, many of these employees will never harvest the fruits of their labor because they will be victimized by the loopholes through which employers may now slip. Millions of workers continue to lose their pensions because they change jobs, because their jobs are closed down, because the companies for which they work are sold or go bankrupt, because their employers are negligent in their promised payments, or because the operations of their employers are moved to other communities. The necessity for dealing with this issue must be considered one of the most pressing of our day.

Through the evidence of past failures and the testimony of contemporary experts, it is indeed apparent that any legislation upon which we are to act must meet certain minimum standards in a wide range of areas in need of Federal regulation and that only a comprehensive bill, such as the one which I am introducing, will accomplish such a purpose. The aspects of vesting, funding, fiduciary and disclosure requirements, plan termination insurance, and an experimental and voluntary portability program are those most deserving of attention and it is to these areas that my bill is addressed.

Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of this bill, the act would cover all pension and profit-sharing plans except those of Federal, State, and local governments, religious organizations, and those with 25 or fewer participants. It would impose minimum vesting requirements in pension plans whereby employees, after 8 years of service, would be entitled to a vested, nonforfeitable right to 30 percent of their accrued pension benefits, and, thereafter, each year would acquire an additional 10 percent to such right until, at the end of 15 years' service, they would be entitled to 100 percent vested benefits. It would establish minimum funding requirements for pension plans to assure that all unfunded pension liabilities of the plan will be funded over a 30-year period. It would establish a voluntary program for portability of pension credits through a central fund, whereby employees of participating employers may transfer vested credits from one employer to another upon change of employment.

In addition, a plan termination insurance program would be established to guarantee that vested pension credits of employers will be paid upon termination of a pension plan when there are not sufficient assets to pay the workers' vested benefits. The bill prescribes new stringent rules of conduct required for trustees and fiduciaries administering employee benefit funds, and prohibits conflicts of interest and various specific practices to prevent actual or potential misuse of such funds. It requires additional and comprehensive disclosure of vital data in reports to be filed with the Federal Government, and understandable explanations to workers of their rights and obligations under their pension plans.

The bill makes it unlawful for any person to discharge, suspend, expel, fine, discipline or discriminate against participants in order to interfere with their rights under the plan or the act or for the purpose of preventing the attainment of their rights under the plan or the act. And finally, it establishes Federal jurisdiction and adequate remedies to both the Government and individual worker for judicial and administrative enforcement of the bill's provisions, including recovery of pension benefits due.

For too long, the laborers of America have been driven to shock and despair by the failure of pension plans to assure some measure of security for the years of their retirement. For too long, the benefits for which they have worked have been abused by insufficiency or deception. For too long, 35 million Americans have been forced to wait for legislation that would seek to remedy the defects in the system of pension plans and provide the retirement security that is rightfully theirs.

Mr. Speaker, as an individual whose greatest personal financial asset, other than a home, is my pension fund payments, I realize the disaster that would await me and my family if my pension program were inadequate. Happily, Members of the House of Representatives, as all Federal employees, have a sound retirement system. I think that we can do no less for all Americans, and I think enactment of my bill will move toward that goal.

AID ASSISTANCE

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the House has considered H.R. 9360, the Mutual Development and Cooperation Act, which admirably intends to—

> Focus bilateral development assistance on acute problem areas and encourage the developing countries to allow the poorest people to participate more effectively in the development process.

To those of us who are friends of Africa, this would seem to signal a long-awaited end to the dismal current American performance; that performance being $2.7 billion of AID loans and grants that have been allocated for Africa in the past. Since World War II, the United States has given Africa only 2 percent of its total economic and military aid to developed and developing nations. During that time, we have assisted more than 100 developing countries, 40 of which reside in Africa. The population of those developing countries that have received U.S. assistance is estimated—1972—to be around 1,763 million. The developing nations in Africa contain 18.5 percent of the population of the developing world which has received American assistance. But Africa has never received over 12.5 percent of the AID budget for development loans and grants. In fact in this budget, as in past ones since 1964, Africa will receive about one-third of what should be its proper share.

Other figures reveal that Africa is not given fair treatment in AID assistance. The 25 Latin American countries which have received aid have a population of about 296 million compared with 326 million for the aid-receiving African nations. However, Latin America, by the end of fiscal year 1973, had received $6.2 billion support from AID compared with Africa's $2.9 billion. This year's breakdown is outlined in the following manner:

Asia, fiscal year 1973, $474.6 million; proposed fiscal year 1974, $457.8 million.

Latin America, fiscal year 1973, $315.1 million; proposed fiscal year 1974, $274.7 million.

Africa, fiscal year 1973, $162.2 million; proposed fiscal year 1974, $159.7 million.

This inequity in the distribution of AID assistance becomes more appalling when one considers that of the 25 nations that the United Nations has defined as "least developed," 16 are in Africa, while 1 is in Latin America. If our new assistance program aims at helping poor developing nations, these figures reveal a blatant contradiction of that purpose.

Specific instances of this inequity can be noted by contrasting AID program projection for various nations around the world. Afghanistan, for example, which has a population of 18 million would receive an allotment of $17.8 million, while Zaire, which has a greater population of 18.7 million would receive only $7.1 million. The Yemen Arab Republic, with a population one-third that of Zaire's, would receive $7.2 million. Contrast the Dominican Republic which has a population of only 4.9 million and yet would receive $10.8 million with Sudan which has a population of 16.7 million and would receive only $5.4 million. Tanzania, with a population almost seven times that of Paraguay, receives less money than that nation.

Opponents of foreign aid may argue that this money is simply being given away to Africa as a noble cause. Actually, the situation is quite different. For instance, consider the economic benefits we derive from Africa. In 1971—the most recent data available—American firms had investments in Africa of about $2.8 billion—excluding South Africa. They earned $557 million from these investments. In 1972, the AID program for Africa was $175 million, which amounts to less than half the profits American businessmen made the year before. And of that $175 million given to Africa, $104 million was to be repaid to the United States in future years. It is clear that our economic relationship with Africa is very favorable to the United States. In a way, Africa really aids the United States, rather than vice-versa.

The point I am making is simply that to discuss this bill as a legitimate, serious attempt by this Congress to restructure the AID program so as to help the poorer nations of the world without giving a substantial increase to developmental aid to Africa is not only short-sighted, but rather, it reflects an out right, overt racism on our part.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY DILEMMA OF THE BLIND

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, to have the sense of sight, and then to lose it, is surely one of the saddest tragedies which can befall an individual. Yet in most cases, the misfortune does not end there. Society views the blind person as handicapped. He is looked upon as being unable to meet the demands and requirements of the average job. Thus, the individual finds his loss double; he is deprived first of sight, and then of employment.

Several weeks ago, I received a very special letter from Mrs. Norma N. Spencer, president of the Utah State Association of the Blind. In her letter, she notes the sorry personal and economic predicament the newly blind person finds himself in. She points out that one of the most difficult problems he faces is his present coverage under social security.

Under existing social security law, only subsistence level income is provided for the blind person who has worked for at least 20 quarters in social security covered work. Benefits can be cut off if the individual is employed and earns as little as $140 per month.

There is a pressing need for legislation to remedy this situation. One such piece of legislation is H.R. 6554, the "disability insurance for the blind" bill, introduced by Congressman BURKE, and cosponsored by Congressman MILLS. This bill would allow for qualification for disability benefits to persons who are legally blind and who have worked for six quarters in social security covered jobs. It also provides for benefits to continue, without respect to earnings, for as long as blindness lasts.

At this point, I am including the text of Mrs. Spencer's letter, as well as the Burke bill. While the Committee on Ways and Means has yet to hold hearings on this and related legislation, I urge my colleagues to study it and consider its merits. We must not allow legislative shortcomings to further hinder those already set back by physical handicaps.

UTAH STATE ASSOCIATION OF THE BLIND,
June 20, 1973.

Congressman WAYNE OWENS,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OWENS: Thank you so much for your telegram of acknowledgment of my telegram concerning S7, the over-riding veto Rehabilitation bill. Even though the bill did not make it, we sincerely appreciated your efforts in our behalf.

Now I have another matter which I would like to bring to your attention. And that is House Resolution 6554, which is a Social Security amendment which the National Federation of the Blind has been seeking to have passed for many years. We are an affiliate of NFB. They refer to the bill as: "the Disability Insurance for the Blind" bill. At our state convention last month a resolution was passed to support the bill.

Are you familiar with this bill? I am enclosing a copy of the "Fact Sheet" concerning NFB views on the bill. In accordance with our resolution, we also favor these views.

As a rehabilitation teacher for the blind, I see many pathetic cases which I feel could be improved with the passage of the bill. I can think of two cases in particular within walking distance of down-town Salt Lake City. The living conditions, in each instance, are deplorable. The housing situation in both consists of an old, run-down shack, with only the bare essentials inside. I realize that there are thousands upon thousands of people in the general population who live in dire poverty. But to me, blind persons seem so much more vulnerable that it makes it all the more tragic.

Another aspect of the economic problems of the blind (and one which perturbs me deeply) is what I would call: "the Social Security dilemma."

The questions confronting the blind individual in this instance are: should he play it safe, sitting at home in his rocker, without a job, effortlessly collecting his Social Security check each month?

Or instead, should he seek employment and possibly earn too much money to keep his Social Security standing? And furthermore, hypothetically, possibly risk failing at a job and losing it and then not qualify for reinstatement under Social Security.

The fear of this final possibility is enough to deter many capable blind persons from even accepting employment, let alone seeking it.

With the tremendous adjustment which accompanies the transmitter experience of losing vision, comes with it, as a usual intregal facet, fear, loss of self-confidence and self-esteem. All too often the newly-blinded individual is not willing to assume the risk of losing his only means of financial security.

I believe that passage of the "Disability Insurance" bill may help to provide an incentive for those people by removing the threat of no income should they try at a job and fail.

In this way, instead of making blind people more dependent, it could make them more free. It could likely create a situation where a substantially higher rate of blind persons (proportionately) would enter the work force. Thus not only helping themselves, individually, but obtaining personal gratification through the dignity of achieving success, but also, in the process, help society as a whole.

Will you please obtain a copy of this bill and study it? Then, on its merits, decide if you could co-sponsor it?

We would be so grateful for your support. We feel that it is vitally important to the blind.

Thank you so much for your previous support, and we hope that you will continue to support our endeavors.

Sincerely,

MRS. NORMA N. SPENCER,
President.

H.R. 6554

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 214(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding "or" after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (3), and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) in the case of an individual who has died and who was entitled to a benefit under section 223 for the month before the month in which he died, 6 quarters of coverage;".

(b) Section 215(b)(1) of such Act is

amended by striking out "shall be the quotient" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall (except as provided in paragraph (5)) be the quotient".

(c) Section 215(b) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) In the case of an individual who is blind (within the meaning of 'blindness' as defined in section 216(i)(1)), such individual's average monthly wage shall be the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the total of his wages paid in, and self-employment income credited to, all of the calendar quarters which are quarters of coverage (as defined in section 213) and which fall within the period after 1950 and prior to the year specified in clause (i) or clause (ii) of paragraph (2)(C), by (B) the number of months in such quarters; except that any such individual who is fully insured (without regard to section 214(a)(4)) shall have his average monthly wage computed under this subsection without regard to this paragraph if such computation results in a larger primary insurance amount."

(d) Section 216(i)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The requirements referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (2)(C) are satisfied by an individual with respect to any quarter only if—

"(A) he would have been a fully insured individual (as defined in section 214) had he attained age 62 and filed application for benefits under section 202(a) on the first day of such quarter, and (i) he had not less than 20 quarters of coverage during the 40-quarter period which ends with such quarter, or (ii) if such quarter ends before he attains (or would attain) age 31, not less than one-half (and not less than 6) of the quarters during the period ending with such quarter and beginning after he attained the age of 21 were quarters of coverage, or (if the number of quarters in such period is less than 12) not less than 6 of the quarters in the 12-quarter period ending with such quarter were quarters of coverage; or

"(B) he is blind (within the meaning of 'blindness' as defined in paragraph (1) of this subsection) and has not less than 6 quarters of coverage in the period which ends with such quarter.

For purposes of clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, when the number of quarters in any period is an odd number, such number shall be reduced by one, and a quarter shall not be counted as part of any period if any part of such quarter was included in a prior period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage."

(e) The first sentence of section 222(b)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "(other than such an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in section 216(i)(1))" after "an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits".

(f) Section 233 (a)(1) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the comma at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "or is blind (within the meaning of 'blindness' as defined in section 216(i)(1)),";

(2) by striking out "the month in which he attains age 65" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the case of any individual other than an individual whose disability is blindness (as defined in section 216(i)(1)), the month in which he attains age 65"; and

(3) by striking out the second sentence.

(g) Section 223(c)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) An individual shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if—

"(A) he would have been a fully insured individual (as defined in section 214) had he attained age 62 and filed application for benefits under section 202(a) on the first day of such month, and (i) he had not less than 20 quarters of coverage during the 40-quarter period which ends with the quarter in which such month occurred, or (ii) if such month ends before the quarter in which he attains (or would attain) age 31, not less than one-half (and not less than 6) of the quarters during the period ending with the quarter in which such month occurred and beginning after he attained the age of 21 were quarters of coverage, or (if the number of quarters in such period is less than 12) not less than 6 of the quarters in the 12-quarter period ending with such quarter were quarters of coverage, or

"(B) he is blind (within the meaning of 'blindness' as defined in section 216(i)(1)) and has not less than 6 quarters of coverage in the period which ends with the quarter in which such month occurs.

For purposes of clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, when the numbers of quarters in any period is an odd number, such number shall be reduced by one, and a quarter shall not be counted as part of any period if any part of such quarter was included in a period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage."

(h) Section 223(d)(1)(B) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B) blindness (as defined in section 216(i)(1))."

(i) The second sentence of section 223(d)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting "(other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in section 216(i)(1))" immediately after "individual".

SEC. 2. In the case of an insured individual who is under a disability as defined in section 223(d)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act, who is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under section 202(a) or 223 of such Act for a month after the month in which this Act is enacted, and who applies for a recomputation of his disability insurance benefit or for a disability insurance benefit (if he is entitled under such section 202(a)) in or after the month in which this Act is enacted, the Secretary shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 215(f)(1) of such Act, make a recomputation of such benefit if such recomputation results in a higher primary insurance amount.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for and after the second month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

A RESPONSE TO THE MOBIL OIL CORP.

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the week of July 9 of this year an "open letter" to Congressmen on the gasoline shortage, written by the Mobil Oil Corp., appeared in hometown newspapers of Congressmen throughout the country. Although it purports to give the complete facts of the situation, it falls considerably short of this goal. The explanation of the shortage and the proposed remedies included in the ad are self-serving and inadequate.

Today I am submitting the following detailed response to the charges Mobil has made:

A RESPONSE TO THE MOBIL OIL CORP.

(By George E. Brown, Jr.)

Mobil Oil Corporation recently placed an "open letter" to Congressmen on the gasoline shortage in hometown newspapers of members of the House of Representatives. Individual corporations like Mobil have spent millions of dollars on such advertisements. Similar propaganda efforts have been fostered by the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Association, two trade organizations who alone spent $12 million on three recent energy campaigns.

Mobil tries to "set the record straight" on the gasoline shortage. Although their intention is not to get into "a posture of charges and counter-charges," more commonly known as free and open debate, I feel compelled to respond to their arguments and their recitation of so-called facts. I also suggest that if Mobil Oil Corporation and the petroleum industry were really serious about finding solutions to the energy crisis, they would take the millions of dollars they are now spending on misinforming the American public and spend it on research and development efforts.

Mobil's first point is that "Gasoline production is at an all-time high." More specifically they say:

"When they hear the word 'shortage,' many people think the industry must be supplying less than before. Far from it.

"The U.S. oil industry is making more gasoline than ever—5% more than last year."

In the first place, the fact that Mobil Oil Corporation and the oil industry is "making" (i.e. producing and refining) more gasoline than ever in no way means that the industry is "supplying" (i.e. transporting and marketing) that gasoline. So the fact that gasoline production is at an all-time high proves very little; indeed, gasoline production has frequently been at an all-time high over the past few years.

In the second place, when I hear the word shortage I do not necessarily think that the industry is supplying "less than before," rather I think that the industry must be supplying less than they could be supplying. And the facts substantiate this view of the shortage. New York state's antitrust chief, Assistant Attorney General Charles A. La Torella, recently cited figures that cast doubt on the authenticity of the shortage. He pointed out that as of June 1, gasoline reserves totaled 202.5 million barrels. But he said that last year, when no "crisis" existed, stocks were 1.6 million to 9.6 million barrels less.

The Office of Oil and Gas in the U.S. Department of Interior publishes a biweekly report entitled "Summary of Current Petroleum Industry Operations." The July 13, 1973 report concluded that gasoline stocks are now 2 million barrels above last year, that normally there should be a strong downward movement in gasoline stocks at this season of the year, but that instead the opposite has occurred. The Office reported that in early April gasoline inventories were 24 million barrels below the previous April, and now we have a surplus. These statistics indicate that the short-term gasoline shortage is probably phony and that the industry must be supplying less than they could be.

But there is additional evidence that the oil industry has been underproducing. Last fall oil refineries were running at 85 per cent capacity and even at lower capacity while the oil industry assured the country that there would be no shortages in the winter months. Mobil Oil Corporation was making these same assurances. For example, an Office of Emergency Preparedness memorandum of a telephone conversation with Mobil Oil, May 26, 1972, states:

"Mobil expects to have adequate supplies and transportation to meet the Number 2 oil requirements of its own customers during the 1972–1973 heating season."

Yet shortages were soon to follow. Thus the short-term gasoline shortages can be best explained by oil industry failure to produce and supply what they were capable of.

Mobil's second "fact" is that "Political decisions have produced the shortage." Mobil asserts that seven factors, "all essentially resulting from political decisions," have produced today's so-called shortage. These factors are Mobil's full explanation of the crisis. I disagree with Mobil and the oil industry in their explanation on two major counts: first, some of their reasons for the shortage are incorrect and second their explanation as a whole is incredibly inadequate and ignores the prime causes of the problem.

First let me briefly examine what Mobil Oil does say to explain the crisis. One factor they cite is that the "United States is short of refining capacity." This observation seems to be accurate, but Mobil's explanation of why this is so isn't. One recent Mobil ad answers the question of why oil companies haven't built more refineries by saying "Mainly environmental and financial constraints . . . have effectively kept oil companies from obtaining satisfactory sites for new refineries." This argument is repeated in the open letter when Mobil talks about "environmental constraints."

I immediately wonder why Mobil could not simply add new capacity to existing refineries. But beyond that, the notion that anti-pollution controls have stopped the building of refineries does not look convincing in light of recent actions by the oil industry. For example, since President Nixon's Energy Policy speech at least eight oil companies are expanding or building new refineries to increase the nation's capacity by 10% or 1.5 million barrels per day. Exxon announced a $400 million expansion. These activities coincide with present environmental standards which are the strictest ever in recent history. Clearly these standards have been no block to attempts to build or expand these refineries. I am at a loss to explain why the environmental standards are no longer a stumbling block unless, of course, they never were.

And advertising claims to the contrary, oil companies have had little trouble in the late '60's in overriding environmental concerns when they wanted to. Mobil itself built a plant in Joliet, Illinois. Mobil's explanation is obviously deficient.

The most reasonable explanation for the shortage of refinery capacity is not given by Mobil or the oil industry. It is oil company self-protection. In a recent issue of the highly respected *New York Review of Books*, Emma Rothschild explained:

"They (oil companies) have been unwilling to build new refineries because they experienced excess capacity after a building splurge in the 1960's, which in a classic example of business overshoot, stimulated attempts to create more demand: campaigns to 'Discover America' by buying more gasoline, the selling of excess gasoline at discount prices to the same independent retailers whom major suppliers are now attempting to crush."

I think this is a far more plausible explanation of the present refinery shortage: to blame the problem on "environmental concerns" is an insult to all of those who have sought an acceptable energy-environment balance.

Many of the other factors given by Mobil are insufficient to explain the short-term gasoline shortage. To say that today's shortage is caused by the failure to construct a pipeline in Alaska ignores two important facts. First, even if a pipeline had been built already, it would hardly now be pumping sufficient oil to solve the shortage Mobil says already exists. In addition, recent estimates indicate that by 1980 Alaskan oil will supply less than a tenth of U.S. oil demand. This is hardly the panacea to our present problems.

Oil companies are also on weak ground when they try to explain shortages by pointing to the fact that two of the major oil-exporting countries in the Middle East and North Africa have reduced crude oil production. Though these sources of oil will undoubtedly become more significant in the future, they can't explain present shortages. For in 1973, according to predictions in a "fact sheet" that accompanied the President's energy message, less than 14% of oil used in the United States will be imported from the entire Eastern Hemisphere. It is hard to fathom an explanation which tries to explain the apparent shortage on minor fluctuations in supply from only two of the many countries we get oil from in the Eastern Hemisphere.

The thrust of one argument Mobil makes about the causes of the energy crisis is less disputable. Mobil says that government regulatory policies have contributed to the problem. I agree. The oil import quota policies, for example, have limited imports of refined gasoline to practically zero. But of government policies Mobil claims "oil companies had no control." However, oil companies have consistently lobbied for such quotas and thus are partially at fault in this regard.

Regulatory policies of the Federal Power Commission have also contributed to the present problem. In the past I have often attacked these policies mainly because of their industry orientation.

But above all, Mobil Oil Corporation can be faulted for what they fail to say in their explanation for the gasoline shortage. All of the reasons they give are a well designed subterfuge which ignores the most important cause of the crisis: the structure and performance of the oil industry itself. A recent staff report of the Federal Trade Commission, part of the culmination of an almost two year study, presented conclusions which bear directly on this point.

The report says that the "major firms, which consistently appear to cooperate rather than compete in all phases of their operation, have behaved in a similar fashion as would a classical monopolist: they have attempted to increase profits by restricting output." The report presents detailed analysis of anti-competitive practices by the nation's largest oil companies which have helped cause the shortage of gasoline. And the six reasons it gives for the gasoline shortage are markedly distinct from those given by the oil industry.

Federal investigators are not the only ones to support a different explanation for the energy crisis. For example, Florida Attorney General Robert L. Shevin filed a 68-page suit in federal court July 9 against 15 major oil companies for federal antitrust violations. He declared that the gas shortage is a result of anti-competitive practices manipulated by the major oil companies to protect their profits. Similar statements have emanated from top law-enforcement officers in at least five other states.

As I testified before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on June 26, a great deal of the responsibility for our present energy shortage is that gas producers are holding gas off the market in order to get more profits by selling it later. S. David Freeman, Director of the Ford Foundation's Energy Policy Project and former White House Adviser, put the issue in clear terms when he warned

"The 'energy crisis' could well serve as a smoke screen for a massive exercise in picking the pockets of the American consumer to the tune of billions of dollars a year."

The major oil companies are compounding the fuel shortage by using shortages they helped create to drive out their competition. Although Mobil denies this charge in their letter, the facts are quite clear. As the Federal Trade Commission report concluded:

"A final cause of the shortage is the fact that efforts by the majors to squeeze the independents' market share have kept retail gasoline prices from responding to excessive demand . . . the majors have used the shortage as an occasion to attempt to debilitate, if not eradicate, the independent marketing sector. They are doing this not by lowering prices in those areas where they compete with independents but simply by not permitting their prices to rise."

The result of major oil company actions has been that over 1,200 independent stations had been forced to close by May 30. Such stations have continued to close at the rate of about 200 a week. These consequences of actions by major companies are serious; they are further evidence that the structure and performance of the oil industry itself are the prime reasons for the present gasoline shortage.

Mobil claims that the gasoline shortage is not contrived and that there is "no conspiracy." The assertion that there has been "no conspiracy" is certainly debatable; recent evidence on this point indicates that there may well have been collusion on the part of the oil companies. But even if there was no conspiracy, this does not mean that the shortage was not contrived. The big oil companies did not have to get together and secretly plan out a shortage; rather each of the companies have behaved in a similar fashion to produce the shortage.

The recent FTC report indicated that the behavior of the large integrated firms could be characterized as cooperative rather than competitive. There is direct evidence of interdependence and absence of competition in the petroleum industry in the following areas: bidding combines, banking interlocks, joint ownership of oil pipelines, joint production, international joint ventures, and other actions. Oil firms have behaved similarly and cooperatively with respect to influencing legislation, bidding for crude leases, establishing the purchase price of crude oil, transporting crude oil, refining crude oil, and marketing gasoline.

Mobil also claims that "Oil is one of the least-concentrated major industries in the world." They assert that "No oil company supplies as much as 9% of the U.S. gasoline market." These "facts" are a ridiculous distortion of reality. Dr. John W. Wilson, Chief of the Division of Economic Studies of the Federal Power Commission, recently explained that the only analytically meaningful measures for assessing market concentration are those based on available uncommitted reserves. And if one looks at these figures, a totally different view of the industry is clear. For example, 80.6% of the reported uncommitted reserves in the Permian Basin are controlled by the 4 largest producers. The 8 largest producers control 94.2% of the uncommitted reserves in this area. Of the uncommitted reserves in Alaska, 93.9% of them are controlled by the 4 largest producers while 99.9% are controlled by the 8 largest firms. And for the entire United States, the comparable figures are 51.0% for the 4 largest firms and 73.9% for the 8 largest firms.

This data is especially significant if one knows the familiar rule of thumb that in industries where the eight largest firms have at least 50% of the sales, normal unrestrained market forces are likely to be an insufficient guarantee against monopolistic market performance. I believe that this evidence about the structure of the industry and my previous elaboration of the performance of the industry goes a long way toward explaining the energy shortage that we are presently experiencing. Any oil company which tries to explain the entire short-term shortage using the results of "political decisions" is hardly setting the record straight. Rather, companies like Mobil have mutilated the facts to fit their own views and to protect their interests.

Mobil's next point in the open letter concerns the independent marketers. The ad does not deny the fact that hundreds of independent marketers are already out of business and that more will follow. Rather, Mobil says

"You should know that the overwhelming majority of service station dealers in this country are independent businessmen, whether they sell under the Mobil brand name or the brand of one of our major competitors . . ."

This is simply not true, M. B. Holdgraf, executive vice-president of Hudson Oil Company of Kansas City and founding member of the Independent Gasoline Marketers Council, contradicted Mobil's statement when he testified:

". . . such dealers are not independent. Their competitive behavior is controlled by their suppliers. The products they handle and the prices they charge, the marketing concepts they employ, are determined, directly or indirectly, by the refiner to whom they are committed. The branded jobber or dealer, who markets in the name of a refiner-supplier, cannot claim to be independent in a competitive sense. To the contrary, the true independent marketers, not affiliated with a particular refinery, compete by striving for efficiency, lower costs, lower prices, and better services, while the majors compete by imitating one another."

These same independent marketers are the ones being ruined by current policies of major oil companies.

Probably the most important question Mobil's open letter raises is "Where do we go from here?" This question is important because the real energy crisis is not a short-term problem, but a medium- and long-range one. It is this problem we should be acutely aware of today. And it is in the area of long-term solutions that the Mobil statement is especially disappointing.

Mobil presents self-serving "solutions" instead of the best solutions. I say this because the 25 largest oil companies are all involved also in natural gas. 18 of them have invested in oil shale and uranium. 11 are in coal. And 6 of the ten largest oil companies have vested interests in all four of these domestic fuels—oil, gas, coal, and uranium. And the solutions Mobil gives involves finding new reserves of oil and gas, producing non-conventional oil and gas from oil shale and coal, and constructing nuclear power plants at an accelerated pace. In other words, Mobil and the oil industry want to do what will maximize their profit, not maximize our future energy supply.

As a member of the Energy Subcommittee of Science and Astronautics, I have tried to find real solutions to the future energy crisis. I think that the record amply demonstrates that if oil companies are left to themselves, our problems will only continue. The solutions I have proposed can be grouped in three categories: finding the best alternate sources of energy, cutting down on consumption of energy and gasoline supplies, and providing consumer-oriented regulation of the oil industry.

I believe we should be developing alternate energy sources which have great potential but which the oil industry is to a large extent ignoring. I have authored legislation to create a Geothermal Energy Development Corporation. This bill authorizes the National Science Foundation to fund basic research related to energy as well as establishing the corporation. I am also co-sponsoring legislation which would establish a national program of scientific research, development and demonstration in energy and energy-related technologies, and provides for the coordination and financial supplementation of federal energy research and development. I believe that these efforts will lead to the development of the best solution to present shortages.

At the same time I have favored a variety of proposals to cut down on consumption of energy and gasoline supplies. These proposals include recent actions which would have diverted highway trust fund money to public transportation, using a graduated excise tax based on gas consumption to discourage large gas-consuming cars, and employing tax incentives and other means to stimulate recycling of lubrication oil. These are just a few of the actions I have supported to provide a real solution to the long-term energy crisis.

Finally, I have recommended legislative action which would provide strong regulation of the petroleum industry to assure that producers do not use present shortages they are responsible for to extract the maximum possible tribute from the American people. The action I recommended included amending the Natural Gas Act to require the Federal Power Commission to set prices based solely upon costs plus a fair rate of return, and to require production at those rates, and outlaw the notorious optional pricing procedure. With prices set in such a manner, I do not believe that the industry would be motivated to manufacture "shortages" in a play to increase their profits.

Action along these lines would provide the best means of meeting our future energy needs. I suggest that the three categories of proposals which I am working on are realistic plans which attempt to solve our problems objectively. They are motivated by an understanding of the real facts of the energy situation and the gasoline shortage, not by false reasoning and misunderstanding of the situation displayed by Mobil Oil Corporation.

SHOUP STATEMENT ON ENERGY

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Americans to wake up and recognize the grave implications of today's energy problems. It is time for the Federal Government, industry, and the scientific community to make a united effort to develop long-term energy resources. Two of these resources are geothermal power and solar energy.

Important breakthroughs in the use of solar energy were forecast recently at a Paris meeting of 900 scientists. The reality of the solar energy picture was expressed by French physicist Ivan Peyches. He said:

> The speed at which solar energy will be put to use is a direct function of the world's fear of running out of conventional energy sources.

I am appalled at the shortsighted tunnel vision with which some people in responsible positions operate. Mr. R. W. Fri, Acting Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, spoke to the National Coal Association on June 18. He suggests that:

> Before our fossil fuel resources are completely exhausted we must develop a "perpetual" energy supply.

I suggest that a "perpetual energy supply" be developed as soon as possible.

No two sources appear to agree on how long our reserves of oil, gas, coal, and other energy producing resources will last. The consensus says, however, that the fossil fuels are finite in character, that natural gas will go first, oil will be next with 80 percent depletion in 50 years with coal lasting 200 to 300 years.

The Interior Department has provided some interesting statistics and projections in "United States Energy Through the Year 2000." In 1971, domestic natural gas provided 96 percent of our supply, 4 percent being imported. Their projections show our year 2000 gas supply as being 58 percent domestic, 28 percent imported, and 14 percent synthetic. The latter will come from gasification of coal.

We can extend our supplies of gas by gasification of coal. There are serious considerations involved here, however. Our coal production now accounts for more than half our electricity. We must not divert the coal to gasification before we provide alternative means for producing electricity. Another objection to gasification is that the process involves converting one fuel into another fuel form at the expense of the consumer.

Petroleum supply problems grow more acute. In 1971, domestic sources provided for 74 percent of our needs. This will drop to 56 percent in 1980 and to less than 30 percent by the year 2000. We will have to rely on outside sources for over 70 percent of our petroleum.

Oil reserves could be increased markedly if we go to production from shales and tar sands. Environmental problems arise from these resources. Shales are difficult. They are compacted materials which when dug up and processed increase in bulk, creating a monumental disposal problem. So, at best, we are faced with increased reliance on imports. In the face of the unstable situation in the Middle East we must look now to the alternatives. We, as a nation, can no longer rest assured that there will be ready supplies of crude oil and petroleum products to meet our import requirements.

There has been a great deal of rhetoric regarding the energy crisis and efforts to step up production of fossil fuels to meet this crisis. Stepped-up production of coal, gasification, and the Alaska pipeline are frequently mentioned as solutions.

I agree that we must work on these as short-term measures but it is essential that we push development of long-term alternatives that do not require fossil fuels.

A factor which dictates conservation of fossil fuels is our thriving and growing petrochemical industry. This is a $20 billion industry, employing thousands and producing paints, plastics, fabrics, cosmetics, asphalt, lubricants, medicines, vitamins, and a multitude of other products. The lifeblood of this industry is fossil fuel. It cannot exist without these resources. We must look at alternative energy sources so that we insure future generations of adequate resources for the production of real goods.

Let us look at what has been done with other energy sources. The geothermal power production at the Geysers area north of San Francisco will reach 389 megawatts by the end of this year. To put this into perspective, this is enough power for the domestic needs of San Francisco.

In my district of western Montana we have a great geothermal potential that is only now being investigated. We also have an aluminum plant; an industry with a real thrist for electric power. This plant requires 372 megawatts of power for its operation, again nearly the equivalent of the needs of San Francisco or the domestic needs of the State of Montana. It is certainly within the realm of possibility that geothermal sources will one day provide domestic and industrial power for our State and much of the northwest. Research and development money will be needed before this can be accomplished.

One of the reasons for the tremendous increase in demand for electricity is our increasing reliance on air-conditioning, particularly in our urban areas. This use has shifted the peak load to midafternoon, the peak period of incoming solar radiation. While solar energy is not a panacea for all our energy problems the December 1972 NSF-NASA report singles out heating and cooling of residential and commercial buildings as the most promising application of solar energy.

"Solar One," a solar house recently completed at the University of Delaware uses the sun's energy for heating and cooling and will also convert sunlight into electricity to run household appliances. We have the technology with which to harness solar energy for a number of uses now. Let us at least start to eliminate the afternoon peak loads caused by our air conditioners. Let us stop procrastinating and hedging and get on with the job at hand.

Let us take a look at our energy needs using the term "quad" as an energy unit. A "quad" represents a quadrillion Btu's—British thermal units. To put things in perspective, in 1890 we as a Nation consumed 7 "quads" of energy as opposed to 70 "quads" in 1971.

In the United States, on a clear day, approximately 225 quads of solar energy fall on a flat surface of a thousand square miles. This is three times our annual energy needs falling on an area 10 miles wide and 100 miles long during 1 clear day. We have 3 million square miles of land area in the continental United States—one-tenth of 1 percent of our land area intercepts solar energy equivalent to three times our annual energy requirements, in 1 day.

Solar energy is an infinite energy source as far as man is concerned. It is a resource that knows no geographic bounds. Except for the high latitudes, there are no "have nots" when you consider the Sun as an energy source. It is a self-expending resource in the Earth's natural energy cycles. Amounts that man can capture and put to use constitute a net energy benefit as contrasted with the use of fossil fuels.

We can no longer continue blithely on our way ignoring continuing depletion of our fuels. While it may not happen in my time or in yours, these finite fuels will eventually be gone. I do not suggest that solutions to our energy needs are simple but I say that we must begin now the process of harnessing geothermal, wind and solar resources for the conservation and eventual replacement of fossil fuels as energy sources.

We took up the space challenge when Sputnik was launched. Our achievements in space stand as an example of what we can accomplish with motivation. I am confident we can do the same in the generation of energy without the sacrifice of our environment. Our greatest danger is to listen to those who tell us that these goals are too remote, that we should not pursue them. I say if we listen to them they will surely bring an economic and industrial dark ages. Let this instead be a renaissance, a transition to a period of ample, clean power for all our needs.

I propose that we begin with a significant acceleration of our research and development programs. The attached bill is a start in this direction. Mr. Speaker, I insert it in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

The bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to authorize supplemental appropriations for National Science Foundation Energy Research and Development

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the National Science Foundation Energy Research and Development Supplemental Appropriations Authorization Act.

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) That fossil fuel reserves are finite and though coal resources are estimated to be adequate for two to three hundred years, an eighty percent depletion of oil reserves has been forecast by 2025 with gas reserves due to be depleted earlier;

(2) That the United States with 6 percent of the world population is using 35 percent of the world's energy and mineral production with energy requirements continuing to increase both here and abroad;

(3) That our dependence on oil imports increases annually while the sources of supply become less dependable;

(4) There are recognized hazards associated with the production of nuclear energy;

(5) That fossil fuels cannot be expended solely for the production of energy in the face of growing needs for the production of real goods by a viable petrochemical industry;

(6) That geothermal energy sources are capable of providing substantial energy during a time of growing concern for our energy reserves;

(7) That solar energy can be considered as an infinite energy reserve which offers a solution to our long range energy requirements.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation, Research Applied to National Needs, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 for the following areas of research:

(1) Geothermal energy, $20,000,000;

(2) Solar energy, including wind, solar thermal conversion, photo-voltaics, ocean thermal and photosynthetic production of organic materials and hydrogen, $80,000,000;

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation, Research Applied to National Needs, for each of the four fiscal years beginning July 1, 1974, for the following areas of research:

(1) Geothermal energy, $45,000,000;

(2) Solar energy, as in Sec. 3 (a) (2), $230,000,000.

THE 1973 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the response of broad segments of our society to the annual observance of Captive Nations Week has been most reassuring. Our people are not prone to forget that one-third of mankind still is under totalitarian communist bondage. Further examples of the success of the 15th observance of Captive Nations Week are as follows:

PROCLAMATION: STATE OF MISSOURI

Whereas, all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and

Whereas, these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and

Whereas, Missouri has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and

Whereas, it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of Missouri to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of independence and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I, Christopher S. Bond, Governor of the State of Missouri, do hereby designate the week of July 15-21, 1973 as Captive Nations Week and invite the people of Missouri to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for independence and human liberty.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Great Seal of the State of Missouri, in the City of Jefferson, this 13th day of July, 1973.

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
Governor.

Attest:

JAMES KIRKPATRICK,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION: STATE OF NEBRASKA

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples:

Now, therefore, I, J. James Exon, Governor of the State of Nebraska, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15-21, 1973, as Captive Nations Week in Nebraska, and call upon the citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Nebraska to be affixed.

Done at the State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska, this 5th day of July in the Year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy-Three.

J. JAMES EXON,
Governor.
ALLEN J. BEERMANN,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION: STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Whereas, the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212) by the United States Congress authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to proclaim each year the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week", until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the World; and

Whereas, the Ukrainian, Tatar, Slovak, Serbian, Russian, Romanian, Polish, North Caucasian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Kalmuck, Jewish, Hungarian, Georgian, Estonian, Croatian, Cossack, Chinese, Byelorus, Bulgarian, Azerbaijani, Armenian, Albanian peoples, and many others, are still held in captivity by Communist Imperialism; and

Whereas, the Communist regimes continue to violate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by suppressing religious, cultural and economic freedom and the right of national self-determination and political sovereignty; and

Whereas, those peoples are constantly struggling for their freedom, human rights and independence as witnessed by the events in Poland and Hungary in 1956 and by the recent turmoil in Lithua and Soviet Jewry and in Czechoslovakia and Romania, and thus serving as a mighty barrier against further expansion of the Communist menace toward the free World; and

Whereas, the United States of America enjoys the friendship of all the captive peoples and represents a source of inspiration to them; and

Whereas, it is clearly in the best interests of all peoples throughout the World and of the United States to encourage and help the Captive Nations to attain their just aspirations for freedom, independence and all God-given human rights;

Now, therefore, I, William T. Cahill, Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby proclaim July 15-21, 1973, as Captive Nations Week in New Jersey, and invite all our freedom-loving citizens to observe this week and support the cause of freedom and justice for the nations held in cruel captivity by Communist tyranny.

Given, under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of New Jersey, this tenth day of July, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy-three, and in the Independence of the United States, the one hundred and ninety-eighth.

WILLIAM T. CAHILL,
Governor.
ROBERT M. FALCRY,
Acting Secretary of State.

(From the Sunday News, July 15, 1973)

LEST WE FORGET

This week—from today through July 21—Americans observe Captive Nations Week, a time for reflection on the fate of peoples and countries enslaved by communism.

These "huddled masses yearning to breathe free" look to the U.S. for deliverance as the immigrants of another era sought liberty and opportunity here.

We cannot abandon them, or cease striving by every means at our command to lift the yoke from their necks.

[From the Evening Press, July 11, 1973]

RELIC OR RELEVANT?

No reader of letters to the editor of this newspaper can fail to be aware that a good many of his fellow citizens are loathe to regard Captive Nations Week, which begins Sunday, as a dying relic of the rapidly receding Cold War.

To them the annual observance, established by Congress 14 years ago to show American support for the freedom of such countries as Poland, Lithuania, Tibet and North Korea, is a commemoration of what they feel U.S. foreign policy should be.

The governments of the countries involved vigorously deny that they are the "captives" of anyone, of course, and the Soviet Union, whose relations, with the U.S. have changed dramatically in scarcely more than a year, is affronted by the inclusion of such Soviet republics as Turkestan, the Ukraine and Cossackia on the captive list.

These nations of Europe and Asia were specified in a resolution adopted in 1959. It also requested the President to issue a yearly Captive Nations Week proclamation. The proclamations began as detailed listings of countries that had lost their independence. But in the past few years they have become more general statements affirming this country's support of the right of national self-determination.

When President Eisenhower issued the first Captive Nations proclamation on the eve of Vice President Nixon's visit to Moscow in 1959, Soviet Premier Nikita S. Krushchev flew into a rage and the Soviet press thundered its protests. Nowadays the Communists—and most Americans—pay scant attention to Captive Nations Week.

The father and leading promoter of the captive nations idea is Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University. He argues (Ukrainian Quarterly, summer 1973) that no matter what U.S.-Soviet agreements are made, this country must not relax its defenses. Americans must continue to police the world because "All current, substantial evidence points to the eventual outcome of new captive nations."

Dr. Dobriansky also wants the presidential proclamation to be more forceful. Because of all the summit conferences and East-West bear-hugs that have occurred in the past year, President Nixon's statement for Captive Nations Week will probably be carefully tailored so as not to anger the Soviet and Chinese leaders more than necessary.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—1973: STATEMENT OF THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

From July 15 to July 21, 1973, the American people will mark the 15th annual observance of Captive Nations Week. This yearly manifestation is based on Public Law 86-90, which was passed by Congress and signed by President Eisenhower in July 1959.

Given the number of significant international developments thus far in 1973, including the recent summit meeting between President Richard M. Nixon and Leonid I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the Conference on European Security and Cooperation, the first phase of which was held in Helsinki, Finland with 34 states participating, it seems that genuine peace and understanding have descended upon the world, and that there no longer is a captive nations problem to deal with.

But such is not really the case. Despite the Soviet peace overtures, as expressed in Washington and Helsinki, the Soviet Russian totalitarian government has not changed its policies toward the captive nations. The oppression and persecution of the Ukrainian people, as well as of the other non-Russian peoples of the USSR, go on unabated.

Therefore, we appeal to our Branches and Member Organizations to commemorate this year's Captive Nations Week with appropriate celebrations and manifestations and to demonstrate the concern of freedom-loving Americans for those who are enslaved and dominated by the Communist powers.

The captive nations, both in the Soviet Union and in the satellite countries, have defied and resisted Soviet Russian efforts to suppress their freedom and their undying quest for national statehood. As stated in the resolution that underlies Public Law 86-90: ". . . The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitute a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace . . ."

Brezhnev and his brand of policies will bring neither peace nor justice to the peoples of the world. He has remained a Stalinist, and his policies of Russification and persecution of the Ukrainian people clearly indicate that he is not a believer in peace.

Consequently, while observing this year's Captive Nations Week, we strongly urge all UCCA Branches and Member Organizations to do the following:

Take active part in all public observances and gatherings marking this year's Captive Nations Week, along with other American and ethnic patriotic organizations;

Appeal to U.S. Senators and Congressmen to call the attention of the U.S. Government to the plight of the captive nations and the persistent violations of the basic human rights of these peoples by the USSR and its subservient Communist puppets in Europe and Asia;

Appeal to the Governors and Mayors in the United States to honor this singular event by issuing special Captive Nations Week proclamations in their respective states and cities, thus demonstrating their belief in the cause of universal human freedom and justice;

And, finally, to appeal to the American people for their understanding and support of the struggle of the captive nations, and to lend their moral support in this unequal battle against the Communist tyranny that enslaves the millions of captive peoples throughout the world.—Executive Committee, Ukrainian Congress, Committee of America.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER PROCLAIMS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Governor Nelson Rockefeller proclaimed the week of July 15 through 21 as the 15th annual Captive Nations Week to kindle the hopes of the many millions of people languishing behind the Iron and Bamboo curtains. Similar proclamations are being issued by President Nixon and Mayor Lindsay as well as many other governors and mayors in accordance with U.S. Public Law 86-90 establishing this annual observance.

Judge Matthew J. Troy, Chairman of the Captive Nations Week Committee of New York, observes that "While there are captive nations there will be no true freedom in the world. Those who enslave others never enjoy complete freedom from fear, rebellion and even assassination."

Judge Troy stresses the added importance of observing this Captive Nations Week because of the proposed charter placed before the recent Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation by Soviet Minister Andrei Gromyko. This charter calls for maintaining a status quo on all political units of Europe and Asia. If adopted this would effectively legalize and guarantee the permanent enslavement of the more than thirty nations now languishing under Communist imperialism.

The Committee Chairman announced that St. Patrick's Cathedral in Manhattan offered a special Captive Nations Mass on the opening day, Sunday, July 15 at 10 a.m.

After Mass, Judge Troy and guests of honor led a massive procession up Fifth Avenue at 11:15 a.m. from St. Patrick's Cathedral to 72nd Street, and then to the Central Park Mall. The procession included refugees from many enslaved nations plus local veteran and civic organizations and many other friends of Captive Nations.

A program of native folk dances from various captive nations was presented at the mall at 12 noon, along with a short talk by a distinguished guest of honor.

The Committee will sponsor a motorcade through midtown Manhattan on Thursday evening, July 19, starting from First Avenue and 40th Street at 6 p.m.

The public is invited to attend and participate in these varied activities and may contact the Committee by calling (212) 728-1275.

MURDER BY HANDGUN: A CASE FOR GUN CONTROL—NO. 10

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Washington Post noted that 6 months have passed since Senator John Stennis was shot in front of his home in the District of Columbia. Those 6 months have seen many public statements of sorrow and anger, many "fresh calls for strong gun controls," but little concrete action to stem the flow of handguns.

The editorial states:

In a real sense, the cause of sound gun controls would be better served if public officials would forego those empty statements about "senseless shootings" and "tragic events" each time one of the victims happens to be someone a lot of people know. . . . Only when public officials come to realize that the same senseless tragedies are occurring every day to ordinary people are we likely to see the enactment of effective controls on deadly weapons.

The articles on handgun murders which I have been inserting into the Congressional Record each day have attempted to make the same point: Every day, in fact, every 4 minutes, a man or woman or child is killed senselessly, needlessly, by a handgun. All of us, you, I, our families, our friends, are, and will continue to be, potential victims of violence as long as there are so many handguns in civilian hands.

A murder can, and does, occur any time, any place, for any reason, or for no reason. The murder which we are describing today happened because of a dispute over the price of an ice cream cone.

Albert Anderson, a father of 10 children, was told by one of his children that an ice cream vendor would sell only two cones for the price that had formerly bought three. The vendor said the price of cones had gone up.

Anderson went back to his home and returned with a pistol. He exchanged shots with the ice cream vendor, who was also armed. Police could not say who fired the first shot, but the ice cream vendor was wounded and Anderson was killed.

Prof. Leonard Berkowitz of the University of Wisconsin and many other psychologists have noted that violence is very often impulsive. "It is not primarily planned, purposeful activity," he wrote in Psychology Today magazine. "Neither is it the 'inevitable' result of internal drives of maladjustments. These things set the stage and help carry the action forward, but in many cases it is also important that there be a stimulus or immediate cue to trigger aggression."

The gun can be that stimulus to violence. "The finger pulls the trigger," Professor Berkowitz wrote, "but the trigger may also be pulling the finger."

We can only speculate what would have happened in Albert Anderson's case if a gun had not been so readily available during that moment of anger and rage. Perhaps his anger would have subsided. Perhaps Anderson would have used his fist. Perhaps a murder would not have resulted.

I suggest that public officials, rather than wringing their hands over "senseless shootings" and "tragic events" should make it as difficult as they possibly can for people to murder people. We must take the responsibility for controlling the circulation of the deadliest murder weapon of all—the handgun.

Two articles from the Washington Post follow:

Hand Guns and Hand Wringing

Nearly six months ago, Sen. John C. Stennis of Mississippi was shot at point-blank range in front of his home on Cumberland Avenue NW, an event which prompted a wave of public reaction from all over the nation. There were statements of sorrow and anger and from public officials, fresh calls for strong gun controls. As always, however, these calls have subsided as public attention shifted to other matters. As we have seen all too often, the mere passage of time is one of the more effective weapons in the arsenal of gun lobbyists. While public attention wanders, the gun people never let up in their opposition to serious controls.

When a public figure is shot, there are political pledges of support for stiffer gun legislation, but the opponents are safe in characterizing these statements as simple reflexes, not to be taken seriously. We need only recall some of what was said right after Senator Stennis was shot. President Nixon, for one, endorsed the concept of legislation to restrict the sale of cheap "Saturday night specials," the hand guns widely used in stick-ups, assaults and murders. He said that "most reasonable people believe" that these hand guns should be controlled and he announced that the Attorney General and Sen. Roman L. Hruska (R-Neb.) would try to work out a formula for hand-gun legislation that could pass Congress. Many members of Congress, conscious of national sentiment at that moment, chimed in with supporting statements. But so far, nothing has happened on this score in Congress, and nothing more has been heard from President Nixon on the subject.

Locally, people may also recall that Mayor Walter E. Washington said on Jan. 31 that strong gun-control legislation was then under review by city officials—and would be included in the District's 1973 legislative program. "We must find a way in this nation to control the use of hand guns and 'Saturday night specials,'" the mayor declared. But so far, no local bill has been sent to Capitol Hill; if one is in the offing, the public hasn't heard about it.

To be sure, six months isn't a long time in the legislative process. But experience suggests that it's enough time for some 5,000 Americans to be murdered by gun-fire and for thousands more to be wounded in gun accidents. In a real sense, the cause of sound gun controls would be better served if public officials would forgo these empty statements about "senseless shootings" and "tragic events" each time one of the victims happens to be someone a lot of people know. This would at least spare us the false hopes raised by these false promises. Only when public officials come to realize that the same senseless tragedies are occurring every day to ordinary people are we likely to see the enactment of effective controls on deadly weapons.

Father of 10 Slain in Row Over Ice Cream

Chicago, July 28.—A fight over an ice cream cone led to a sidewalk shootout and the death of a father of 10 children on Chicago's Westside Friday night.

Police said a quarrel began after one of Albert Anderson's 10 children told him an ice cream vendor would sell only two cones for the money which formerly bought three. Vendor A. C. Thomas, 24, said the price of cones had gone up.

Police said Anderson, 46 went back into his house and returned with a pistol. Anderson and Thomas, who also was armed, exchanged shots. Police said it was not clear who fired first.

Anderson was shot once in the chest and pronounced dead at St. Anne's Hospital. Thomas was shot in the left leg and was listed as in serious condition.

RECENT WEEKLY REPORTS FROM CONGRESSMAN PRICE OF TEXAS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as part of my continuing effort to keep my constituents informed about my activities in the Congress, I am including in the Record at this time the texts of my recent news reports to the district:

Weekly Report From Congressman Bob Price

(February 8, 1973)

This week Congressman Bob Price was admitted to Bethesda Naval Hospital in Washington for evaluation of an incident of chest pain and discomfort. During the next ten days while the Congress is in recess in honor of Lincoln's Birthday, the Congressman will undergo extensive testing and treatment procedures. As a result of several months of strenuous activity involving an election campaign, the introduction and preparation of several new bills in the 93rd Congress, trips to the new 13th Congressional District, and the assumption of responsibilities as one of the few members named to serve on two major Committees in the new Congress, doctors have detected evidence of extensive physical exhaustion requiring an undetermined period of rest and convalescence.

The office of Congressman Price will continue to operate on a full time basis and staff personnel will respond to constituent inquiries and needs until the Congressman returns to the office in the weeks ahead.

On February 7, legislation similar to that introduced by Congressman Price to reinstate the Rural Environmental Assistance Program was approved by a large majority vote in the House of Representatives. Price, as a Member of the House Agriculture Committee, has in recent weeks met several times with Agriculture Secretary Butz to discuss and express his support for REAP, which has been of great benefit to our Nation's farmers in conserving and protecting our land, air and water resources.

The bill now goes to the Senate for action.

Congressman Price has continued to receive encouraging remarks concerning the three bills he has introduced this year which are designed to combat the energy crisis by establishing a Council on Energy Policy and incentives to allow for the continuation of exploration for our oil and gas reserves. Price plans to seek the support of his colleagues in Congress in the months ahead to build up our Nation's energy supply thereby decreasing our dependence on the importation of these vital resources from other countries.

WEEKLY REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN BOB PRICE

(February 2, 1973)

This has been a busy week for the Committee on Agriculture of which I am a Member. On Thursday, the Committee approved legislation to reinstate the Rural Environmental Assistance Program and sent this legislation to the House where it will be voted on within the near future. As a sponsor of a comparable bill to reinstate this valuable Federal cost-sharing conservation program, I could not be more pleased with the outcome of the Committee's decision. I can only hope that the Congress will follow suit by approving this bill as soon as possible.

Monday, February 5, brings another week of meetings for the Committee on Agriculture. During this time hearings will be held on legislation I recently introduced to restore the Farmers Home Administration emergency loan program which has proven to be invaluable to the farmers in our district and the nation who have been hard hit by extremely bad weather conditions during the last several years. It is anticipated that the Agriculture Committee will once again act quickly to approve this legislation and send it to the House Floor for further action.

This has been a week in which Americans have rejoiced over seeing the names of those POW's who will soon be returning to their homes. For the last several years I have been wearing two of the POW bracelets which contain the names of two men who used to be my flying buddies during the Korean Conflict. Soon I hope to send the bracelets I have been wearing to these men who have constantly been in my thoughts as a small expression of appreciation for their extraordinary service to our Nation. Others who have been wearing these bracelets might wish to do the same.

The cold-blooded and cowardly shooting and wounding of Senator John Stennis this week has touched off a new wave of demands for gun control legislation. It is sad that the Congress has, like an ostrich with its head in the sand, ignored the crime epidemic brought on by a decade of liberal, permissive leadership; but just as sad is the way in which the Congress is reacting to the brutal assault of one of its own Members. Contrary to the plea of liberals whose only solution is the confiscation of guns—"Let's get the guns off the streets" they say—the time has come for a return to strict law enforcement and for the infusion of new backbone in our courts and law enforcement system. Instead of getting the guns off the streets, I believe what we really need is to get the criminals off the streets.

WEEKLY REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN BOB PRICE

(January 24, 1973)

This has been a truly historical week in American history. Starting with ceremonies last Saturday to mark the reinauguration of President Nixon for a second term, citizens everywhere were later stunned upon learning of the untimely death of former President Lyndon B. Johnson.

As a member of the Texas Congressional Delegation, it was my solemn privilege to join in leading our Nation in ceremonies at the Capitol rotunda to honor Mr. Johnson for his tireless service to the Nation and to our State of Texas.

It is ironic that President Johnson's death should precede by one day the marking of another historic event and a cause for which he labored so hard, the announcement of a ceasefire in the Vietnam War. Americans everywhere have been greatly relieved to hear this long-sought good news, and we can be thankful to both Presidents Nixon and Johnson that they showed great strength and determination to achieve an honorable peace. Perhaps the best news of all is that the waiting and anxiety of the brave families and friends of our Prisoners of War Missing in Action will soon be at an end.

The legislative activities of the 93rd Congress continued at a fast pace throughout the week. While agreeing in principle with the President's efforts to hold down Federal spending, after much study and several conferences with the Secretary of Agriculture and other Members of Congress, I introduced a bill to reinstate the Rural Environmental Assistance Program which has proven over the years to be of great benefit not only to agriculture, but also to the Nation in the areas of water and soil conservation.

With the energy situation in our country becoming more critical daily, I further submitted a bill similar to one I introduced last year to establish a Council on Energy Policy. It is my hope that the Congress will act quickly on this legislation in order to establish a means to systematically arrive at solutions to the fuel shortage crisis which has crippled communities across the Nation this winter.

WASHINGTON REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN BOB PRICE

(January 23, 1973)

Today Congressman Bob Price introduced legislation which, if enacted, will require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the existing law providing for the authorization and funding of the Rural Environmental Assistance Program. "While I agree in principle with and applaud the President's efforts to keep Federal expenditures within reasonable limits," Price stated, "I feel that the effects brought about through the discontinuance of this important program would be detrimental to the long range preservation of our most vital human resources—namely our soil, water and air."

Noting that the Rural Environmental Assistance Program has worked effectively as a Federal cost sharing program for conservation programs installed by farmers since the 1930's, the Texas Congressman went on to mention some of the accomplishments made possible through this program: "REAP has enabled our farmers to do more to clean up and preserve our environment than any other federally sponsored program. Through this program our farmers have been able to protect our soil through the establishment and improvement of vegetative cover, strip-cropping practices, terracing, the re-seeding of marginal land, and cross fencing for grazing. REAP has also provided for strides to be made in the areas of sediment retention and chemical runoff control, drainage, irrigation and related practices and livestock water utilization and distribution on ranches. Through this program our farmers have also been able to embark upon activities which have slowed the spread of noxious brush and weeds, accounted for a major portion of our reforestation program on private lands, helped aid wildlife conservation and increased the development of recreational areas."

Price went on to state that it would be unfair of us to demand America's farmers to take on the burden of the conservation of our natural resources single-handed when it is evident that REAP has benefited not only rural America, but our Nation as a whole. He added that it is not feasible at this time for farmers to initiate and continue long range programs without the aid of cost sharing initiatives provided by the Federal Government especially if we are to continue to feed the starving millions abroad.

"I am looking forward to the hearings which will soon be held on this matter by the Committee on Agriculture of which I am a member and I am hopeful that the Administration will reconsider its action with regard to this important program," Price concluded.

WASHINGTON REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN BOB PRICE

(January 3, 1973)

Immediately upon the convening of the new 93rd Congress today, Congressman Bob Price introduced several bills dealing with a variety of important issues for consideration, including:

A Constitutional Amendment to permit voluntary prayer in the Nation's classrooms and other public buildings.

A Constitutional Amendment setting minimum attendance requirements for Members of Congress—failure to be present and voting on at least 70% of recorded yea and nay votes would result in the dismissal from office of a delinquent Congressman.

A Constitutional Amendment to prohibit deficit spending by the Federal Government except in time of war or national emergency, and to require a retirement of the National Debt over a one hundred year period.

A bill to abolish the limitation on outside income for social security beneficiaries over the age of 65.

A bill to provide tax credits for expenditures made in the exploration and development of new reserves of oil and gas in the United States.

A bill to establish a Council on Energy Policy to advise the Congress and the President in the formation and execution of a national energy policy to meet the future needs of the United States.

A bill to modify the Delaney Amendment to the Federal Food and Drug Act to permit the use of DES in animal feeds when residues from such use may be present in inconsequential and harmless amounts.

A bill to reestablish November 11th for the annual observance of Veterans Day in the United States.

A bill to modify the inheritance tax laws applicable to farmers, ranchers, businessmen and other property owners.

"I believe the 93rd Congress has a great challenge ahead—we have an opportunity to take up the unfinished business of the past and to enact responsible new legislation to meet the pressing needs of the American people. As the Representative of the new 13th

Congressional District of Texas, I shall vigorously attempt to promote the views of all of my constituents in the Congress and to seek legislative action in those areas which meet with their needs," Price said.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT BY EXECUTIVE ORDER ON THE MARCH

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1972, President Nixon signed Executive Order 11647, titled "Federal Regional Councils," and embarked this Nation on a course of regional government, dividing the country into 10 Federal regional districts.

At the time, I remarked in the RECORD of—

The vast powers which, without congressional approval . . . placed in the hands of the President and his heads of departments and agencies (control) over food supply, money and credit, transportation, communications, public utilities, and other facets of the lives of our people. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 16, 1972.)

This EO divided the United States into 10 separate and distinct Federal regions, to be administered and controlled by 10 Federal regional councils. All the administrators are appointed and serve at Executive pleasure and are not subject to voter approval. Additionally, Congress has no review of the activities of these regional functionaries.

The power of the Federal regional councils was recently extended and amended by Executive Order 11731 issued on July 25, 1973. Under the new order, the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior are now "regionalized." Other changes will be noted in the new Executive order, which I request to follow my remarks.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations set up the groundwork for the 10-region concept. Congress, in drafting the legislation establishing the ACIR, exempted this important Commission from legislative oversight. The ACIR, therefore, is sheltered from congressional inquiry into its activities and spending of taxpayers' money. The voters have no investigative powers over the Commission which takes credit for laying out the controversial 10 standard Federal regions.

Earlier this session, I introduced H.R. 6869 which would include the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations within the definition of "advisory committee," and thus bring it under legislative oversight. It would remove the special exemption the commission now enjoys.

It is interesting to note that the chairmanship of the regional government bureaucrats is under the control of the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, another agency not under congressional oversight.

Regionalization of our sovereign States with control centralized in Washington will inevitably reduce the status and power of State governments. The impact of "regional government" by Executive order has a far-reaching and revolutionary affect on the ideal of "government by laws rather than men."

Executive Order 11731 follows:

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

TITLE C—THE PRESIDENT

Executive Order 11731

Amending Executive Order No. 11647 Relating to Federal Regional Councils

On February 10, 1972, I formally established Federal Regional Councils for each of the ten Federal regions, and established an Under Secretaries Group for Regional Operations to strengthen and improve services to the public at the regional level. I have now determined that the mandate of the Federal Regional Councils should be broadened to include the coordination of direct Federal program assistance to State and local governments (as well as grant assistance as now provided), that the membership of the Councils and the Under Secretaries Group for Regional Operations should be changed, and that the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget should be substituted as Chairman of the Under Secretaries Group in place of the Associate Director of that agency.

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States of America, sections 1, 2, and 3 of Executive Order No. 11647[1] of February 10, 1972, are amended to read as follows:

SECTION 1. *Federal Regional Councils.* (a) There is hereby continued a Federal Regional Council for each of the ten standard Federal regions. Each Council shall be composed of the principal regional officials of the Departments of Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, Agriculture, the Interior, and Transportation, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

The President shall designate one member of each such Council as Chairman of that Council and such Chairman shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Representatives of the Office of Management and Budget may participate in any deliberations of each Council.

(b) Each member of each Council may designate an alternate who shall serve as a member of the Council involved whenever the regular member is unable to attend any meeting of the Council.

(c) When the Chairman determines that matters which significantly affect the interests of the Federal agencies which are not represented on any such Council are to be considered by the Council, he shall invite the regional director or other appropriate representative of the agency involved to participate in the deliberations of the Council.

SEC. 2. *Functions of the Council.* Each Federal Regional Council shall be constituted as a body within which the participating agencies will, under the general policy formulation of the Under Secretaries Group, and to the maximum extent feasible, assist State and local government by the coordination of the Federal program grants and operations through:

(1) the development of better ways to deliver the benefits of Federal programs over the short term;

(2) the development of integrated program and funding plans with Governors and local chief executives;

(3) the encouragement of joint and complementary Federal grant applications by local and State governments;

(4) the expeditious resolution of conflicts and problems which may arise between Federal agencies;

(5) the evaluation of programs in which two or more member agencies participate;

(6) the development of more effective ways of allocating Federal resources to meet the long-range needs of State and local communities;

(7) the supervision of regional interagency program coordination mechanisms; and

(8) the development of administrative procedures to improve day-to-day cooperation on an interagency and intergovernmental basis.

SEC. 3. *Under Secretaries Group for Regional Operations.* The Under Secretaries Group for Regional Operations is hereby continued and shall be composed of the Under Secretaries of Agriculture, the Interior, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation, the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, an Associate Director of the Domestic Council, and the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall serve as the Chairman of the Group. When the Chairman determines that matters which significantly affect the interest of Federal agencies which are not represented on the Group are to be considered by the Group, he shall invite an appropriate representative of the agency involved to participate in the deliberations of the Group. The Under Secretaries Group for Regional Operations shall, consistent with the objectives and priorities established by the President and the Domestic Council, establish policy with respect to Federal Regional Council matters, provide guidance to the Councils, respond to their initiatives, and seek to resolve policy issues referred to it by the Councils. The Under Secretaries Group, under the Chairmanship of the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall be responsible for the proper functioning of the system established by this order.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 23, 1973.*

[1] 37 FR 3167; 3 CFR, 1970 Comp., p. 146.

FRANK M. BRANDSTETTER IS RECIPIENT OF AMERICA AWARD

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the recipient of a religious heritage of America Award, Frank M. Brandstetter, my friend and an outstanding American.

A native of Hungary, Frank has served his adopted country well, both during World War II as a staff aide to General Ridgeway, and later in a variety of humanitarian efforts. He is currently the vice president and managing director of the Las Brisas Hotel in Acapulco and has truly used his position for the benefit of the community there. Among other things, he has heavily supported the nearby orphanage of La Casa Hogar Del Nino and has employed these children at his hotel, thereby not only helping them with their own support but also teaching them about the hotel business.

Frank was recently honored with the

presentation of the "Business and Professional Leader of the Year Award" at the 23d National Awards Program of the Religious Heritage of America held at the Washington Hilton Hotel. Because of the timely significance of his acceptance speech, I would like to share it with you at this time:

SPEECH BY FRANK M. BRANDSTETTER

Thank you, Mr. Stone, for your kind remarks.

Dear Fellow Americans, I am profoundly grateful for the Religious Heritage of America Award; and I express my thanks to the committe which chose me.

The essence of religion is to worship God, to follow moral guidelines in our lives; and thus to perfect ourselves by seeking goodness in everything. But the seeking cannot be a passive philosophy! We must reach out to grasp perfection in our own actions, in our relationships with others, in our work, in our mental attitudes.

It is a ceaseless striving. We cannot attain the best unless we work at it. We must be aware of the principles of justice and integrity. More—we must commit ourselves with our whole heart to their realization: Justice and integrity. This awareness and this commitment are the rocks upon which all religious faiths inspire their followers to be good citizens of our "beautiful, yes—beautiful" United States of America! Only a religious faith as solidly based as this, can be a vital force in our lives.

The bicentennial of this Nation is 1976. Two hundred years of democracy—a government by and for the people. But some do not believe this and they see signs of decadence; for them there is a loss of self-confidence and self-assurance.

We, as a Nation and a People, are faced with many problems. Only strong religious faith is our weapon to overcome them. There is nothing so desperately needed at the present time as a renewal of religious faith; and a renewal of hope in our democracy!

Our Founding Fathers demanded justice and integrity, truth and individual dignity. Let every American be brave and valiant and personally overcome the challenge against our Nation. How? This question is answered by a constant striving for perfection in his or her responsibilities and thus they will exemplify a loyal leadership! And this collectively is the life of our Nation as a free Democracy dedicated to justice and integrity. My dear fellow Americans, there is a solemn obligation upon each citizen to give this Nation "a vote of confidence and loyalty"; and to have a personal renewal of hope in this great Nation! Proudly speak the words: "beautiful America", because we have a Constitution and laws to protect and strengthen this Nation, United States of America, and may God bless our Country! Thank you!

IMPACT OF NIXON PROPOSALS ON LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year President Nixon proposed to the Congress a budget which would have had, in the words of a June 1973 study by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, a staggering impact on colleges and universities.

Says the study:

Reports from institutions . . . predict losses of revenue ranging from approximately $1 million, for some of the smaller public universities, to more than $20 million for large multi-campus systems if the Nixon proposals are actually implemented.

The study went on to document the ravaging blows the President's budget would have dealt to our institutions of postsecondary education with regard specifically to the health sciences and student aid.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House, in a prudent and wise decision, rejected the President's budget proposals in these areas.

H.R. 8877, which provided fiscal 1974 appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, raised the President's request for health manpower support from $382 million to over $706 million. Even that drastic increase, Mr. Speaker, will not provide as much money for health manpower programs as was appropriated in 1973, when over $738 million was available.

And the House rejected, as well, the President's approach to funding student aid programs, by appropriating money for the Supplementary Opportunity grant program, as well as the direct loan program, both of which the President wanted to dismantle. By providing these funds, Mr. Speaker, while at the same time cutting the funds appropriated for the Basic Opportunity Grant program, the House was able to follow the dictates of the authorizing legislation and stay within the President's budget request.

But I want to remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that the bill approved by the House is not yet the law of the land.

A Labor-HEW measure has yet to be approved in the Senate, and we do not know if the House's views will prevail in conference, nor, indeed, do we know that the President will sign the bill.

So by way of congratulating the Members of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, so ably chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) as well as the members of the Committee on Appropriations, chaired by our distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. MAHON) I insert the study prepared by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges at this point in the RECORD.

For I want to remind my colleagues that the thoughtful changes made by the committee—and subsequently endorsed by the House—to the President's proposals for higher education mean a great deal to our colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, the summary of the study to which I refer follows:

THE IMPACT OF NIXON BUDGET CUTBACKS ON STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

SUMMARY OF A SURVEY

JUNE, 1973.

If changes proposed for federal higher education support in President Nixon's 1973–74 budget are put into effect, the financial impact on colleges and universities will be staggering.

Reports from institutions holding membership in the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) predict losses of revenue ranging from approximately $1 million, for some of the smaller public universities, to more than $20 million for large multi-campus systems if the Nixon proposals are actually implemented. NASULGC membership consists of the nation's 71 land-grant colleges and universities and a number of other large public universities. The biggest cuts would come in the areas of student aid and health sciences. However, virtually every on-going higher education program has either been eliminated or reduced substantially in the 1974 budget request.

REVENUE SHARING NOT THE ANSWER

College representatives fighting to save these vital funds are being told that they should seek revenue sharing funds being sent to the states. For large universities with extensive research and highly specialized training programs, the problem with this approach lies in the fact that state legislatures are not likely to provide funding for programs that benefit the nation as a whole more than any individual state or community.

"Clearly there are too many problems of national scope to rely upon a sudden shift to revenue sharing or independent state management," noted Stanley J. Wenberg, vice president for state and federal relations for the University of Minnesota, which receives approximately 73 percent of its research budget from federal funds.

"How can a university that has achieved tenth or eleventh place in national service—as measured by its grant record—maintain its momentum, its staff, its potential by having all its national and international endeavors placed in the village hall's consideration of competing local concerns?"

Colleges and universities object to the fact that the President is proposing specific cutbacks in the education area without corresponding specificity in his "education revenue sharing" proposal. At the same time, he has refused to request funds to implement the institutional support section of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972.

President's proposals unexpected

The need for widespread mutual understanding of local, state and federal responsibilities is the key problem at present, university spokesmen agree. The lack of understanding is evidenced by the fact that many public universities had already developed their requests for state appropriations for the next fiscal period prior to the release of the Nixon budget without any knowledge of the proposed reductions in federal contributions.

"This is a new and wholly unforeseen development," noted Iowa State University President W. Robert Parks, who is also president of NASULGC. He observed that many of the funds for land-grant universities have been coming to institutions since before the turn of the century.

"These are not 'frill funds.' They go straight to the support of the core functions of the university in teaching, research and extension."

Cutbacks in basic programs devastating

Even before the threatened federal funds cut-off, public institutions across the country were facing the prospect of no more than "hold the line" budgets. For most colleges and universities there is little change of replacing federal funds from other sources. President Parks predicted that the added loss of revenue in many cases will result in critical cutbacks in basic educational programs and services.

"Public higher education has been faced with a grave financial crisis throughout the last four years, and we have taken drastic measures to cope with this situation," noted

Willard L. Boyd, president of the University of Iowa. "Against that background, the federal cutback is devastating." President Boyd's institution will lose $9.6 million in federal support of educational programs. In addition, the university could lose up to $3.2 million in student loan funds and tuition income. The loss in tuition income is based on an expected decline in enrollment if student aid funds are inadequate to assist many students who would otherwise enroll.

Universities caught in a budget vise

Testifying before the California State Senate Finance Committee, President Charles J. Hitch of the University of California recommended that a special session of the state legislature be called to consider the impact of the reversal in federal policy and what might be done about it.

"As matters now stand, we are caught firmly in a budget vise between Washington and Sacramento and the federal side is tightening painfully," Hitch told the legislators.

The university head noted that an early estimate of an $80 million loss in federal revenue for his institution over the next 28 months, based on proposed cuts and losses of new awards, has now been revised upward to well over $100 million for the period.

"And that's not counting the additional $100 million we expected for health science construction," he added. "A great deal of our basic research will be affected, as will language and area studies, graduate student support, agriculture, student aid and, perhaps hardest hit, the health sciences."

Hitch noted that if many of the President's proposals become public policy, several of the university's key programs will be eliminated, others will be reduced dramatically and the balance will have to be reevaluated and restructured.

Institutions stand to lose millions

The University of Wisconsin System has issued a detailed table of estimated expenditures from federal funds, reflecting the President's budget proposal. The analysis shows that the system could lose as much as $25 million under this budget in 1973–74. This would include $15.7 million in student aid funds and $9.3 million for other educational programs. The Madison campus alone would lose $14 million in revenue.

Other state and land-grant universities which have released estimates of the total amount of federal funds for operating expenses (losses for capital outlay are not included) they would lose under the new budget proposals and the amounts of the estimated losses include:

University of Michigan, $8 million.
University of Missouri, $7.1 million.
University of Illinois, $5.6 million.
Iowa State University, $4.5 million.
Rutgers University, $4.0 million.
University of New Mexico, $3.5 million.
University of Tennessee, $3.5 million.
Auburn University, $3.3 million.
University of Maine, $2 million.
University of Oklahoma, $2 million.
University of New Hampshire, $1.9 million.
Unversity of Rhode Island, $1.8 million.
Montana State University, $1.1 million.

It should be noted that these figures are not exactly comparable because some institutions did not try to include estimates of losses in student aid funds while others did.

Institutional reports detail the impact of cutbacks in specific programs. The following analyses relate to some of the reductions that will have the most serious effect on college and university operations.

Crippling blow to health sciences

The severest cuts in higher education federal support in the President's scheme of things would be in the area of the health sciences. Universities across the nation would lose millions in training grants, capitation grants for pharmacy, nursing, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry, allied health and public health and the elimination of regional medical programs.

"I find it very disheartening that the deepest cuts of all should be in the health sciences, for I thought that if we had consensus anywhere it was that we badly need more health practitioners," stated President Hitch.

The proliferation of university programs and enrollments in the health sciences in recent years has come about largely because of federal budget incentives based on the establishment of health-related education as a high federal priority.

Most state universities which have set elaborate plans in motion for an expansion in health sciences fields, in response to the national need, must now consider reducing enrollments and the variety of academic offerings that have been developed to meet modern-day needs.

Capitation grants

Capitation grants, which are grants paid to the institution in direct proportion to the number of students enrolled, have become the backbone of many schools and departments devoted to the health sciences. The original federal intent in establishing these grants was "to provide a dependable financial base" for education in the health sciences.

As a measure of just how important these funds are, the University of California noted that 15 percent of the Davis Veterinary Medicine School's core support budget and 40 percent of the San Francisco School of Nursing's instruction and research budget come from these grants.

The University of Illinois reports that loss of capitation grants will take away 25 percent of the budget of the College of Pharmacy with "serious and compounded impact" because the new and innovative programs are precisely those developed and sustained by this federal source.

Still another example of the effect of the loss of capitation grants is offered by Michigan State University. Its School of Nursing would lose $55,600 if the grants are eliminated. Unless the funds could be replaced from other sources, this could result in a 20 percent reduction in student enrollment and a loss of four faculty positions.

Public health programs

There are only 19 schools of public health in the United States and only 18 schools of veterinary medicine. Almost all of these are located at major state universities or land-grant colleges. Yet these institutions, each of which must serve residents of several states, are faced with the necessity of making serious reductions in both staff and enrollment due to the threatened withdrawal of federal support.

The University of Minnesota has announced that the Administration's proposals would cause the elimination of 29 of 50 F.T.E. (fulltime equivalent) faculty in the school of public health, as well as traineeship support for 173 of 256 students.

The University of Michigan reports that its School of Public Health faces the greatest potential loss of federal funds during 1973–74 of all of the university's schools and colleges. Myron E. Wegman, dean of the school, has called the budget reduction especially harsh because since 1958 schools of public health have responded to the Congressional mandate to expand and to increase health manpower in such vital fields as community mental health, environmental control and health facilities planning.

At Michigan, the budget reduction for the School of Public Health, as of July 1, 1973, means the loss of support for more than 35 fulltime faculty at all ranks. It also means no new students will receive federal support.

Dean Wegman comments: "What is even more devastating is the shift in the values of our government and nation from high priority public health problems such as mental health, pollution and health care planning programs designed to cut the escalating costs of health care, to a provincial nineteenth century concept of letting the other fellow do it."

Crisis in student aid

The Nixon Administration has proposed that "no qualified student who wants to go to college . . . will be barred by lack of money."

Student aid has received the highest federal budget priority, accounting for the seven percent overall increase in the higher education budget. However, the Nixon plan for achieving financial access for all students calls for a complete restructuring of federal student aid programs in a manner that campus student aid officials say will fail to accomplish his desired goal.

At the same time, a major tug of war is developing between the chief executive and Congress which threatens to delay the passage of any student aid appropriations measures for fall, 1973.

The confrontation is developing over the President's failure to request any funds for either the National Direct Student Loan (NDSL) program or the Supplemental Opportunity Grants (SOG) program. He requested a reduced amount for the College Work-Study program. This is in direct opposition to the Education Amendments of 1972, which contain the requirement that the three existing student aid programs be funded at specified levels before any sums are appropriated for the new Nixon program of Basic Opportunity Grants (BOG). Under this program needy students are eligible for up to $1400 of assistance less whatever their families may "reasonably" be expected to contribute, but not more than one-half of the total costs, including board, room, tuition and fees.

Although informed sources believe that Congress will appropriate money for existing programs along with approving the requested $622 million for basic grants, the President may use his veto power to delay action. And, if this fails, he could continue his policy of impounding funds appropriated for purposes of which he disapproves.

Students the losers

Whatever the end result, students are bound to be the losers, according to university financial aid officers. Until the final decisions on funding federal programs have been made, universities will not know how much money they will have available for student assistance in the fall. Many institutions are already late in making their traditional announcements of aid for incoming freshmen. A number of financial aid offices are predicting that they may not be able to start informing students as to their financial aid package until late summer and perhaps not until after the opening of the fall term.

"Students are in danger of becoming the unwilling victims of the battle between the President and Congress over federal support for education," observed Chancellor Albert H. Bowker of the University of California at Berkeley. "The debate in Washington is beginning to have an impact on the lives of Berkeley students. The uncertainties about future federal grants and loans, the reduction of research opportunities and the rising cost of education may force many to consider ending their studies."

Problems with BOG program

Problems in implementing the new BOG program, about which there are still many unanswered questions, make the fall, 1973 start-up date extremely tight. Before the program can be put into effect, universities must conduct analyses of family contribution for each qualified student. At present uniform national standards for determining distribution of BOG funds on an equitable basis throughout the country have not yet been released, and standardized family contribution forms are still in the planning stage.

Universities have estimated that under the BOG program there will be money available for more students but in smaller amounts. The result will be greater pressure on state and university funds, since no student may cover more than half his educational costs from federal sources.

Michigan State University, which has one of the most extensive programs of student financial aid of any university in the nation, has conducted a study that shows that some of its students who are currently receiving SOG's will receive less under BOG, and some will receive no grant at all. The latter is due, according to the university, to (1) the treatment of family assets and (2) the manner in which Social Security and Veterans Benefits are handled.

"If it becomes necessary to place the reduction formulas into effect, practically all students now receiving SOG's would receive less grant money next year than this year," a university spokesman reported.

This university, along with numerous others throughout the country, is calling for the continuation of the SEOG program as a companion to the BOG program to correct inequities and to guard against the adverse effects of inadequate funding of BOG until the new program can be properly funded and phased-in.

Loan programs

Campus spokesmen also are fearful of the intended shift from the government-subsidized NDSL program to emphasis on privately financed loans guaranteed by a new federal Student Loan Marketing Association. A report on the student aid situation at the University of Illinois noted that graduate students will be especially adversely affected by this shift because "experience shows that the mobile graduate student has trouble finding a bank to make such a loan."

According to other university reports, all students have experienced difficulty in getting private loans in recent years because of the reluctance of lending institutions to tie up more funds for this purpose. With the prime interest rate going up—and likely to keep doing so—student loans are not profitable investments for most banks.

The University of Rhode Island estimates that under the Nixon program at least 1,000 of its students who formerly could have qualified for the NDSL program would have to borrow from banks in order to stay in college. From 35 to 40 percent of the university's needy students already are borrowing from banks in order to maintain themselves in college and there is no indication from loan institutions that they will be able to increase support actiivty to help additional students.

LAWRENCE M. CARINO

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Lawrence M. Carino recently stepped down after a 1-year term as chairman of the Detroit Chamber of Commerce. In a speech delivered at the board's annual meeting, he reviewed the activities of the past year and outlined the challenges that lie ahead for the chamber and Detroit.

Unlike the forecasters of doom and gloom who seem to delight in their pessimistic warnings, Mr. Carino looks to the future with hope. More important, he and the chamber are dedicated to working for that future in sharp contrast to many who are quick to criticise, but are short on solutions. This takes hard work and long hours and the chamber of commerce has shown itself willing to deliver the necessary effort when called upon.

Whether it is counseling small businessmen, attracting new industry, and more jobs to cut unemployment or participating in the revitalization of downtown Detroit, the chamber of commerce has been at the forefront. Mr. Carino initiated or assisted these and many other community-oriented projects within the past year and I would like to join the chamber of commerce and the people of Detroit in offering him my congratulations.

From his unique vantage point as a successful businessman and acknowledged civic leader, he has been able to draw conclusions and offer proposals that have value not only for Detroit but the country as well. Therefore, I include the following speech which was printed in the Detroiter Business News in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY LAWRENCE M. CARINO

I approach with mixed emotions these last few official acts—including the delivery of some comments appropriate to the occasion—of the twelve months it has been my honor and privilege to serve as chairman of your Chamber's Board of Directors.

I will remember this past year as one of unparalleled opportunity to serve the community which all of us . . . beyond our own personal and business pursuits . . . must regard as more than worthy of our best and dedicated efforts.

My tenure as chairman . . . and how rapidly it has passed! . . . also will be recalled in terms of my high and growing regard for those individuals with whom it has been my pleasure to work. Our Chamber . . . and, in fact, our entire community as Greater Detroiters . . . may be justly proud and confident of the caliber of people pledged to the well-being and betterment of Southeastern Michigan.

I would like to touch very briefly on some of the Chamber's many accomplishments during my period of concentrated involvement. Equally important, I believe, are what I see as some of our most crucial and pressing obligations . . . as individuals and as an organization . . . in months just ahead.

Among the very many meetings and planning sessions in which I have found myself involved, I chalk up as among the most meaningful a meeting one Saturday morning a little over a year ago. That was when about half of the Chamber's Board of Directors and several other key leadership people gathered to discuss ways and means of undergirding the economic revitalization of Detroit. Out of that meeting came what I viewed . . . and still view . . . as a series of truly fateful and far-reaching discussions with the idealistic yet intensely practical leadership of Detroit Renaissance, followed by the Chamber's acceptance of a major share of responsibility for the all-important mission of helping restore the brilliance of our city's once-shining image. Despite the serious tarnishing which that image has undergone in recent years—both justly and most unjustly—the return to its full luster is not only possible, but imperative if much else is to be accomplished.

Image-making, in this case, must be far more than cosmetic. It must reflect a fundamental soundness of resources and planning. It must be based on not just a local conviction, but a demonstrable fact that business and commerce in Detroit are not merely viable, but thriving, fully ready and capable in meeting intense competition from around the nation and, increasingly, from around the world. Of paramount importance in this effort, of course, is the preservation and creation of jobs. But most fundamentally, it involves the retention and the attraction of business and industry, the maintenance of Detroit's once virtually unchallenged position of commercial health, excellence and creativity.

Though there undeniably has been slippage in this area, it has not been as severe as sometimes pictured. Though Detroit has lost economic ground over the past decade, it can be reclaimed. Though we have suffered perhaps more than our share of urban ills, they manifestly have not been fatal.

In our programs to implement such positive views, we can be proud of the Chamber's lead . . . under the capable direction of Bob Hastings . . . in bringing to the attention of both government and union leaders the need for a coalition effort by business, government and labor to re-create the economic climate necessary to stimulate job development. To a large degree, I think, we have been successful in stimulating such action—which is, at its heart, simply a matter of reordering some people's priorities.

I also want to single out the good work of our President's Club under the direction of Charlie Chestnutt, so largely responsible for the greatest membership building year in the history of this organization. We now stand at an all-time high of 43-hundred member firms with an assigned membership of more than 7,000 individuals throughout the region.

In the limited time available, it is impossible for me to adequately credit all who have, through volunteer service on our various committees and staff, furthered the Chamber's many action programs.

I must, however, mention Daylight Saving Time—five years in the achieving, and almost entirely through the initiative and effort of the Greater Detroit Chamber of Commerce. This . . . and not a few other notable accomplishments . . . came through our vastly improved legislative liaison, for which our Government Relations Division and Gordon Traye, our man in Lansing, deserve abundant credit and steadfast support.

In addition, I would note with no small satisfaction the adjustments in the Governor's $380 million dollar tax reduction package, with that portion so vital to business amounting to same $45 million dollars each year over the next two years.

In the vital and already-mentioned area of image-rebuilding, our newly created Communication Division merits considerable praise, with chief attention due our much-acclaimed new monthly magazine, the Detroiter. It fills a long-felt need in our city and, I'm sure, will go on to exceed the impressive heights already reached in only two issues. In the communications field, the new semi-monthly Detroiter Business News also promises to be of considerable value and practical use, as does the Chamber's advertising and PR contract with nationally respected Carl Byoir & Associates.

Also demanding all-too-brief mention are the work by our Transportation Department which led the way to downward adjustments in North Atlantic air cargo rates effective in Detroit . . . the Chamber's major role in securing for Detroit the federal IRS and McNamara buildings and in recently announced state plans to purchase Executive Plaza . . . the Chamber's Job Centers, in the past year interviewing more than 15,000 applicants and placing nearly 2,000 . . . our Small Business Advisory Department, counseling 124 small businesses, bringing 11 into being, creating 43 new jobs and saving 49 others . . . and, of course, the Chamber's Project Pride '73 campaign—good for the Chamber from a grass-roots community relations point of view and, most important of all, good for a cleaner, more livable city.

It is now passé . . . but still very much to the point . . . to press the fact that our system—the business and industrial establishment of which we're all very much a part—has been and continues under vicious, unprecedented, and mostly unjustified attack. As Henry Hazlitt has written: "Ignorance, shortsightedness, envy, impatience, good intentions, and utopian idealism have combined to engender an endless barrage of charges against free enterprise. And the return fire, if free enterprise is to be preserved, must also be endless." The return fire, I would further submit, can best come from businessmen speaking with a concerted voice, with that kind of forceful voice coming most convincingly . . . almost exclusively . . . when orchestrated by such organizations as your Greater Detroit Chamber of Commerce.

What can we do about the criticism—and, more importantly, about the restrictive laws and regulations to which the criticism inevitably leads? What we must do is take our case . . . in increasingly urgent terms . . . to the public, just as the other side has done. Fortunately, the people of America have a long history of responding favorably to the truth, and it's about time they heard the truth about the opponents of private industry.

We must show our fellow Americans that what they have been getting from what has been called the Disaster Lobby is a mixture of fiction and exaggeration . . . that our environment is getting cleaner and healthier all the time, not dirtier, as they have been told . . . that our free enterprise system has in fact made this nation the envy of the world and that, if the system is overturned or systematically strangled to death, our living standard will be the first casualty.

We've got to show the people of America . . . and with this Chamber one of the best vehicles I know . . . that if they permit the government to take over industrial production and marketing, their own freedom will disappear . . . their freedom in an open market to buy the products they want, in the sizes and colors they want them, at a price they are willing to pay.

The Big Lie about our system has, of course, been promulgated and spread by the professional and so-often self-aggrandizing consumerists, as if all of us weren't consumers. And let the people of America be warned that on the day the professional consumer propagandists . . . the Ralph Naders . . . determine what shall be made and sold in this country, the people of America had better learn to like the things Ralph Nader likes . . . because that's all they'll be able to get.

It is organizations such as, preeminently, your Greater Detroit Chamber of Commerce, which can help the beleaguered business community find its voice and, even more important, properly use it. It can help correct a ridiculous, really tragic situation which University of London economist P. T. Bauer described in these words:

"Our market system delivers the goods people want, but its supporters cannot explain why or how.

"Other systems, generally socialist, do not deliver the goods, but their supporters readily explain why they do not, cannot, or should not do so.

"Our system is long on desired goods and short on effective arguments.

"Other systems are short on desired goods but long on successful arguments."

It's a situation, as I said, that is as ridiculous as it is tragic, and it renders the Greater Detroit Chamber of Commerce . . . and organizations like it across the country . . . never more important than they are today.

The Chamber, of course, can be no more effective than its individual member businesses are enthusiastic in their support. All of the new activites I mentioned a few moments ago . . . and the other pro-business, pro-free enterprise, pro-America programs still on the drawing boards . . . represent increased dollar needs for the Chamber, needs to which many of you already have graciously responded by increasing your dues investment.

In my concluding words as your Chairman, let me reemphasize my heartfelt conviction that the attack on the world's greatest, most creative, and yet most compassionate economic system demands the best that is in us by way of response. And that, in short, demands continued support of this Chamber and, hopefully, a reexamination of that support with an eye to judging whether it really has been enough.

For, putting it mildly, the duty of defending our system does not fall exclusively on professional economists. It falls upon each of us who realizes the untold benefits of free enterprise, and the very real threat of its destruction, to expound his convictions within the sphere of his own influence . . . and to support other, stronger voices expounding like convictions. And our strongest most united voice . . . as I have said . . . is embodied in the organization which has brought us together tonight. The opportunity we mutually and capably face . . . with the Chamber as our spokesman . . . is fully as great as the challenge.

I'll close now by expressing my sincere appreciation to the Board of Directors seated before you for having elected me to the duties of the past year and the tremendous experience which those duties constituted. And I thank innumerable others for being so responsive and cooperative in assisting me when you were asked. Further, I commend the leadership experience to those who have never really known it. Working through the Greater Detroit Chamber of Commerce, you will come to know the power for good engendered by the spirit of men and women working together for the things in which they truly believe.

ENERGY CRISIS PREDICTED IN 1960

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to have become the practice of many, both in and out of Congress, to blame the Nation's oil producers for the current energy crisis. These same persons seem blind to the fact that for years the more farsighted spokesmen for the oil industry have been sounding an alarm that has been largely ignored.

One such knowledgeable spokesman is Michael T. Halbouty of Houston, a well respected consulting geologist and independent oil operator. As far back as 1960, Mr. Halbouty made some startling predictions relative to the Nation's energy outlook.

Recently the Houston Chronicle published portions of a speech he presented before the American Association of Petroleum Geologists on November 3, 1960. Because of the haunting accuracy of his remarks, and their timeliness, I submit the article for the RECORD at this point.

[From the Houston Chronicle, July 15, 1973]

HALBOUTY CAN NOW SAY: "I TOLD YOU SO" BACK IN 1960

(By Max B. Skelton)

Michael T. Halbouty made two predictions during a 1960 speech in Los Angeles.

The Houston consulting geologist and independent oil operator said an energy crisis would develop by 1975 unless domestic explorations for new oil and gas reserves increased sharply.

He also predicted consumers would ignore such warnings until actually facing shortages and would then blame the petroleum industry.

AHEAD OF TIME

Shortages have developed well ahead of 1975 and there have been many charges that oil companies have conspired to contrive the crisis.

And Halbouty has been receiving requests for copies of the speech he made on Nov. 3, 1960.

"It is rather fantastic when you look at today's situation and at what was said more than 12 years ago," says Halbouty, who was the 1966–67 president of the American Assn. of Petroleum Geologists, the world's largest group of earth scientists.

The Los Angeles speech was made at a time the United States had a surplus of oil. Domestic crude oil productive capacity was in excess of 9.7 million barrels a day but actual production was only 7 million. Oil imports were approaching 2 million barrels a day despite a mandatory control program that was then less than two years old.

TWO MAIN POINTS

Halbouty's speech emphasized two points. First, the surplus conditions were discouraging exploration for new domestic reserves. Second, long range forecasts indicated spiraling demand within a decade not only would eliminate the idle productive capacity but would require the discovery of tremendous new reserves.

Halbouty's concern was underscored by the fact only 46,000 domestic wells were drilled in 1960 compared with a record 58,000 in 1956.

Speaking before the Pacific section of the association he later headed, Halbouty said he believed the nation was reaching toward a severe economic crisis "as well as an imposition on our national security by our not doing everything possible to increase our domestic production now." He said the impact of an energy shortage would be absolutely disastrous.

"Unless there is an appreciable and sustained turnaround in our exploratory activities, I can safely predict that between now and 1975 we will have an energy crisis in this country which will cause repercussions throughout the width and breath of this great nation of ours like a devastating earthquake."

There have been hopeful signs in recent months but the end of the drilling slump is not yet in sight. Only 28,771 wells were completed in 1972 and only 27,300 in 1971.

APATHY DECRIED

"It is appalling to me that the American people can be so apathetic to what is so obvious to some of us in the industry," Halbouty said in 1960.

"They are not experiencing shortages now and evidently they care less what will happen in the future. Some of these days the shortage will catch up with us and then the people will say 'The industry is to blame, why weren't we told?' Well, I am telling them now."

Prior to making his predictions. Halbouty said an economist of note had said that an additional 52 billion barrels of domestic oil would have to be discovered in 10 years to permit the nation to enter the 1970s with the same reserves ratio that existed in 1960.

Industry reports indicate only 26.1 billion barrels of new crude oil reserves, exclusive of Alaska, were discovered in 1961–1970 but that actual production exceeded 28 billion.

NATURAL GAS DEMAND

Halbouty also quoted a natural gas authority as forecasting demand would nearly double within 10 years and that this and retention of the reserves ratio would require the drilling of 925,000 wells and the discovery of 305 trillion cubic feet of new gas in the 1960s.

Between 1961 and 1970, natural gas demand increased from 13 to 21 trillion cubic feet a year. The 371,033 wells drilled during that period discovered 197.9 trillion cubic feet of new reserves but actual production exceeded 170 trillion.

SOME FARMWORKERS FEAR "CHAVEZ"

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress and most people who do not live or work near the row crop farms of America do not have sufficient information to understand the real problems of the farmworker in California.

I wish it were possible for Members of the congressional committees to hold hearings in the field, in California, where the workers are, where the problem exists.

We who sit several thousands of miles away in air-conditioned offices, and may never have seen lettuce or grapes grow or workers cut lettuce or pick grapes, cannot understand the problems.

Until hearings are held in the farm area, we must rely on the observations from the fields.

Mary K. Shell, of the Capitol News Service of California has told a story that is seldom understood but needs to be told. Those who are interested in the facts of the farm labor disputes in California should read the report.

National farm labor legislation is urgently needed now. I insert the article from the Paso Robles Daily Press at this place in the RECORD:

FARMWORKERS FEAR CHAVEZ; NOW TELL OF UFW "BLACKMAIL"

(By Mary K. Shell)

A few months ago they were covered under a United Farm Workers Union contract. But no longer and they're free to talk to tell what it was like.

UFW is supposd to be a champion of the farm workers, but a group of Chicano farm workers here tell quite a different story a story of three years of intimidation and oppression under UFW of discrimination, or threats and shakedowns by union hiring hall bosses.

These workers are amoung the several thousand (more than 8,000 to date) California farm workers who are now working under a Teamster's contract.

UFW head, Cesar Chavez claims they are "sweetheart" contracts a deal between the Teamsters Union and the growers. The growers, however, insist a majority of their workers voluntarily signed petitions asking for Teamster representation.

The farm workers interviewed here verify this contention.

After hearing the workers describe the UFW hiring hall operation, it's not surprising that another union, in this instance, the Teamsters, has been successful in gaining support from the people who harvest California's crops. All but two growers in the Coachella Valley and 19 growers in Kern and Tulare counties signed with the Teamsters when their UFW contracts expired in April.

Nearly all the growers in the Delano area (where Chavez launched his crusade eight years ago) are also expected to sign with the Teamsters when their UFW agreements terminate later this month.

Meanwhile Chavez and UFW are acting like a rejected suitor who refuses to accept the fact that the affair is over. In spite of the signed petitions, in spite of the fact nearly all the workers are busily working in the fields, Chavez is still trying to convince the world that the workers are "on strike" and he is calling for a boycott of Teamster harvested grapes.

The Teamsters, armed with years of experience in the art of union organizing, walked into fertile territory when they kicked up the dust of California farmlands. The workers were like overripe plums falling into their outstretched hands.

The Chicano farm workers interviewed talk bitterly about the three years under Chavez and UFW. First, they complained they had no voice at all in the signing of the UFW contracts on 1970.

As one worker put it, "They (the growers) told us we would have to join Chavez if we wanted a job." Resentment has been festering ever since.

Under the UFW contracts once independent workers were forced into a position of being totally dependent upon the union hiring hall bosses for their job assignments.

First they needed a "dispatch card" from the union. But before they were given a "dispatch card" they had to pay up their union dues.

One worker complained he had to pay two years' dues for his wife who had been sick before she was eligible for a "dispatch card." It cost more than $100.

And, they also complained about UFW playing favorites. Some of the workers would be given first opportunity to work when a call came in, regardless of another worker's seniority with a particular grower.

A woman who has worked for 16 years in Kern County grape vineyards described it like this: "They (the hiring hall bosses) would tell us, 'we'll give you a dispatch card when we feel like giving you one. You can get down on your knees and beg for a dispatch card'."

Another woman said sometimes certain workers would be forced to wait three or four days for a dispatch card.

Others had better luck. The same woman worker said, "Some people go there and they pay through the back door and they get sometimes 40 dispatches. See, they're blackmailing the people."

She said the people working for UFW in the hiring hall complained they were making only $5 a day and they needed help to pay their bills.

"So they say, 'you give me a hand and I'll give you a dispatch'."

UFW's hiring hall operations—the intervention of the union in many long-standing relationships between the workers and the growers is most often cited as the reason for the growing anti-Chavez feeling.

Many of the workers had been employed by the same grower for a number of years. It was a direct relationship. The worker asked for a job and was hired by the grower.

UFW coming between the two without the worker's consent was a source of constant irritation. No longer could the worker seek his own employment. Instead, he was forced to wait his turn at the hiring hall, no matter how experienced he or she might be.

EUROPEAN REACTION TO THE UNITED STATES-SOVIET SUMMIT AND POSSIBLE UNILATERAL U.S. TROOP REDUCTIONS IN EUROPE

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have taken the opportunity to point out some of the possible dangers which would result if we unilaterally withdrew our troops from overseas. During a recent television program, "Meet the Press", British Prime Minister Heath also warned of the dangers our pulling out of Europe would produce. I am enclosing an article explaining his position.

For the benefit of my colleagues, who will be discussing this question of troop withdrawal shortly, I am also inserting other articles which discuss the fears of France that the superpowers might reach an accord to the detriment of our European allies. This is a fear which would be compounded if we decided to reduce our troop strength in Europe without prior consultation with our allies. And finally, I am inserting an article by the British Lord Chalfont, a former Minister of State in the Commonwealth Office. Lord Chalfont refutes the idea that the threat to Western Europe has declined and considers it a notion of childlike simplicity.

I think these articles raise questions which demand our consideration in the upcoming debate and I believe further that they illustrate, yet again, why it would be detrimental for us to unilaterally reduce our troop strength at the present time.

The articles follow:

[From the London Times, Feb. 5, 1973]

OVERSEAS—MR. HEATH WARNS UNITED STATES ON THE DANGERS OF PULLING OUT OF EUROPE

Mr. Heath has told Americans that a good many countries in Europe might start making a deal with the Russians if the United States withdrew most of its troops from Europe.

Appearing in a nationally televised interview broadcast today, Mr. Heath refused to name the European countries he had in mind, but said Britain would not be among those giving way to Russian political pressures. "That is not our history," he said. "It is not our approach."

Mr. Heath mentioned, in a separate context, that it remained his policy to maintain the British nuclear deterrent. Amid strong indications here that bringing Britain's force up to date was now a live issue, he said he would not "discuss particular weapons at this stage, because we are not at the point of making decisions."

Mr. Heath chose deliberately not to evade discussion of the hypothesis of an American withdrawal, even though there is not the slightest indication that the topic, in terms of reducing American strength in Europe to a token force, had come up in his two days of talks with President Nixon.

The topic is a real one in Congress, however. A few hours after Mr. Heath left yesterday, Senator Mike Mansfield, the majority leader, who had met Mr. Heath at the private meeting of the Senate foreign relations committee, again raised his challenge. He proposed halving what he called the 300,-000-strong American force in Europe over the next five years, to reduce it to a "leaner, better, more effective fighting force". For good measure, Mr. Mansfield threw in a demand for an end to all American foreign aid round the world.

In the National Broadcasting Company's *Meet the Press* programme a questioner mentioned congressional opinion in asking Mr. Heath to give good reasons for keeping more than a token American force in Europe.

Mr. Heath said that Europe had been and remained a vital interest to the United States. He could not agree that a token force would serve those interests. The Soviet Union, he said, would be unlikely to regard "a symbolic force as really having any meaning at all."

Americans were entitled to ask Europeans to maintain balanced orthodox forces. He recognized that as Europe became more prosperous, it would be able to play a larger part in the orthodox forces. But he reminded his audience, as he had done in his speech to the National Press Club last week, that European contributions to NATO were already "very large." For every American serviceman in Europe there were 10 West Europeans under arms. "Well, that is quite a proportion, 10 to one", he said.

Asked again what would happen if America did withdraw most of its forces, Mr. Heath replied: "Well, I think the general conclusion would be that America was becoming isolationist, withdrawing into herself, and is no longer interested in world affairs." The Soviet Union and China would be quick to draw the same conclusion.

He had absolutely no doubt that the Soviet Union still posed a military threat to Europe. Only through strength and the possibility of balance could agreement be reached. "Once you are found to be weak, there isn't any possibility [of agreement]."

Asked if he was suggesting that Soviet troops might start crossing borders after the United States withdrew most of its troops, Mr. Heath again did not shrink from the hypothesis.

"Well, what I would say is: the Soviet Union would then start using much greater influence in Europe . . . and, of course, you might very well then find that Europe would say: 'What is the point of standing up for our own sort of freedom and organization if we are just going to be on our own like this? Perhaps we had better start doing a deal with the other side'."

Observers here could not recall any European in recent years putting so forcefully the case of scepticism towards detente and raising the alarms of potential European instability.

To an extent the Nixon Administration and the American right wing embrace the same view, at least in public, and base on it much of their argument for holding the line on troop withdrawals while the talks on mutual and balanced force reductions are pursued.

Mr. Heath, whose interview was recorded before completion of his final round of talks with the President at Camp David, said there had been important results.

The future development of relationships between the European Community, Japan and the United States, and trade and monetary reform were, he said, subjects on which the talks had been "very valuable".

He also said in the interview that he believed that Concorde was a viable project. He rather doubted that the American decision not to build their own supersonic airliner was a permanent decision for all time.

[From the Washington Post, June 27, 1973]

BREZHNEV FAILS TO ALLAY PARIS SUMMIT FEARS

(By Jonathan C. Randal)

PARIS, June 26—Soviet Leader Leonid I. Brezhnev's efforts to persuade France that he and President Nixon concluded no secret deals behind Europe's back encountered some French skepticism today.

Although the Soviet leader relentlessly pursued his attempts to mollify the French during nearly seven hours of talks with President Georges Pompidou, French press reports provided just the kind of hints which the touchy French interpreted as Soviet-American dictation.

The press reports said in essence that Mr. Nixon and Brezhnev were dangling the possibility of Paris as the site for a climactic December East-West summit conference to bury the Cold War in return for a French agreement to speed up the European security conference.

The final communique of the Brezhnev-Nixon talks spoke of "possibilities for completing" the European security conference "at the highest level."

White House negotiator Henry A. Kissinger explained that the United States insisted on a guarded reference to such a summit meetting to see if the forthcoming foreign ministers' conference of nations involved in the security talks produces results.

Neither the communique nor Kissinger referred to Paris as the site for a summit nor December as the date.

The French, in reports attributing the idea to sources close to Mr. Nixon, said that it smacked of heavy handed super-power pressure tactics. Although French spokesmen diplomatically said that no such project had been discussed at the Brezhnev-Pompidou meetings at the chateau of Rambouillet 30 miles southwest of Paris, the French government is nevertheless supicious.

Pompidou's press spokesman said, however, that the president "didn't need to be reassured that he had no fears," and added that Brezhnev's rundown of his American meetings was "very interesting and important for the world's future."

The French, at the 35-nation security conference whose second phase gets under way in Helsinki July 3 at foreign minister level, argue that the only way to extract meaningful concessions from the Soviets is to avoid setting arbitrary deadlines, such as would be needed to start planning now for a summit.

As French spokesmen reiterated in the wake of the leaks from America, France feels that the level of any final European security conference can be determined only after special committees finish their work in Geneva. "For the time being", the spokesman added, Helsinki remains the Soviet and French choice for the site of a concluding conference.

The only leverage the West can exert in trying to obtain meaningful Soviet commitment for "free movement of people and ideas" across what used to be called the Iron Curtain, the French feel, is to make Moscow sweat.

In the short term, the Soviets stand to be the big winners in any case since any document emerging from the security conference will tend to legitimize Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe.

Political observers seeking to understand why American sources apparently leaked the "jumbo summit" project speculated that Mr. Nixon wants such an international gathering as a substitute for his fruitless attempts to promote a meeting of Atlantic Alliance chiefs of state this fall.

Observers stressed that Pompidou could scarcely display enthusiasm about such a Paris "jumbo summit" without appearing to accept Soviet-American dictation to France and the other Europeans.

Only 10 days ago, a NATO meeting in Copenhagen agreed that nothing should be said or decided about any grand finale for the European security negotiations until their results became clear.

Pompidou, Breszhnev and their spokesmen sought to put the best possible public face on their meeting.

Brezhnev toasted Pompidou at lunch to the effect that "the period of dangerous tensions of the Cold War" was over and "we are entering a period of peace and cooperation which delivered mankind from the threat of nuclear war."

Pompidou said through a spokesman that the day's talks were "very positive and very constructive," almost the same words Brezhnev used to describe his talks with Mr. Nixon.

Brezhnev sought to quiet French—and all West European—fears about his Washington agreement on preventing nuclear war, saying it "serves the vital interests of all peoples."

The French spokesmen reiterated that Brezhnev had assured Pompidou that he and Mr. Nixon had reached no decision which would directly involve France or any other third country.

[From the New York Times, June 25, 1973]

EUROPE REACTS WARILY TO U.S.-SOVIET ACCORDS

(By Flora Lewis)

PARIS, June 24—Europeans have welcomed the new agreements between President Nixon and Leonid I. Brezhnev with caution and a certain skepticism.

It is plainly considered in Europe's interest that the United States and the Soviet Union reduce the danger of major war, since the assumption remains that Europe would be the prime battlefield unless a world wide nuclear conflict developed.

But, responsible officials here noted, the fear also remains that Soviet-American agreement will be at Europe's expense.

The tone of press and private official comment in Britain, France and West Germany has reflected this double-edged reaction and uncertainty, only slightly eased by Secretary of State William P. Rogers' assurances that the new accords will in no way diminish the United States' support for its allies.

In the view of qualified officials, it will take much more complete and detailed explanation to European chancelleries of just what the Nixon-Brezhnev meetings accomplished before European governments being to draw their own policy conclusions.

BREZHNEV VISIT AWAITED

France will hear the Soviet version first, since Mr. Brezhnev will arrive in Paris tomorrow night on his way home from the United States and will spend a day and a half with President Pompidou.

Preparations for the Pompidou-Brezhnev meeting provide an example of the ambivalent attitude of the European states toward what Mr. Brezhnev called "the new track" in Soviet-American relations.

No special agreements are expected and no significant negotiations have been arranged here. The visit will be primarily a gesture to show the Soviet Union's continued interest in its own improved relations with Western Europe and particularly with France, which took the lead in promoting an East-West thaw when President Charles de Gaulle journeyed to Moscow in 1966 and signed a joint declaration of principles with President Nikolai V. Podgorny.

French commentators in the last week have been expressing pleasure at the new evidence found, and at the same time noting wistfully that Moscow is now clearly much more interested in its dealings with Washington.

Mr. Pompidou went to Bonn to see Chancellor Willy Brandt at the end of last week. They talked a good deal about European security, which Mr. Pompidou defined as "defense plus détente." Mr. Brandt said pointedly, in reference to American desires to rejuvenate the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, that refurbished Atlantic relations could in no case put in question West Germany's policy of reconciliation with the Communist states.

Each made clear the importance he attached to his country's own direct dealings with Moscow, and implied concern that these might be undermined by a new Washington-Moscow relationship.

A "NEW YALTA" FEARED

Some of the more Gaullist elements of the French press have spoken of the danger of a "new Yalta," a secret deal by the superpowers to establish a kind of joint domination over Europe and even the world. Though with more reserve and more open appreciation for the decline of the cold war, similar fears have been expressed in Britain and West Germany.

Despite Washington's arguments, officials here observed * * * Soviet-American commitment to prevent nuclear confrontation will necessarily erode the United States pledge to defend Western Europe against a large-scale conventional attack by the Soviet Union. The Soviet build-up in conventional military strength has been much noted, along wtih the growing pressures in the United States for reduction of American troop strength in Europe.

These circumstances have served to reinforce the arguments of the French about the value of their own nuclear force for Europe's defense. However, it is conceded that the French force cannot be considered "European" until political unity emerges clearly on the horizon, something that is still a long way off.

But the question for "independent defense" is once again a current topic in Paris. A speech by Foreign Minister Michel Jobert early last week stressing this subject provoked more questions than it answered. Chancellor Brandt asked Mr. Pompidou to explain it, without achieving much clarity on which way French policy is evolving.

Still, it now seems evident that the issue of European defense will be crucial in coming American-European negotiations and the promised review of Atlantic relationships.

[From the New York Times, June 28, 1973]

PARIS INFLEXIBLE ON DEFENCE POLICY

The most concrete result of the 10 hours of talks between Mr. Brezhnev, the Soviet party leader, and President Pompidou at the Chateau de Rambouillet, was the decision to meet again early next year in Russia.

The brief communiqué for the press issued this afternoon emphasized again the "broad mutual understanding" of the talks and their "atmosphere of friendship". Mr. Pompidou told Mr. Brezhnev this morning that the friendship between France and the Soviet Union was "certainly one of the essential bases of peace and cooperation in Europe and in the world".

However, Mr. Brezhnev failed to convince M Pompidou that the agreement he had reached with President Nixon on the prevention of nuclear war was anything more than a bilateral agreement between the two super powers. France continues to maintain that nothing short of general and controlled disarmament will remove the threat of nuclear war.

Meanwhile, France will pursue its independent, defence policy and, with the prospect of a reduction of American troops in Europe and the possible creation of a neutral zone in central Europe, it will maintain its military effort.

The difference of opinion between France and Russia on the mutual reduction of forces and the Vienna negotiations remains unbridged. In M Pompidou's way of thinking, France will continue to keep itself closely informed about the progress of these negotiations, but will maintain its defence, effort with the aim of achieving an independent deterrent.

It was being emphasized here tonight that this was one of the key aspects of the Franco-Soviet talks, and an uncompromising reassertion of the French standpoint.

Somewhat surprisingly, there was no question during the 10 hours of talks of a grand East-West summit at the close of the third phase of the European security conference, to open at Helsinki on July 3, although this was expressly mentioned in the Soviet-American communiqué last week.

Such a summit, in the French view, depends on the extent to which concrete results are achieved in the first two phases of the conference.

There was agreement to develop and increase cooperation between the two countries. M. Giscurd d'Estaing, the French Minister of Economics and Finance, will go to Moscow on July 10 to sign a 10-year economic cooperation agreement already agreed upon.

He also told Mr. Patolichev, the Soviet Minister for Foreign Trade, that France was ready to prolong existing credit terms to Russia for the purchase of capital goods after the present agreement ends next year.

The two leaders drove to Orly airport just after noon, and Mr. Brezhnev flew directly to Moscow.

[From the London Times, June 1, 1973]

WEST MUST LINK ARMS TO FILL DEFENCE GAPS

(By Lord Chalfont)

There is a childlike simplicity about the idea that the military threat to Western Europe has disappeared and that therefore the American troops can all go home and NATO, the last embarrassing relic of the Cold War, can be dismantled. The logical extension of this cosy philosophy is that there is no need for military defences at all, and that the West could now safely embark upon a massive programme of unilateral disarmament. It is, however, right to point out that as long as the Soviet Union keeps 20 divisions at a high state of combat readiness in East Germany, such a policy might contain a certain element of risk; and no politician who advocated it could expect to be taken seriously. Concern about the state of Western Europe's defences is not a symptom of chronic militarism—it is simply a reflection of the proposition that if the governments of Western Europe think it right to maintain defences against an external threat, those defences ought to be sound. It is possible to argue that it is wrong to spend enormous sums of money on military establishments and there can be more than one opinion on the matter; what is surely beyond dispute is that to spend enormous sums of money on ineffective military establishments is not only wrong, but feeble-minded and irresponsible.

As I have sought to demonstrate in previous articles, the strategy of the West is basically defective. In the event of a change in Soviet foreign policy and a breakdown in the system of mutual nuclear deterrence between the super-powers leading to a military attack on Western Europe, the Atlantic Alliance would be faced with using nuclear weapons in the very early stages, or seeing its considerably weaker conventional forces quickly overrun—a strategy which has been vividly described as presenting a choice between suicide or surrender. This situation, already disturbing, would become positively dangerous if pressure in the United States Congress led to a substantial withdrawal of American troops from Europe. The enlargement of the European Community and the tentative moves towards political union in Western Europe provide an opportunity to restore a situation which has been deteriorating alarmingly in recent years.

One obvious way of proceeding is to seek to eliminate the threat by political and diplomatic means—to persevere with policies of *détente* until the danger of military conflict no longer exists. It is, however, essential to do so without losing our grip on reality. Of the various East-West negotiations in progress at the moment, none shows any sign of bringing about a dramatic change in the situation. The Strategic Arms Limitation agreements so far concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union have turned out to be little more than measures by the two super-powers to preserve the nuclear balance at a lower cost to themselves. There is nothing wrong with such agreements, but no one should believe that they have any bearing on the security of Western Europe, still less anything to do with nuclear disarmament. The next round of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks may well have more direct implications for Europe in that they will be concerned with such things as forward-based systems and "tactical" nuclear involvement in the defence of Western Europe. It is, to say the very least, unlikely that the discussions will do much to increase the confidence of Europeans in the existing system of defence.

The talks on European Security and Cooperation in Helsinki are similiarly unlikely, on their own, to lead to any substantial change in the military situation, although they might in certain circumstances affect the outcome of the Vienna talks on mutual and balanced force reductions. These negotiations are profoundly important, but the present indications are that most of the concessions are likely in the long run to be made by the West, and that initially the Americans will agree to reduce their forces in Europe by a percentage of their current strength in exchange for a similar *percentage* reduction by the Russians. The immediate effect of this, taken in conjunction with the relative ease with which the Russians could move their troops back into Eastern Europe, would be a further weakening of the Western defensive position. The search for permanent political solutions in Europe will be long and complicated and it is essential that in pursuing them we do not place ourselves at a serious disadvantage by negotiating from a rapidly weakening position.

It is, therefore, vital that Western Europe should now begin to repair the gaps in its defences; and it might be as well to deal first with a proposal which comes to the surface from time to time—most predictably whenever Mr. Heath meets M. Pompidou. It is the suggestion that the nuclear weapons of Britain and France should be "pooled" in some way, possibly as the basis for something called a European nuclear deterrent. There are so many decisive arguments against this half-baked proposal that it is possible only to list them briefly. Militarily, the idea suffers from all the weaknesses of the obsolete concept of massive retaliation, aggravated by the fact that Western Europe is a densely populated industrial conglomeration so close to the Soviet Union that warning time of a nuclear attack would be negligible.

Then there is the vital political question of how this weapon system is to be controlled. Past experience does not suggest the likelihood of full and immediate agreement between the French President and the British Prime Minister; and what about the Chancellor of West Germany? It seems inconceivable that he could be left out of a decision so vital to the survival of his country. Yet if it were proposed that he should take part in it there would not be much left of the Ostpolitik or of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Finally, the economic implications of constructing a modern strategic striking force in Europe, capable of presenting a credible deterrent to the Soviet Union are so formidable that much of the advantage of enlarging the Community would be cancelled out.

What is needed in Europe is not another nuclear armoury which would be doubtful as a deterrent and useless as a defence; but a non-nuclear system strong enough to deter aggression at its own level but able to offer an effective defence if deterrence should fail. This does not necessarily mean any substantial increase in the level of forces. It *does* mean using the resources which already exist intelligently and efficiently. The Eurogroup of 10 nations has made a useful start in repairing some of the gaps in important types of equipment, such as artillery and main battle tanks, but a great deal more remains to be done. Possibly the most important decision which will have to be faced sooner or later is that which affects the disposition of ground forces. It is clearly ridiculous that the powerfully equipped American forces should be stationed where an attack is least likely, just because that is where they happened to be when an entirely different war ended a quarter of a century ago. Of course, the upheaval and inconvenience of a comprehensive redeployment would be considerable; but it seems a small price to pay for getting strong defenses astride the obvious line of any advance into the heartland of West Europe.

There are many other improvements which could be brought about by more intelligent and cooperative planning among the European members of the Alliance. What the defence planners call, somewhat inelegantly, "interoperability" is still some way from perfect. For example, there are military airfields in some NATO countries which are technically unsuitable for use by the aircraft of their allies—a state of affairs which must afford the Russian planners a certain amount of quiet amusement. Then there are more obvious requirements such as standardization of arms and equipment, rational division of responsibility between members of the Alliance in the manufacture and procurement of equipment, and a higher degree of specialization, especially among smaller countries who cannot, in any case, afford to cover the whole spectrum of military preparedness. There is something ludicrous about the spectacle of the various members of a military alliance competing with each other in arms production, each trying to maintain "balance forces" of its own without regard to the collective requirements of the alliance and each with its own ideas about equipment, training, command and organization.

There is, however, one final and important consideration. It is that no substantial improvements are likely to take place until the European Community emerges as an identifiable and influential body within the Alliance. Without a large measure of common defence planning there is unlikely to be much progress in political unification; and without political unity the EEC will have lost most of its meaning.

AMATEUR SPORTS IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from the president of the U.S. Olympic Committee, Philip O. Krumm, urging me to oppose the proposed Amateur Athletic Act of 1973.

As I understand this legislation, it calls for the establishment of the U.S. Amateur Athletic Board to oversee the operation of amateur sports in this country and the National Sports Development Foundation to promote the growth of amateur sports.

In his remarkable letter, Mr. Krumm states:

> Without question, this is the most dangerous legislation ever put forward for passage in the history of our country.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, would like to thank Mr. Krumm for pointing this out to me and the other Members of Congress. All along we have been worrying about the war in Southeast Asia, the economy, Watergate, and civil rights, when we should have been concerned about who is in charge of the high jump and 220-yard dash in this country.

His letter continues:

> It not only calls for the regimentation of our amateur organizations by governmental control of amateur sports in our country but seeks control of our youth in their everyday, off-the-streets sports and competition which certainly must remain free in the defense of their and our civil rights.

This is a very fine statement and I agree that athletes should be free to compete when and where they want. For this reason I am surprised that Mr. Krumm does not seem to recall many recent incidents in which amateur athletes were prevented from taking part in meets run by one national organization because another national organization had not sanctioned that particular competition.

In these cases the leaders of the amateur athletic organizations were certainly not worried about "competition which must remain free" and the athletes' "civil rights." They were concerned solely with maintaining their own power and influence and restricting the activity of the rival organization.

Mr. Krumm also says:

> The complexities of amateur sports organizations in the United States call for a sound understanding and well-planned intelligent effort on the part of those organizations now holding the international franchise or rights, so to speak. Years of experience are behind these organizations and one might in a broad sense say that an excellent job has been done through experience and exposure and knowledge gained over a period of many years by all of these sports federations.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the president of the U.S. Olympic Committee. Our young men and women deserve the best support possible when they compete in international events. They should not have to worry at all about anything but doing their best.

That is why I wonder about the caliber of management of our 1972 summer Olympic team, which was the only one of 122 teams at Munich to have sprinters disqualified because they failed to show up for their heats; the only one which was forced to return a medal because an athlete was permitted to use a forbidden drug, and the only one which lost a gold medal in basketball because its officials permitted a game to run in overtime until the opposition had won.

Finally, Mr. Krumm warns us that—

> If this bill is passed, the United States Olympic movement is in serious jeopardy as there is no doubt that the International Olympic Committee may cancel out the American franchise and prohibit Americans from competing in the Olympic games by reason of the fact that Rule 25 of the International Olympic Committee, composed of 134 nations, states clearly that there shall be no government intervention, interference or control of amateur sports in the Olympic movement.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Mr. Krumm credits the members of this body with any sense at all. Everyone knows that for years the Communist countries have completely subsidized and administered their athletic programs and that in reality their athletes are professionals. If the International Olympic Committee suddenly tried to enforce this rule, all of these teams would have to be disqualified along with the United States and there would be no Olympic movement.

I believe the Congress should give the proposed legislation very serious consideration simply because Mr. Krumm's letter indicates that the people who are in charge of amateur sports in the United States do not really understand that the important people in athletic competition are the athletes themselves with the spectators in second place and the administrators a distant last.

SOUTH BEND, IND., TRIBUNE EDITORIAL ON "WHITE HOUSE BUGGING"

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of an editorial published July 18, 1973, by the South Bend, Ind., Tribune entitled "White House Bugging":

WHITE HOUSE BUGGING

> Is there no end to the distasteful revelations before the Senate committee about the behavior and atmosphere in the White House? Almost every day brings a new disclosure of questionable ethics.
>
> The news that all of President Nixon's conversations in his office and all his telephone calls have been secretly recorded for two years is a genuine shock.
>
> Hundreds of official visitors including heads of foreign states have had their conversations with the President put on tape without their knowledge or permission. No advance warning or beeping sound has been given on the recorded telephone calls, a violation of telephone company regulations.
>
> All this has been done for historical purposes, according to Alexander P. Butterfield, the former White House aide who accidentally spilled the truth. Eventually the transcriptions are to be placed in the Nixon Library (what president these days can retire from office without building a memorial library for himself?).
>
> This is going too far for the sake of history. The practice should be stopped immediately.
>
> If the recordings are for history only, why were they done so secretly? According to Butterfield only four men including the President and himself, plus the necessary Secret Service technicians, knew that they were being made. Not even John Ehrlichman, the No. 2 man on the White House staff, and John Dean III, the White House counsel, were aware of the recording operation, he believes.
>
> Since the recording devices were turned on automatically whenever anyone spoke, no individual could have a truly private conversation with the President, man to man. Undoubtedly many persons who thought they were talking to Mr. Nixon in true privacy are astounded to learn that every word they spoke has been placed on tape and filed in the White House.
>
> The disclosure makes it easier to understand the atmosphere around the President

that spawned the illegal buggings and break-ins testified to in the Watergate hearings; also, the so-called national security espionage plan that Mr. Nixon approved, including buggings and burglaries, only to rescind his OK a few days later under pressure from the late J. Edgar Hoover.

More than that, it emphasizes the intrigue that infested the White House staff, with one clique holding secrets from another—a genuinely unhealthy atmosphere.

If Mr. Nixon looked upon the secret recording system only as a way to preserve a historical record of his presidency, which he may have done, this can only be interpreted as a dangerous lack of sensitivity to the feelings of those with whom he dealt.

There are circumstances in which the taping of a session or a conversation is desirable for the sake of accuracy, but it only should be done with the knowledge of all participants.

Now that the truth is out, Mr. Nixon should without fail turn over to the Senate committee the tapes on those key conversations with Dean and others that would help fix the guilt for the Watergate break-in and cover-up. He owes that to the country.

"PETE" STARK: MAVERICK BANKER GOES TO WASHINGTON

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, among our many colleagues in the House, FORTNEY "PETE" STARK brings a most interesting background to his current role as Congressman. He has worked hard and contributed much of his considerable talents to this institution. His efforts to make Congress into a responsive body rather than an artifact have served as an example to his colleagues. Through sheer dedication and skill, PETE STARK has made a lasting and valuable impression after only a short time on the job.

A profile of him appeared in the spring 1973 issue of Business and Society Review/Innovation, under the title "Maverick Banker Goes to Washington." As the article concludes, being a maverick is a question of "relative to whom?" I commend the article to my colleagues' attention, so that we all might appreciate the kind of creativity and insight that Representative STARK has brought to Congress.

The text of the article follows:

MAVERICK BANKER GOES TO WASHINGTON

(By R. B. Miller)

"Trouble is, too many bankers think they are some kind of god."

It's that kind of statement that earned Fortney H. Stark, ex-president of the Security National Bank of Walnut Creek, California, the name of maverick in banking circles. "Pete" Stark was certainly not a typical banker, and so he stood out from the crowd. After all, how many bank presidents install an illuminated eight-foot peace symbol on the outside wall of their headquarters office?

Will Representative Stark be a maverick congressman? He is not so sure, though he's not about to change his style. In Congress there are a number of others with liberal, even far out, ideas. The matter of being a maverick, then, is really a question of "relative to whom?"

A transplanted native of Wisconsin, who studied engineering in Massachusetts (at MIT), Pete Stark received an MBA from the University of California at Berkeley. Two years later, he founded Beacon Savings and Loan Association in Antioch, California, and two years after that in 1963, he founded Security National. It was here that he tried out some of his off-beat (for banking) ideas. He started an on-going minority hiring and training program before many other banks even got around to hiring their first black bookkeeper. His bank initiated an account executive program, in which each customer is assigned a bank officer who serves as his personal financial consultant. Stark even edited a bi-monthly newspaper for customers of Security National.

Actually, many of those ideas, as well as Stark's appearance—longish hair, modish clothes—weren't all that radical. Moreover, they apparently worked. When he sold the bank (the closing was held two days after he was sworn in as Representative of the Eighth Congressional District of California) it had grown to five offices in the San Francisco bay area, with resources of $100 million. The sale to the Triad Corporation, an international investment group based in Beirut, brought twenty-nine dollars a share, when the market price was ten dollars. "For the first time in years I don't owe money," Stark observed.

The new congressman has some critical things to say about banks and bankers in general. Much of it has to do with taking care of the poor. Though his bank made considerable strides in this area, he feels the major trouble is that, on the whole, bankers are indifferent to the problems facing the cities and the disavantaged who live there—banks as they are now constituted, he says, simply aren't designed to deal with poor people. In addition to believing that banks should be truly "concerned about how they are serving their customers," he contends there is a need for an alternative kind of organization. The way things now stand, Stark declares, "the only unique thing banking has is a pool of information," and the bankers aren't even making effective use of that.

Pete Stark is, as one might gather, an advocate of business involvement in government. After all, he points out, in this day and age "business cannot exist without the government. You've got to pay your share; . . . everything is interdependent; . . . business has to be vitally concerned" and become socially responsible. If industry doesn't make this effort, the legislature will. To illustrate the point, he cited the truth-in-lending law. Stark was one of the leaders of the truth-in-lending movement that resulted in the landmark legislation, passed in 1969, that requires retailers and lenders to state the effective rate of interest they charge. Last year, he also challenged the constitutionality of the Bank Secrecy Act of 1970. Working with the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, he fought provisions requiring banks to report domestc transactions over $10,000. This part of the suit was upheld last fall by a United States district court. The ACLU, continuing the suit, is asking the United States Supreme Court to overturn various parts of the Act affecting foreign transactions.

Stark was appointed to the House Banking and Currency Committee, chaired by Wright Patman, in a move that was somewhat surprising for Congress to have made. Stark and another freshman Representative—who, incidentally, had no banking experience—were in contention for one of three vacancies. The Democratic political leaders, in their wisdom, decided the appointment with the toss of a coin, and Stark won. As a liberal, he may not be a particular friend to banking. At the same time, it isn't clear how much of a friend he'll be to Chairman Patman, a populist from Texas and hardly a buddy of the big bankers.

How and why did the head of a successful business enterprise get involved in politics? Pete Stark has always been issue-oriented, which was one reason he got into banking. After all, he notes, next to the bedroom and the bathroom, people are most concerned about money. But he wasn't sure political office was the place for someone with his interests and concerns. Then last spring, several people asked him to run in the Democratic primary against long-time (twenty-eight years) incumbent George Miller. Stark didn't think he had much chance in the six-way race against Miller, but he ran away with it. He did figure he would have a fairly easy time against the Republican opponent in November. However, with George McGovern losing the essentially liberal district to Richard Nixon, Stark had to fight hard to achieve his 53 percent of the total.

Stark ran with the idea of using his campaign headquarters as his regular base of operations. He plans to do case work in his district, working through regional offices of Social Security, immigration, the military, etc. His idea is to keep things closer to home, and solve problems and answer questions for his constituents more rapidly.

Looking ahead, what are Pete Stark's goals? In the near term, he figures on running again for Congress in 1974. Beyond that, he'd eventually like to be the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, because he feels HEW needs substantial restructuring to be responsive to the needs of the people. But, as he points out, that will have to await a "more responsive" man in the White House.

MEET THE LADIES OF THE CLIPT WINGS SORORITY

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from the Sunday Call-Chronicle newspaper of Allentown, Pa., about the formation of the Lehigh Valley Chapter of the Clipt Wings Sorority.

This newly organized group of about 20 retired stewardesses representing various periods in airline history from the 1940's to the present, especially enjoys swapping experiences about changes which have occured as airline service has become more complex.

These women, who have been contributing to the community through other organizations, have now banded together to support several very worthwhile causes including Lehigh Valley Multiple Sclerosis Society. In addition they are providing support for the child of a Korean leper. Also, St. Joseph's Children and Maternity Hospital in Scranton, which specializes in programs for neurologically damaged children, has been the major beneficiary of their charitable contributions.

These ladies are to be sincerely commended for their enthusiastic support of many worthwhile causes which have proved to be of benefit to the entire community.

I certainly extend my best wishes to them for the success of their organization and for the continuation of their service to the community.

The article follows:

MEET THE LADIES OF THE CLIPT WINGS SORORITY

(By Doris Leete)

When former airline stewardesses get together, you can count on congenial company. Ask any permanently grounded "stew" belonging to the newly organized Lehigh Valley chapter of Clipt Wings Sorority about her fellow members and she's likely to reply: "We all feel as though we've known one another for a long time, even though some of us have just met."

They're a lively group, with outgoing personalities—a trait airlines seek in an applicant—varied backgrounds and experiences that cover the globe.

There are 20 retired stewardesses in the growing local sorority started by president Hope (Mrs. William B.) Carpenter of Mt. Bethel, the wife of a flight engineer. Mrs. Carpenter had been president of a chapter in Houston, Tex., while flying with Pan Am (1961–64). Pleased with the camaraderie of the Lehigh Valley group, she is hoping to reach more ex-stewardesses in this area.

COMPARING PROCEDURES

What is interesting, she says of the membership, is the difference in hiring plateaus. Since the women represent different airlines and at different stages, they have enjoyed comparing procedures.

The Clipt Wingers have served on airlines from six months to 10 years and have flown both domestically and internationally. They have had as passengers foreign potentates, presidential candidates, show biz personalities and international playboys. All have a stock of amusing anecdotes to swap.

ACROSS OCEANS

As publicity chairman Karen (Mrs. Bruce) Berrettini of Allentown describes the group: "We've walked coast to coast, across the oceans and over the North Pole, holding the hands of novice passengers, reassuring those with little flying experience and joking with those who've been around.

"We've delivered babies and aided coronaries, and we've competed with other airlines to prove that ours offered the finer service."

Grounded for one reason or another—mostly because of marriage and motherhood—some of the girls became the brides of boys back home, and a few are wed to pilots. Now the parents of 46 children, they are homemakers, nurses, teachers, volunteers in nursery schools, libraries and political organizations.

ALL ENTHUSIASTIC

The women are all enthusiastic about the new Clipt Wings chapter. They hold a luncheon meeting once a month and have drawn up a program that includes time for fun and fellowship and for good deeds as well. Members have voted to support a child of a Korean leper, and the Lehigh Valley Multiple Sclerosis Society. Their major charity is St. Joseph's Children and Maternity Hospital in Scranton. The hospital specializes in the care of neurologically damaged children.

PERSONAL INTEREST

The former stewardnesses retain a personal interest in the flying profession and as passengers are apt to cast critical glances at flight personnel, subconsciously comparing present service with their own past performances.

Those who remember the days when a lone stewardess was assigned to a 70-passenger plane, (today's 747 jet crew complement calls for 12 to 15 stewardesses), feel that many former niceties are missing. "It's a shame that the girls are too busy to be charming hostesses." observes Hope Carpenter. "They don't give of themselves as we used to," contends Mary (Mrs. William) Marston of Bethlehem, Delta 1958–60.

NO BETTER

Observes Clipt Wings membership chairman Betty (Mrs. Glen) Nyman of Bethlehem: "I don't think stewardesses are any better or any worse today." Betty, the wife of a Pan Am flight engineer, flew with United from 1955 to 1964, making the transition from piston engine to jumbo jet.

The only stewardess on a DC–6 coach flying from Chicago to Los Angeles, she recalls: "I would be loaded down collecting coats and hats from the 70 passengers at the beginning of a flight. When I think of all the baby bottles and baby food I've warmed in my time—as many as 14 infants at a time—and the passengers I've tried to put at ease. When passengers were interested in a bridge game I'd even manage to get a foursome together.

PASSED THE GOODIES

"I can remember," Betty continues, "when passengers weren't offered meals in flight but would pick up box lunches at the airport for $1.50. Some would also bring a bag of cookies aboard and pass them around. We stewardesses would offer them a beverage and you'd think we were giving them the moon, they were so appreciative. Passengers are much sophisticated today and they've come to expect a choice of cocktails and a menu listing three entrees."

Some of the women recall that regulations and uniforms were more military during their term of service. No eye makeup was allowed, only lipstick was permitted. A watch and one ring were the only accessories a girl might wear.

HATS IMPORTANT

"So much emphasis was placed on hats," remembers one ex-stewardess. "We were grounded if we didn't wear them at all times, both during flight and at the terminals. It was thought that the hats expressed authority and give passengers a sense of confidence in case of emergency. Today most airlines don't even issue hats."

AMUSING TALES

The onetime ladybirds have amusing tales to tell on themselves.

"One charter flight I remember well," says an attractive mother, "involved the Dallas Cowboys. Being young, single and interested in the opposite sex at the time, I was excited to learn that I would be one of two stewardesses on a plane being sent from Dallas to Chicago to pick up the 58 football players. It was enough to send any young girl into a frenzy. All the way to Chicago, I checked and rechecked my makeup.

"I was certain that as soon as I descended the stairs there'd be a football player who would become enamored of me by the time we reached Dallas. Then we started to board our passengers. They averaged 6 feet, 5 inches in height and more than 260 pounds in weight. We were more frightened than charmed by this more than 15,000 pounds of manhood. They put away five kegs of beer, 22 gallons of orange juice, 16 gallons of milk and 15 gallons of water.

"As you can imagine, I and the other stewardess didn't have the fun we had expected, but worked ourselves until we were nearly dead on our feet."

A TREND

How do the women feel about the idea of men infiltrating the sisterhood in the role of stewards? Some look at it as a trend and think it's good, believing that male counterparts can handle an unruly passenger more easily and in the case of emergency might inspire more confidence. Others express opposition, declaring that this is a woman's job and should remain so.

The women agree that a stewardess career is a marvelous and good-paying one for a young woman, with travel privileges making it especially attractive. The girls work hard, they point out, but it's a fun job really, even though the speed of the present-day jets allows stewardesses less layover time for exploring between flights.

SENATE—*Tuesday, July 31, 1973*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

Rabbi Sheldon Ephraim Elster, Agudas Achim Congregation of Northern Virginia, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Determiner of human history.

We come together from the world of committee hearings, meetings with constituents, the morning headlines, and the Dow Jones average:

To give pause

To praise

To give thanks

Disturb us, O Lord, ruffle us from our complacency; make us dissatisfied with the peace of ignorance, the quietude which arises from a shunning of the horror, the defeat, the bitterness, and the poverty, physical and spiritual, of men.

Shock us, O Lord, deny to us the false Sabbaths which give us the delusions of satisfaction amid a world of war and hatred.

Wake us, O Lord, and shake us from the sweet and sad poignancies rendered by half-forgotten melodies and rubric prayers of yesteryears.

Make us know that the border of the Senate is not the border of living, and the walls of Thy temples are not shelters from the winds of truth, justice, and reality.

Grant us integrity and Thy wisdom. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate mes-