

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEW MELONES DAM

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, for many years, environmental groups have argued against the proposed construction of the New Melones Dam in northern California. I have agreed totally with their argument that this Corps of Engineers project is unneeded and potentially damaging to the area.

The San Francisco Chronicle, in a recent editorial, also took note of this potential threat. For this reason, I am calling the attention of my colleagues to the Chronicle editorial.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle]

PROBLEMS OF THE NEW MELONES DAM

Spanish-speaking miners said the gold nuggets found in the river looked like melon seeds, and so the site of the little mining camp alongside the Stanislaus came to be called Melones. It is only a ghost camp now, but it has become the latest battlefield in the unresolved dispute between the State and Federal governments over water control.

The Army Corps of Engineers wants to dam the Stanislaus near Sonora with a gigantic rock fill to be known as the New Melones Dam. It would be as high as a 62-story building and one of the largest, if not the largest, structures of its kind in the United States. Impounded waters would reach 20 miles back into the Sierra foothills and only incidentally submerge all that is left of the mining camp of Melones.

The Engineers say the dam is needed for flood control, irrigation and power, as well as new reservoir recreation opportunities. They put a price tag on the project of \$181 million in addition to the \$30 million that have already been spent for preparatory work.

Conservationists attacked with the claim that the Engineers were up to their old trick of building a dam simply because a river and a canyon were undammed. Notably, the Environmental Defense Fund said the dam would hardly fulfill the claims made for it because the needs as depicted by the Army Engineers did not exist in the first place.

A geologist came forth to say the reservoir would submerge a unique array of geological phenomena, speleologists said some of the largest most unusual limestone caves in California would be inundated, and sportsmen and fishermen predicted tragic consequences to trout and other wildlife.

A rallying cry for all was the need to preserve a nine-mile stretch of the Stanislaus that annually attracts thousands of white-water kayakers and raftsmen. It is the only year-round stretch of white water left in California and it, too, would be lost.

Then the State Water Resources Board said that San Joaquin ranchers and Federal officials have failed to demonstrate a need for all the water that would be stored behind the dam. The Board said the reservoir could be filled to only one-fourth of its capacity. This restriction would also maintain the quality of water downstream in the Sacramento-San Joaquin delta and, incidentally, preserve most of the nine mile white-water stretch upstream.

The Water Board dictum raised a totally new issue. Federal officials said they cannot

accept the State order, because a state cannot interfere with a mandate of Congress that authorizes a dam.

At the moment, there are more questions about the dam than there are answers. The U.S. Court of Appeals, for example, has under consideration a petition for an injunction filed by the Environmental Defense Fund on the ground that environmental impact studies for the project were inadequate. If the court finds this to be true, then a new element is added.

Until there are more answers, all agencies involved should move with the utmost prudence. A great natural asset—such as the Stanislaus—should not casually be tampered with, for the scars of bulldozers take a long time to heal.

CONCERN FOR RIGHTS AND DIGNITY

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, today I call to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting editorial from the July 19, issue of the Catholic Standard, published in Washington, D.C.

While I am as anxious as anyone to see that those who have broken the law are given their due, I am not in favor of the Senate hearings continuing. Aside from the fact that they may prohibit those involved from getting a fair trial in a court of law, they have turned into a three-ring circus which even Ringling Brothers would be hard pressed to beat. Judging by some of the letters and phone calls received from the viewers, the Senate committee members have done more to titillate the fantasies of the American housewife than to arrive at any pertinent conclusions.

As the editorial points out, and I commend the paper for it, the proceedings—

Must be conducted with the highest degree of decorum and with utmost concern for the rights and dignity of those who testify.

As yet they have not, and I doubt they will.

The editorial follows:

SAD AND SORDID

The Watergate conspiracy and all its ramifications is a sad and sordid affair. Unfortunately, too, the conduct of the televised Senate hearings leaves much to be desired in terms of our national image and the positive results it purports to be seeking.

The headline from last Thursday's Washington Star-News reads, "Mitchell's 'Stone Wall' Battered by Senators." It accurately characterizes the treatment given former Attorney General John Mitchell by a panel of United States Senators and staff attorneys during his public appearance last week.

Mr. Mitchell on the basis of his sworn testimony is not entitled to a great deal of sympathy. Nor do we intend to come to his defense. He proved himself to be a very intelligent and articulate witness and was ably represented by extremely competent attorneys. Whatever his motives may have been, Mr. Mitchell, by his own admission, is guilty

of extremely grave errors of judgment, and perhaps more. These have resulted in criminal indictments and he still may have to face additional criminal charges. Nevertheless, under our system of law he is entitled to his day in court and the presentation of his defense, as well as whatever arguments in mitigation he wishes to present if he is found guilty.

In terms of a legitimate legislative purpose—and this, after all, is the purpose of legislative hearings—Mr. Mitchell's testimony was not essential for the committee's work. The Congress already has more than enough data to draft legislation based on the experience of Watergate. Nevertheless, we fully understand the desirability of Mr. Mitchell's appearance. His personal prestige as a former Attorney General and his personal knowledge of the facts in the case add a great deal to the legislative history so important to the enactment of laws.

The fact is, however, that throughout his testimony Mr. Mitchell was badgered, ridiculed and even vilified. Many of the questions asked him were clearly inadmissible in a court of law. Some were speeches rather than questions. He was, in a real sense, subjected to the same type of treatment for which the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy was criticized and censured. If it was wrong then, it is wrong now.

It would appear that the committee was more interested in excoriating the former Attorney General than in developing a background for legislative purposes.

We sincerely hope that the hearings have not compromised the possibility of a fair trial for Mr. Mitchell, or any other witness, or for obtaining convictions in such trials if that is warranted by the facts. We believe that under the American system a person should be tried, and this includes intense cross-examination, in courts of law for the crimes with which they may be charged. Televised hearings are not the place for this. Too many mistakes have been made in the past to allow it to continue.

For many years now the courts of our country have resisted attempts to introduce live radio and TV coverage of their proceedings. The reasons are obvious. At the very least a court appearance is an extremely emotional and trying experience. To add the confusion created by the presence of cameras and microphones and the witnesses' knowledge that every word of testimony is being transmitted instantly to thousands and perhaps millions of listeners places an unconscionable burden on those who have to testify. While the public's "right to know" can justify live TV and radio coverage of legislative hearings, such proceedings, it seems to us, must be conducted with the highest degree of decorum and with utmost concern for the rights and dignity of those who testify.

GRIZZLY BEAR SHOULD BE ON ENDANGERED SPECIES LIST

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the strongest land mammal in North America and one of the most intelligent is on the verge of becoming extinct. The grizzly bear, the symbol of wild America, has already had 16 different subspecies and species wiped from the face of the

Earth. The relentless persecution of the magnificent giant is a shameful chapter in the conservation of our wildlife heritage. And the Federal Government is largely responsible.

No creature can suffer carnage as has the grizzly and be expected to survive. The U.S. Government should take the necessary steps to keep the grizzly from passing its vanishing point.

I have written to the Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C. B. Morton, asking him to place the grizzly bear on the endangered species list, thereby offering it Federal protection, and further protect the threatened animal by stopping hunting of the grizzly in national forests.

In my letter I called the Secretary's attention to published Interior Department figures reporting fewer than 1,000 grizzly bears in the United States. The Interior Department publication, "Threatened Wildlife of the United States," also indicates that wilderness areas are needed to preserve these remaining animals. I have asked that the grizzly bear gets the added protection it needs to survive and grow. I urge others to do likewise.

The alarming reduction in numbers and the plight of the grizzly at the hand of man are revealed in an interesting article in the July 1973 edition of Environmental Equality magazine. The author, Steven Seater, is a staff biologist for the Defenders of Wildlife in Washington, D.C. His article is interesting reading, and I urge my colleagues to review it. I insert the article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

VANISHING POINT: THE GRIZZLY BEAR
(By Steven Seater)

For centuries, before the first white man set foot in North America, the grizzly was the most dominant species on the continent. It ruled a vast domain from the Pacific Ocean to the Mississippi River, and its numbers were estimated at well over a million—probably closer to four million if you add the territories of western Canada and Alaska.

Left undisturbed by the Indians and early white settlers who shared its land, the giant bear was free to roam where it pleased. The few braves that were able to kill a grizzly kept its claws as a symbol of their great hunting skill, and often ate the bear's heart in hopes of gaining the grizzly's great courage and strength. All of this was changed with the introduction of the repeating rifle.

According to naturalist George Goodwin, "Before the use of repeating rifles, the grizzly was Lord over all it surveyed. It openly took what it wanted and none dared question its right. With the introduction of modern firearms, the grizzly recognized defeat and has taught its children to shun the highways of civilization and seek safety in flight when the hated scent of man flows down the breeze." Now, hunting, poisoning and government "management" programs are pushing this giant to extinction. Yet it remains as the most splendid of creatures.

The grizzly is the strongest land mammal in North America—nearly 1,200 pounds of muscle. When standing on its haunches, a full-grown grizzly may be eight to ten feet tall and capable of sprinting at over 30 miles per hour. Its strength can be fully appreciated only if felt or observed.

Enos R. Mills tells of a grizzly that was cornered by dogs and horsemen. The bear lunged at his attackers, breaking one horse's jaw with a single swipe of his great paw, and

with a second blow broke three ribs of the other horse as he escaped. Another story tells of a cub which was captured and taken to a ranch in Colorado. A heavy collar and chain were attached to the cub before it was placed in a cage. The chain was then passed through the bars of the cage and attached to a large post. That night the cub's enraged mother visited the ranch, defeated a whole pack of dogs, demolished the cage, snapped the chain and left with her cub.

The grizzly is more than a ferocious, powerful giant—he is a highly intelligent animal as well. Dr. William Hornady once prepared a list of the 20 most intelligent animals. He based his ratings on ten separate factors. According to his tests, the chimpanzee rated highest with a score of 926 out of a possible 1,000. The grizzly bear received a rating of 725, higher than the gorilla, wolf, coyote or red fox. While the grizzly made a lower score on the memory test than did the chimpanzee, it actually scored higher on the reasoning test.

Although the bear's high degree of intelligence has not been widely recognized, its ferocity has. Many writers have accused the grizzly of being inordinately aggressive and prone to launching unprovoked attacks against man. Knowledgeable outdoorsmen, however, are convinced that unprovoked attacks are rare. Theodore Roosevelt wrote, "No grizzly will assail a man unprovoked . . . though if he is wounded or thinks himself cornered he will attack his foes with a headlong, reckless fury that renders him one of the most dangerous of wild beasts." Old Mose, a Colorado grizzly, is said to have killed five men. However, the men were hunters who had brought the bear to bay and were intent on killing it. In reality, the grizzly generally shuns man. When attacked or molested, however, he is quick to defend himself. Our ethic seems to approve of this trait in ourselves, but condemns the grizzly as a ferocious killer for doing the same.

It is true that a few seemingly unprovoked attacks on man have occurred; but it must be remembered that there is no way of knowing what actually motivated the bear in question to strike out. For example, a hiker may be set upon by an angry grizzly, not realizing that the bear is protecting her cubs which are hidden out of sight. For this reason, hikers in grizzly country are advised to wear bells so as to warn the bear of their approach. If given sufficient warning, grizzlies will normally leave an area when humans approach (female grizzlies are devoted mothers and will go to almost any length to protect their cubs). A bear may also attack a man as a result of persecution by other men in the past. Man's history of trophy hunting makes the very idea of unprovoked attack meaningless.

Needless to say, though, a determined grizzly can make short work of a man. Such was the case of Frenchy Duret, a notorious trapper who had accounted for numerous grizzlies.

One day, Duret came upon a large grizzly held in one of his traps. He approached the tortured beast, whose hind foot was nearly crushed in the jagged toothed jaws of the trap. Duret raised his rifle and fired. The bullet tore into the bear's body, but failed to strike a vital spot. Before Duret could chamber another round, the enraged animal broke loose from the trap with a mighty lunge and fell upon him. In the space of a few short moments, the bear left the trapper a horribly twisted and disfigured wreck who later died in agonizing pain.

There is little doubt that the grizzly is the most aggressive of bears. A comparison of the behavior of trapped bears of different species by biologist Charles Jonkel revealed the grizzly to be by far the most aggressive and vocal. According to Jonkel, trapped grizzlies became so enraged that they dam-

aged nearby trees with a frightful vengeance and repeatedly charged their captors until subdued with drugs. Trapped black bears were docile in comparison and even polar bears exhibited considerably less aggression.

If captured as a cub, the grizzly can be completely domesticated. This is undoubtedly true since the trained bears in circuses are European brown bears and Russian bears—both of which are subspecies of the grizzly. Oddly enough, the less aggressive black bear does not tame as well and usually becomes untrustworthy when full-grown.

FAMOUS OUTLAWS

The grizzly's diet consists of all types of vegetable matter including roots, tubers, grasses and fruits. Grubs and insects are also relished, and, when available, fish make up a large part of the animal's diet. They rarely take healthy big game for the simple reason that they usually cannot catch such animals. Moose, elk, pronghorn and mule deer are all too fast, while the massive bison weighs two to three times as much as a grizzly and has the backing of numerous comrades. Under certain conditions, such as in Yellowstone Park where elk are over-abundant and the winters are harsh, grizzlies prey upon sick and dying animals, as well as healthy ones which may become bogged down in deep snow.

Occasionally, a grizzly turns livestock killer; however, claims of cattle killing were, and still are, greatly exaggerated. Usually, the evidence against the grizzly is entirely circumstantial. Most knowledgeable wildlife biologists feel that what usually happens is that a steer will die from disease, or from eating poisonous plants, or is killed by a mountain lion; then a grizzly happens along and feeds on the carcass. Unfortunately, the bear leaves his tracks near the dead steer and is immediately branded a stock killer.

Early accounts of the cruel contests between grizzlies and bulls describe the bear as being reluctant to attack. This tends to support the claim that the bear was disinclined to attack domestic cattle as well.

There were, nevertheless, a number of outlaw grizzlies who became legends in their own time. Old Mose of Colorado and Two Toes of Montana are among the most infamous stock killers. Bloody Paws held the record for the number of livestock killed. Between 1889-1892, she is said to have killed 570 domestic animals, although this figure is most likely exaggerated.

The actual magnitude of bear predation on livestock is revealed by a study made in Alaska in 1966. According to Schoonmaker, of a total of 156 livestock deaths, only one animal was definitely believed to have been killed by bears.

Interestingly enough, most of the bears known to have been stock killers had either been injured by steel leg-hold traps or were previously wounded by hunters. Bloody Paws, when killed, was found to have three old bullet wounds on her body. Old Mose had been mutilated in a trap, losing two toes to the serrated jaws. Mutilation of one kind or another was responsible for causing the great outlaw bears to turn to killing domestic animals. Much as the man-eating tiger resorts to killing humans for sustenance, often as the result of man-induced injuries, so also does the injured grizzly turn from its natural prey to livestock.

Most grizzly bear mutilations are attributable to the steel jaw, leg-hold trap. In the old days, the standard bear trap had a jaw spread of about 18 by 18 inches and a few measured as much as 22 by 22 inches. Most had serrated jaws and were powered by steel springs up to two feet in length. When the jaws snapped shut they did so with bone-crushing force, and the cruel teeth bit deeply into the bear's flesh. The desperate struggle of a grizzly to escape from the grip of one of these torture devices was horrible

indeed. Often a bear would sever his paw to free himself. Also, it wasn't unusual for a panic-stricken bear to literally shatter all of its teeth on the trap in an effort to escape. Little wonder that bears so severely mutilated resorted to killing sluggish livestock in lieu of pursuing their natural prey.

LESS THAN 800 REMAIN

Few, if any, animals have been subjected to as cruel and intense persecution as the grizzly. Fully 16 different species and sub-species have been slaughtered into extinction. The Mendocino and Henshaw's grizzly were extirpated in the late 1880s, and the California Coast and Klamath races were gone by the early 1900s, as were the Tejon and Southern California grizzlies. At least nine other sub-species also joined the increasing list of extinct animals.

As a result of this persecution, a symbol of wild America has been largely exterminated in the western half of the United States. The situation in western Canada and Alaska is not encouraging, while in Mexico, the bear may already be gone. According to Dr. Kai Curry-Lindahl, a biologist and conservation expert for the United Nations, the Mexican grizzly was thought to be extinct in 1962. However, five years later, a remnant population of 30 to 40 bears was discovered in the Sierra del Nido of central Chihuahua. These were exterminated by poisoning a few years later. In 1969, another group was found in Sierra Madre, but the present status of these last survivors is uncertain.

The invention of high-powered rifles marked the beginning of the end for the grizzly. Big bore rifles like the Sharps came into use at about the same time that domestic animals were introduced onto the grizzly's range. The stockmen branded the big bear as a bloodthirsty killer of their sheep and cattle and waged a war against it. Cash bounties were offered to all hunters for the killing of grizzlies. Steel traps and poisons were later added as a means of further reducing the bear's population. Faced by an onslaught of this magnitude, the grizzly edged steadily closer to extinction.

From 1937 to the present, the U.S. Department of Interior claims credit for poisoning, trapping or shooting about 25,000 bears, a significant percentage of which were surely grizzlies. (No one knows how many were poisoned and wandered off to die in remote areas, never to be found.) This carnage was, and still is, carried out as part of Interior's "predator control" program, designed to eliminate predatory animals from both public and private western lands in order to free the territory for western livestock raisers to graze their sheep and cattle.

In 1970, the Interior Department Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife estimated that a mere 800 grizzly bears were left in the United States. In little more than a hundred years, the white man has reduced the grizzly's population from about 1.5 million to less than 800—a reduction of over 99 percent.

Of the 800 grizzlies which remain in the western United States, most are found in a narrow corridor stretching from Glacier National Park south to Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks. By far the largest concentration of these bears is in the Yellowstone ecosystem. Though ostensibly protected in Yellowstone, the grizzly population there is seriously threatened by unsound management practices of the Interior Department's National Park Service. Outside the confines of the park in Montana, the bear is fair game for trophy hunters.

The situation in Yellowstone National Park requires special attention, for it is the last major refuge the grizzly has in the western states. The trouble there stems from the fact that many grizzlies in and

outside the park congregate at open-pit garbage dumps during the summer months. These animals have become accustomed to eating garbage and are in fact dependent upon it, as would be expected since they have been frequenting disposal areas for over 80 years. In effect, garbage has been an integral part of the Yellowstone ecosystem for nearly a century. Several years ago, National Park Service authorities decided that it was necessary to return the Yellowstone grizzly population to a truly wild state. It was feared that grizzlies used to feeding in garbage dumps would eventually invade campgrounds in search of food, thus increasing the possibility of dangerous bear-man encounters. The problem was how this transition could best be accomplished.

At the request of the National Park Service, Drs. Frank and John Craighead were asked to prepare a management plan for Yellowstone's grizzlies. The Craigheads began their research on grizzlies in 1959 and since then have captured, examined and released over 550 bears. Additionally, they have immobilized and color-marked over 250 grizzlies and put in over 40,000 man-hours carefully studying their activities and behavior. This work has undoubtedly made the Craigheads the pre-eminent grizzly bear biologists in the United States.

The Craigheads submitted a report to the Park Service in which they recommended that the grizzly population be returned to a natural state by closing the open-pit garbage dumps over an eight to ten year period. They emphasized that under no circumstances should the dumps be rapidly phased out. Such precipitous action would have disastrous consequences for the Yellowstone grizzlies with their long-established tradition of feeding on garbage. Incredibly, the Park Service chose to ignore the Craighead report and established a "management" program based on hypotheses supported by little or no data. Instead of a gradual phase-out, the Park Service chose to follow a reckless course and close the dumps in rapid succession. Illogically, the Service assumed that this precipitous action would cause those bears which had fed at garbage dumps to return to the back-country where they belonged, and that the few bears that failed to do so could be dispatched with no ill effects to the overall population.

The Park Service management program has been in effect for five years and is an unqualified disaster. Instead of obediently returning to the backcountry and feeding on wild foods, grizzlies suddenly deprived of garbage not only continued to seek food in areas they had long frequented, but also began to invade campgrounds and developed areas in increasing numbers. Instead of lessening the chance of bear-man encounters, the Park Service program has increased them. Last June, Yellowstone witnessed its first grizzly-caused fatality since 1916, when a young man was attacked and killed by a grizzly near Old Faithful. Moreover, the grizzly bear death rate is now more than twice the birth rate, with 91 bears dying from all causes in 1971-72.

EXTINCTION BY 1998?

In an effort to convince the Park Service that their program had failed miserably, Dr. John Craighead presented his findings at a meeting held early last fall. He began by showing the results of a computer analysis of data he and his brother had gathered on the dynamic processes of growth and decline of the grizzly population within the Yellowstone ecosystem. Data for the pre-management period (1959-1967) were compared with data for the period of mismanagement (1968-1971). The results were startling: During 1959-1967 the Yellowstone grizzly population was slowly growing with an annual incre-

ment of 1.7 bears, but during 1968-1971 the population was shown to be crashing with more than twice as many bears dying as were being born. Moreover, Dr. Craighead's data showed that unless the current management program is terminated, the grizzly bear within the Yellowstone ecosystem can be expected to become extinct by 1998, and quite possibly sooner.

How was the Craighead presentation received by the Park Service? It wasn't—he was rebuffed and his data branded false; yet, none of the Park Service biologists come close to his expertise or years of experience. The fact is that the National Park Service bureaucrats made an arbitrary decision which proved wrong; but rather than admit this, they may have condemned the last significant grizzly bear population in the West to extinction by their intransigence.

The open-pit dumps have been closed and probably cannot be reopened. But it would be possible to provide the hungry grizzlies with garbage which could be dumped at increasing distances from developed areas and campgrounds in decreasing amounts. This would help to lure the bears away from areas of human activity and could provide the necessary supplemental food for the period of transition.

Troublesome bears are now either dispatched or translocated to areas surrounding national forests. The translocated bears that do not return to the Park often fall prey to trophy hunters in Montana and Wyoming, where the bear is considered a "big game" animal. To alleviate this, all hunting within national forests in Montana and Wyoming should be suspended immediately. It is doubtful the grizzly can withstand the pressure much longer.

Moreover, the grizzly should be placed on the Interior Department's Endangered Species List for added protection, instead of waiting until it has passed the biological point of no return, as Interior has done in the past with so many other animals.

Finally, those bears which have been translocated to other parts of the Yellowstone ecosystem but consistently return should not be dispatched or placed in zoos. Federal agencies should begin a program of reintroducing the grizzly to parts of its former range. Yet, as late as January of this year, Interior Department officials were still holding out hope that the plan could be salvaged. Assistant Secretary of Interior Nathaniel Reed was quoted as saying that "we realize the death curve is exceeding the birth rate in the park. We had anticipated that when we shut down the garbage dumps. But we expect it to level off. We have more time than the Craigheads say."

The only hopeful sign at present is the fact that a new National Park Service Director, Ronald Walker, was appointed a few months ago. Hopefully, he will take a fresh look at the problem and adopt a sensible plan for protecting the animals before it is too late. To do so, however, he would have to overcome the Park Service's entrenched bureaucratic inertia which now has a vested interest in continuing the discredited management plan they have been defending for the last few years.

The grizzly is one of the largest and most powerful carnivores to walk the earth. If we are to insure him a place in the wildlife heritage of future generations, we must act now. We must demand that the proper conservation action be taken immediately. Otherwise, this unique and awesome giant is surely doomed.

If you wish to comment or obtain more information on the Government "management" of the Grizzly bear, you may write to: The Honorable Ronald Walker, Director, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240.

FLOYD ARTHUR "BALDY" HARPER,
RIP

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who consider ourselves students of liberty have lost a friend—I enclose the RIP by my friend, Murry Rothbard, because he says it so well.

My first acquaintance with "Baldy" was in March 1970. I told my neighbor Art Van Slyke, of Wilder, Idaho, that I was going to attend a seminar where Baldy Harper was one of the teachers.

Art Van Slyke, a former student of Baldy's, said to me:

Baldy Harper was the most thoughtful individual I have ever met.

Another friend of mine and of liberty, Ralph Smeed of Caldwell, Idaho, said to me:

Baldy Harper added compassion to the Libertarian movement, and is to me like sunshine to a crop of corn.

Mr. Speaker, both of my friends, Art Van Slyke and Ralph Smeed, were right. My friendship and correspondence with Baldy Harper continued to his death.

Mr. Speaker, we lost a friend, but not his ideas. In my last letter from Baldy, he said:

If freedom could only be bought like fire insurance.

Mr. Speaker, we know it cannot be bought like fire insurance, but long live liberty and the ideas of my friend.

The article follows:

FLOYD ARTHUR "BALDY" HARPER, RIP

On the evening of Saturday, April 21, Dr. F. A. "Baldy" Harper died suddenly, of a heart attack, at the age of 68. To say that Baldy's death is an irreparable loss, personally and in every other way, to the libertarian movement, would be a masterpiece of understatement. Ever since he came to the Foundation for Economic Education in 1946, as its chief economist and theoretician, Baldy Harper, in a very real sense, has been the libertarian movement. For all these years, this gentle and lovable man, this wise and Socratic teacher, has been the heart and soul and nerve center of the libertarian cause.

I had the privilege of meeting Baldy in the winter of 1946-47, and from that first meeting, he became my first dear friend and mentor in the libertarian movement. And I was scarcely an isolated example. For years before and ever since, Baldy Harper carried on an enormous and inspiring correspondence, seeking out all promising libertarians, encouraging any signs of their productivity, by his wise teaching and example developing a large and devoted following of friends and students. The thought of never again receiving one of Baldy's famous cryptic and allusive hand-written notes is almost enough to move one to tears. The last letter I had received from him, a brief week or two before his death, was typical: a glowing note about his discovery of a brilliant young mathematics professor who is anxious to move into the field of Austrian economics and to refute the fallacies of orthodox mathematical economics.

It was Baldy's burden, which he bore with his usual uncomplaining grace, that he was a member of a veritable "lost generation" from the libertarian point of view. In the late 1940s, there were some libertarians and free-market economists of the

Ludwig von Mises generation or slightly younger: men then in their 60's, such as Mises, Fred Fairchild, Willford I. King. And there were a few of us youngsters coming up. But in his vital "middle generation," there was only Baldy: all of the other intellectuals of his day were leftists and statist. And so Baldy simply set out, in his quiet and gentle way, to create a body of students and followers. In those early days at FEE, for example, almost every staff member had been brought into the movement by Baldy: W. M. Curtiss, Paul Poirot, Ivan Bierly, Ellis Lamborn, all students of Baldy at Cornell. Baldy was indeed a notable inspiration and guide for young people, and his followers are now everywhere in the libertarian world. There were scarcely any of us touched by his special magic who did not come to love Baldy as a mentor and a friend.

Baldy in those days contributed some vital works to the libertarian literature; perhaps the most memorable was his great anti-war pamphlet, *In Search of Peace*, and his magnum opus, *Liberty: A Path to its Recovery*, which brought to libertarian theory an abiding concern for human variety and diversity which reflected Baldy's lifelong interest in the "hard" and the biological sciences. But Baldy's abiding passion was a deep concern for strategy, for development of a strategic theory and practice for the libertarian cause. It was out of this concern for strategy that Baldy developed his lifelong dream, his vision of the course which libertarians must take for ultimate victory. He saw that the nub and the heart of libertarian strategy must be ideas and scholarship, that activism could never succeed unless informed by a body of ideas and research on the deepest and most advanced levels. Baldy's great vision was to guide and develop a body of libertarian scholarship and research.

In pursuit of this dream, Baldy Harper moved in 1958 to the William Volker Fund, of Burlingame, California, which had been engaged in the vital task of discovering and sponsoring libertarian and allied scholars in all related fields and disciplines, and in aiding and publishing their work as individuals, completely separate from their universities or from such Establishment-agencies as the Social Science Research Council. The Volker Fund concept: of discovering and aiding libertarian scholars, and of bringing them together in meetings and conferences, was an unsung task of enormous importance which developed and held together libertarian scholars during the lonely years of the 1940s and 50s. By the end of the 50s, Baldy saw the importance of establishing the Volker activities on a permanent, funded basis; and he moved to transfer the bulk of the Volker funds to a new Institute for Humane Studies, which would expand the Volker concept and would provide a permanent home for libertarian fellowships, scholarships, conferences, and publications. An endowed IHS would have been of inestimable and incalculable value for the libertarian cause, and the fulfillment of Baldy's lifelong dream. Then, in 1962, just at the point of consummating the new IHS, for various personal and ideological reasons the Volker Fund collapsed, and its funds were forever lost to the cause of libertarian scholarship.

Faced with this shattering blow, Baldy Harper never faltered; with unswerving and inspiring integrity, he determined to build the Institute for Humane Studies even without its promised endowment. Painfully, and at cost of great personal sacrifice, Baldy patiently, step by step, built up the Institute. After nearly a decade of this slow and painfully wrought development, he was able to bring the IHS to the point where it could sponsor conferences, publish books and pamphlets, grant fellowships, and begin to fulfill the Harper dream of a center for libertarian ideas and scholarship.

If, now, despite this grievous blow, we can

continue to build the Institute and see that it flourishes, we can build a monument to Baldy which I am sure he would cherish more than any other. It cannot replace this wonderful friend and teacher of us all; but it would be of enormous and indispensable value to the cause of liberty which Baldy held so dear and to which he devoted his life.

CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1973

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, since my own days as a Capitol Hill staff aide, I have been aware of, and complained about, the inadequacy of the office allowances we provide for ourselves. But since coming to Washington last January as a Member, I have discovered one mitigating factor of which I had been unaware: A Congressman really fast on his feet can hire an extra legislative assistant with 10 to 15 years' relevant experience at no cost at all. I refer, of course, to the Congressional Fellowship program which today celebrates its 20th anniversary. I hope that all Members presently unaware of the program will remain so, as there is already fearful competition for the few fellows which the American Political Science Association and the Civil Service Commission put on the auction block each half-year.

I have been introduced to the Fellowship by an old friend, a former Foreign Service colleague of mine who is now one of the State Department's leading experts in Middle East affairs. When he suggested his availability for 4 months as a congressional fellow, my first reaction was that we were already crowded in the office, and that Middle Eastern matters were not one of the major concerns of my constituency. On second thought, though, we shoehorned another desk into the office, and for almost 4 months now, the State Department fellow has provided research, drafting, briefing, and freelance casework on every conceivable subject, and made thereby an invaluable contribution to the office.

I hope that State, the other Federal agencies which participate, and the educators and journalists who are sponsored by the American Political Science Association derive as much satisfaction from the fellowship as Congressmen do. I trust also that we, as primary beneficiaries of the program, will lend it our unstinting support, especially by insuring that any fellow we are lucky enough to land gets from his experience with us the widest range and the greatest depth of congressional experience which we can, by forethought, arrange for him.

I join with pleasure in congratulating all those concerned with the congressional fellowship program on the success of its first 20 years. The superb quality of the talent it attracts is proof enough of its virtues; but the self-evident benefits derived from close exchange between Members of Congress and fellows from nonlegislative walks of life dictate to us the need to support and nourish the fellowships at every turn.

STATE OF ALABAMA LEGISLATURE
RESOLUTION ON MISSING IN ACTION
IN INDOCHINA

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, each Member of the U.S. Congress is vitally concerned with those still listed by the Department of Defense as missing in action in Southeast Asia.

The loved ones of all our POW's and MIA's had their hopes soar earlier this year when the President announced an end to hostilities and the release of all prisoners of war. For many loved ones, there were joyful reunions when their son and/or husband returned to the United States after being held captive by the Communists. For too many others, however, the wait and the agony continue and the hope diminishes as they await some word on their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, the Alabama State Legislature has passed a joint resolution, urging the President and the Congress to do all in their power to secure the release and information on those still listed as missing in action. I would like to submit this resolution for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RESOLUTION

Memorializing the President and Congress to do all in their power to secure the release and information concerning the missing in action in Southeast Asia

Whereas, of the vallant fighting men of the U.S. Armed Services who served their country in Southeast Asia, many of their number are still listed as Missing In Action; and

Whereas, North Vietnam has still not divulged true and factual information about the Missing In Action revealing the whereabouts or fate of these men; and

Whereas, the families of these service men have endured undue hardship and have waited for days, months, and years on end in hope of obtaining the return of their loved ones; and

Whereas, it is hard for a person to even imagine the torture that these families must go through day after day, wondering, waiting, and praying for some miracle that will return their son, husband, or loved one; and

Whereas, the suffering of the men who are still imprisoned in Southeast Asia cannot be forgotten, and immediate action must be taken to secure their release; and

Whereas, the most heralded aspect of the Peace Treaty was that North Vietnam promised the release of all American prisoners in Southeast Asia and their cooperation in obtaining the fullest accounting of the Missing In Action; and

Whereas, the Communists have merely pretended to meet the terms of the Peace Treaty; and

Whereas, the American people must not forget and turn their back on these patriotic men who have sacrificed for the country more than any person can expect; now therefore,

Be it resolved by the Legislature of Alabama, both Houses thereof concurring, That this legislature urges the President and Congress to do all in their power to secure the release or information concerning the members of the Armed Services listed as Missing In Action.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this

CXIX—1724—Part 21

resolution be sent to the President and to the members of the Alabama Congressional Delegation and be made available to the families of the Missing In Action and the press.

H.R. 8860 IS BAD LEGISLATION AND
SHOULD BE DEFEATED

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8860, as amended, is bad legislation, and should be defeated. The confusion we have created by endless hours of debate and countless amendments is greater than I have seen in this House in 20 years. I doubt that a single Member of the House knows exactly what type of a monster we have sent to the Senate today.

My main opposition to the bill, however, is that the escalator concept contained in the bill runs counter to the basic principle of market-orientation we approved with passage of the Agricultural Act of 1970, and mandates price increases for commodities on the basis of increased costs without regard to the market demand for those commodities. It is a step backward for the farmer from the independence from Government he is beginning to enjoy.

For decades we have enacted programs to stimulate overproduction, then voted payments to make up for weak markets and the inefficiencies we have fostered. We have, in effect used Government programs and payments to farmers as a form of subsidy for the consumer who wanted cheap food. Now farm prices are catching up and consumers are unhappy.

Now we must make a choice between forcing farmers back into dependence on Government payments or sticking to the resolve we demonstrated in the market-oriented Agricultural Act of 1970. H.R. 8860, with its escalator clause, will only hide the fact that food prices have been kept low to placate the consumer by our tinkering with the price system with his tax money.

This escalator concept will be bad for the farmer. It will make him ever more dependent on income from the Federal Treasury. It will be bad for the consumer, because our interference renders the farmer unable to increase production as fast as he could and would under a free system. And it will be bad for the taxpayer, be the farmer or consumer, when the cost of this legislation is felt in his pocketbook.

Farmers need greater profits, and they will have them, through increased productivity, lower unit costs, and expanding markets, if we lessen rather than increase Government interference. We should be getting Government out of agriculture, not more involved.

Let us take another look at what we have done over the past few weeks with this bill. We adopted an amendment that deletes language making recipients of supplemental security income eligible for food stamps. Those who disagreed in-

timated we were somehow discriminating against the aged, the blind, and the disabled. We were simply confirming the agreement we reached with passage of H.R. 1 in the previous Congress that the aged, the blind, and the disabled want cash, and the right to determine how they want to spend it, not food stamps and direction by Government as to what they can buy with them. And we voted them that cash in H.R. 1. Yet, I doubt that a Member of this House who voted for this amendment will escape the charge by an opponent at some time in the future that he voted against a program for the aged, the blind, and the disabled.

Another amendment was even more controversial—the amendment to prohibit strikers from receiving food stamps unless they were previously eligible. If we supported the amendment, which I did, we were accused of being antilabor; if we opposed it we were taking food stamp funds from the poor and needy.

We rejected an amendment aimed at preventing abuse by hippies in communes after being told its passage would hurt old ladies living together to pool limited funds and mothers of nine children whose husbands had deserted them.

By the time we finished with food stamps, the author of the original amendment we had been amending urged its defeat, without success.

Mr. Speaker, there are many provisions of this bill I support enthusiastically. I support limiting the amount of subsidies that can be paid any farmer to \$20,000, and the \$20,000 limit on payments to farmers for idling their land, and the prohibition against leasing their land and selling cotton allotments to avoid the subsidy limit. I might add that I have consistently supported the 10-year effort by my friends and colleagues, Mr. FINDLEY and Mr. CONTE, to obtain this limit, although on occasion I have been accused of not having done so. I also support elimination of the wheat certificate, the so-called "bread tax," which has contributed to high cost of bread. But I have never seen a more vivid demonstration of what chaos can result from uncontrolled and uncontrollable efforts by some to demand recorded vote after recorded vote to show the folks back home their Congressman is looking out after their interests on Capitol Hill. We have given our opponents plenty of ammunition today, Mr. Speaker, no matter how we voted on final passage.

MILITARY RECRUITING PRACTICES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, certain proponents of the draft continue to raise false and misleading charges in an attempt to restore the executive power of conscription. Yesterday, the impression was created that the erroneous and costly entry of young men and women into the military was a product of the All-Volunteer Force.

The report of the Army Audit Agency, upon which this allegation was based, demonstrates that the opposite is true—this wasteful practice is a product of the draft. Fully 23.3 percent of the draftees had to be discharged because they never should have entered the military in the first place; only 14.6 percent of the enlistees were in this category.

Clearly, these figures represent a management problem that must be corrected to prevent needless expenditure of the taxpayer's money. But anyone who takes the time to read the report will see that the problem stems from the draft. Conscription provided personnel managers with the easy ability to take in massive numbers of individuals, with inadequate prior screening. As a result, many erroneously entered the Army but had to be removed from service at great public expense. Now that the draft is gone, manpower officials will no longer have a crutch to compensate for shoddy pre-enlistment practices.

I was pleased to learn, Mr. Speaker, that Chairman HÉBERT has taken this matter in hand and is pursuing the issue through the investigating subcommittee. I am sure that the result of his endeavors will be a system which insures a high quality force without needless manpower expenses.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD the relevant table from the Army report:

	Volunteers		Male In-	Total
	Male	Female	ductees	
Accessions (fiscal year 1972).....	151,351	5,680	25,478	182,509
1st term discharges for unsuitability, unfitness, EPTS.....	22,159	1,111	5,947	29,217
Percent of discharges to accessions.....	14.6	19.5	23.3	16

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK: COMMITMENT TO FREEDOM

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, once again this year Americans devoted time during the third week in July to observances of Captive Nations Week. For the 15th consecutive year, citizens across the Nation have focused attention on the fact that while we enjoy our precious freedom, other people live as captives in their own lands. In countries such as Armenia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, to name just a few, attempts are constantly being made to suppress the national identity of the inhabitants. The strong and courageous resistance of these peoples to subjugation bears testimony to the strength of their national spirit and heritage.

It is difficult for free people to understand the plight of those who are not free. We cannot imagine being restricted in when and where we travel, or in how

we choose to worship. We cannot imagine what it is like to be culturally isolated from the ideas of the rest of the world.

It is fitting that Captive Nations Week follows so closely after the celebration of our Nation's independence. The juxtaposition serves to heighten the contrast between our country and those that have no independence to celebrate.

It is also appropriate that Captive Nations Week comes at a time when the East and the West are finally discussing ways of living together in peace. Leonid Brezhnev's recent visit to the United States and the European security conference in Helsinki are indicative of the progress that has been made. But we should not forget that differences continue to exist. Intellectuals are still suppressed and censorship still prevails throughout the Communist world. These differences may not seem important to some of us, but anyone who is Jewish is acutely aware of the significance of the differing policies. Anyone who has relatives imprisoned in one of the captive nations knows the impact which these differences can have.

As free people dedicated to the fundamental principle of personal liberty, we have the high responsibility of committing ourselves to the eventual freedom of all captive nations. Captive Nations Week lets the people of these nations know that we have not forgotten them. Secretary of State Rogers reemphasized this point for all of us at the European security conference when he said:

Another principle which this conference has already endorsed is the principle of universal respect for the right of every country to independence and to its own internal development free of outside interference, irrespective of its political, economic or social system. We have said in effect that a country must not be denied these rights for any reason . . . there is nothing equivocal about that decision which we have made.

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent pleasure to visit with Dr. I. W. Tucker, president of the Council for Environmental Balance.

Dr. Tucker, who also serves as a professor of engineering research at the University of Louisville, recently participated in a seminar on the energy crisis held at Louisiana State University, and funded by the Southern newspaper publishers. I believe his views are of interest.

Professor Tucker delivered an address upon the responsibility of the news media in its reporting of developments in the ecology versus industry controversy now raging. The text of this address was reprinted in the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate from February 20 to 22, 1973.

The recurring theme of Dr. Tucker's speech is that a balance must be struck between the cries for environmental protection, and the needs of a growing in-

dustrialized economy. It is the media's responsibility to refrain from championing the cause of ecology, while neglecting the proven facts established by industrial scientists. To Dr. Tucker, it is the duty of the media to be responsive to each side in the controversy.

The professor points out that a pollution free environment is no overnight accomplishment; he points out:

My fear is that by seeking to purify our environment too hastily, we will achieve only an illusion of real progress and actually accomplish only the further waste of our energy resources, and the consequent reduction of our ability to enjoy whatever environmental improvements we can achieve.

Those able to effect a change in environmental policy—that is, chiefly, the Government—must not be pressured into action based upon emotion rather than reason.

According to Dr. Tucker, Congress, in passing the Water Pollution and Control Act and Amendments of 1972, enacted a law with disregard to both the environmental and economical consequences of their actions. The elimination of wastes from our water places a strain upon the already limited energy resources of America, and the elimination process does not completely neutralize pollutants, but often changes the wastes into different forms of pollution, such as chemical or thermal. To accomplish even the operation of required pollution control devices, companies must take into account the corresponding rise in the cost of labor, materials, and other plant investments.

The professor asserts that near-zero pollution is a "false notion." In a society based upon technology, some pollution must be tolerated, unless the lifestyle of millions of citizens is to be altered.

Dr. Tucker feels that greater emphasis should be placed upon the possibility of recycled waste as a source of energy. Such use of man-made waste can help to ease the demands made upon our fossil fuel resources.

In the conclusion of his lecture, Professor Tucker expressed hope that a reasonable balance can be found between the two extremes in the industry versus environment controversy. Upon this agreement being reached, the energies of those involved can be turned toward a more extensive investigation of new and promising sources of power, including solar and geothermal energy.

A.T. & T. RATE INCREASE

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received an advance copy of a column written by Frank Van Der Linden which deals with the FCC and higher rates for "occasional" users of telephone lines.

Mr. Van Der Linden's remarks are very timely and informative and I think the Congress should know about this important matter. Therefore, I would like

to insert his column at this point in the RECORD:

A. T. & T. RATE INCREASE
(By Frank Van Der Linden)

WASHINGTON.—The very survival of the companies which give the three giant television networks their only competition in sports, news, and special programs is at stake in a rate-increase battle before the Federal Communications Commission.

The F. C. C. recently allowed the American Telephone and Telegraph Company to give the Big Three a monthly contract rate reduction worth eighteen million dollars a year in extra profits, in order to keep specialized microwave carriers from wooing the networks away from A. T. and T. with the lure of even lower costs.

A. T. and T.—which retiring F. C. C. Commissioner Nicholas Johnson irreverently calls "Ma Bell"—proposes to recoup about seven million dollars annually by sharply increasing its charges to the "occasional" users which lease its lines on an hourly or daily basis. The Commission has delayed a decision on this until at least September 15, admitting that the higher rates might illegally violate its own decision in the Hughes Sports Network, Incorporated, case of 1968.

In that decree, the FCC ruled that Bell's rate structure for inter-city private lines unjustly discriminated against the small user. Bell then adopted the present rate structure which reduced the "occasional" service rate \$1.15 per mile per hour to fifty-five cents. Bell's new plan would nearly double the "occasional" rate to a dollar per mile per hour.

Johnson calls the boost "a flagrant violation of the letter and spirit of the Hughes case," and predicts it would force the small user to "curtail his service to the public" or even go out of business completely.

In recent oral arguments before the FCC, the new higher rates were attacked as unjust and unlawful by spokesmen for the Hughes Sports Network, baseball's two major leagues, the National Hockey League, the State Mutual Broadcasting Corporation, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Association of Independent Television Stations, the Tele Prompter Corporation, station WPIX, New York, station WGC-TV, Chicago, and TVS, Incorporated, which pioneered telecasts of college basketball games. UPI Television News said the extra costs would drive it out of business.

Jay E. Ricks, Washington lawyer for the Hughes Sports Network, warned: "If this price goes into effect, it will drive out an awful lot of occasional users and the service will be again, as in 1956, the exclusive province of the three traditional networks."

"Hughes acts as agent for fifteen baseball clubs," he said. "The higher tariff is going to drive out virtually every user except the three national networks."

Claiming the Big Three already have a built-in advantage over their small competitors, Ricks cited a typical three-hour sporting event telecast from Robert F. Kennedy Stadium in Washington—say, a Redskins football game. To reach the one hundred largest T.V. markets in the nation, through a ten thousand-mile "occasional" network, Hughes would have to pay a telephone bill of \$66,628, while a major network would have to pay little more than a tenth of that: \$7,334.

Under Bell's proposed new rates, Ricks said, the network's phone bill for that game would go down to \$6,531, while the charge to Hughes would zoom up sixty percent to \$105,879.

These figures show why the independents, projecting news programs to break up the Big Three monopoly, are warning the FCC that it will be difficult, if not impossible, for them to produce the diversity of T.V. fare desired by the viewing public if A. T. and T.'s rate boosts are approved.

The losers will not be only the small companies, but the American people.

DAY CARE IS A JOB FOR
GOVERNMENT

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the need for adequate child care facilities is a very pressing problem in our modern society. Day care programs are essential for working parents and their children, but at present, the demand far exceeds available facilities. Now, while the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is rewriting their social service regulations, it is important for us to be aware of what can and should be done in the area of child care. We must not compromise our children by accepting anything less than adequate, decent child care.

A recent issue of the Advance, a newspaper published by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, carried an article on ACWA day care centers. I commend it to my colleagues as an example of the type of program for which we should strive:

DAY CARE IS A JOB FOR GOVERNMENT

Day care centers where working mothers can leave their children in good hands while they work are in scarce supply. These centers benefit children who get good care and also benefit their mothers who can work and help raise the family standard of living. One would think that every effort would be made to expand day-care centers for families. That would make sense, but that is exactly what the federal government is not doing.

Congress recognized the need for day-care centers and in the 92nd Congress passed legislation setting up a national program of comprehensive child-development centers. President Nixon callously vetoed the measure and there were not enough votes to override. It is hoped that another bill can be passed in this Congress and that the President will not have the power to kill it.

The Amalgamated has pioneered in providing child-care services for the children of its members. After a trip to Italy in 1966, in which he visited day-care facilities, ACWA Vice Pres. Sam Nocella, Baltimore Regional Joint Board manager, returned with a burning desire to establish such centers for the children of his members. While the federal government was making studies and surveys, Nocella got the project off the ground; first in Verona, Va., then in Baltimore; then three more in Pennsylvania.

While others were making speeches, the Amalgamated acted.

The Chicago Joint Board in March, 1970, opened a day-care center for the children of its members. And other ACWA joint boards and locals are making plans for their own day-care centers.

Today, under Amalgamated sponsorship and direction, there are more children being cared for than by any other group or institution in the nation.

The day-care centers of the ACWA Baltimore Regional Joint Board have been receiving well-merited attention in the press of the various cities where they are located. The latest story to see print recently appeared in the Staunton, Va., Leader and featured the center in Verona, Va., which cares for more than 250 children of members

working at the Greif Manufacturing Co. plant in nearby Staunton, Va.

Here are some of the laudatory comments from the article:

Verona—A unique day care center located in Verona is concluding its fifth year of operation and it has become recognized as one of the most successful centers in the country.

The First Report of the Status of Women to the Governor and the General Assembly of the State of Virginia notes that the day care center here is "an example of day care in its truest form."

"The reason this center is so unique is that it was the first day care center in the country to be created by a joint union-management endeavor," a spokesman said.

Other day-care centers sponsored by the joint board for the children of its working members are located in Baltimore, Md., and in Chambersburg, Hanover and McConnellsville, Pa. A sixth center is now being planned for Winchester, Va.

ACWA Vice Pres. Sam Nocella, joint board manager, conceived the establishment of the centers, and the complete program was worked out in cooperation with the trustees of the Health and Welfare Fund of the joint board. Mel Bourne is the overall administrator of the program and each center has its own director and staff.

Good as they are, these pioneering ACWA programs are a drop in the bucket. The task of making child-care facilities available to all who need them is a monumental task that must be undertaken by the federal government.

Day-care centers allow mothers and/or fathers with pre-school age children to lead productive lives, secure in the knowledge that their children are getting excellent care. We urge Congress to start moving on a bill to provide this valuable and important service.

THE BILINGUAL COURTS ACT

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which I think can assist in making our Nation one in which every citizen receives justice without prejudice against race. The bill, the Bilingual Courts Act, has been previously introduced by the Honorable GILLIS W. LONG, Congressman from Louisiana.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for an interpreter in U.S. district courts that have been certified as bilingual judicial districts. The intent is to clarify proceedings for non-English speaking citizens within a court proceeding.

This legislation was brought to my attention by Mr. Manuel D. Fierro, a recognized spokesman for the Spanish-speaking community. Mr. Fierro is now the executive director of the Raza Association of Spanish-surnamed Americans—RASSA—with headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Like Mr. Fierro, I believe it is time we in Congress take affirmative, corrective action and guarantee that this important minority receives equal protection under the law. In Kansas, this bill would affect approximately 50,000 citizens and in my congressional district, some 10,000.

I believe it is wrong for non-English

speaking citizens to be forced to participate in legal proceedings conducted in a language with which they are not familiar. By removing this language barrier, these citizens will not only understand the system of justice but respect it as well. I would think we can both improve the integrity of our judicial system and the participation of minority citizens within that system.

OAK HILL, OHIO: 100 YEARS OF
PROGRESS, HISTORY

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1873, a petition signed by approximately 30 persons was presented to the commissioners of Jackson County, Ohio, requesting that their small community be incorporated as Oak Hill. The commissioners complied with the request and subsequently gave birth to one of the more historically rich towns in the heart of southeastern Ohio.

During the week August 4-11, Oak Hill, Ohio, will celebrate its 100th anniversary. From the official opening day ceremonies through the centennial ball on the final night of the celebration, the Oak Hill centennial promises to be one of the memorable weeks the town has ever known.

Beyond the pageantry, exhibits, contests, parades, and historical performances planned for the Oak Hill centennial, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress the historical foundation upon which this beautiful community has grown. Quite understandably, the people presently living in Oak Hill—along with those who might be scattered throughout Ohio or across the Nation but whose family ties remain in Oak Hill and Jackson County—are very proud of Oak Hill. Located in the southern part of Jackson County, Oak Hill has contributed substantially to the county's industrial and commercial base of stone, clay, and glass production as well as lumber, food, and machinery processing.

The first settlers of the region were industrious Welsh pioneers who readily recognized the value of the extensive salt, coal, limestone, iron ore, and clay deposits concentrated in Jackson County and around the later-to-be-incorporated Oak Hill.

Today, after a century of relying upon these economic and industrial resources, Oak Hill and Jackson County continue among the pacesetter regions of the Ohio Valley in economic achievement and potential. New highways have linked the region with other parts of the State. New homes and businesses have been built and the Oak Hill station of the innovative Southeast Ohio Emergency Medical Service promises to provide the people of the community and surrounding area with efficient emergency medical care.

It is on this, the occasion of Oak Hill's

centennial, that I want to pay fitting tribute to the people of Oak Hill—past and present—who have labored in the tradition of our forefathers to make Oak Hill a good place to live and work. I am extremely grateful that I will have the opportunity to join with all our friends in Oak Hill on August 10 for that day's centennial activities and I know that the membership of both the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate join me in wishing Oak Hill, Ohio, continued success and progress—for hundreds of years to come.

For the interest of the Congress, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief history of Oak Hill and the people who developed the town. This article was authored by Mrs. Dan M. Jones and was provided to us by Mrs. Lucille Owens, the fine editor of the Oak Hill Press.

[From the Oak Hill Press, June 20, 1973]

EARLY SETTLERS IN OAK HILL AREA

(Mrs. Dan M. Jones)

The first family to settle in or near Oak Hill was that of Julius Bingham who came in the early eighteen hundreds. He laid out the town of Oak Hill and gave its name. He started the first circulating library and the first Sunday school. He brought a basket of books each Sunday and allowed the members of the Sunday School to take them home for a week. He was followed a few years later in 1837 by Levi Massie. He became the first postmaster when the post office was established. Peter Seel was the first man to pay taxes in Jefferson township. This was in 1837. As far as is known he never actually lived in Oak Hill, but resided near Bethel Ridge which later became known as Sampsonville. He attended United Brethren Church in Oak Hill. The Reed and Darling families were very early settlers. They lived in what is known as East Oak Hill or Old Oak Hill. The Reed Spring located at the foot of the hill on which their home was located became the old "Watering Trough" which many people today still remember.

Other very early settlers who came from Western Virginia, which is today Greenbrier County in West Virginia were the following families—The Shumates, Corners, Whitt, Roach, Horton, Corn, Phillips, Rules', Mackleys, Kackley, Allen, Jaycox, West and McDaniel families. Dr. Gabriel McNeal, probably the first physician was a settler and also Dr. Kitchen and families. These families did not all live in Oak Hill proper, but lived nearby and Oak Hill was their trading center. John McDaniels, Joseph Phillips and one of the Corns were all Revolutionary War soldiers, and their bodies may be in cemeteries in and around Oak Hill. There may be others who would be in unmarked graves. One of the Shumates was a soldier in the war of 1812. All of these families played an important part in the development of Oak Hill and adjacent areas.

The first Welsh immigrants to come to this vicinity arrived in 1818. There were six families. Four of them were Evan Evans (old settler) John Evans, Timothy Jones and Lewis Davies. They became the nucleus of a Welsh settlement which was to grow stronger as the years passed. During the 1830's there was an influx of Welsh settlers. They left Wales because of the heavy taxes and the hardship imposed upon them by the English landlord system. Most of them came from the county of Cardiganshire near Abernuryth. It is said that they were attracted to this region because of the similarity between the green hills of Jackson county and the hills of their beloved native land. Some of these who came at this time were the families of Thomas D. Jones (North) who came from North Wales, John D. Davis (Manager)

David Williams (Pantybeudy) The Edwards (Brybelle) the Davis' (Cool Hill) T. L. Hughes, David Davis (Fornryman), John H. Thomas, John Jones (Liangoras) and many, many others who settled in nearby areas such as the (Cooper) Davis family who had extensive connections here and in the county. The Welsh continued to immigrate here during the Civil War period and through the 1880's.

J. Edward Jones who came from North Wales and settled first near Utica New York and then came to Oak Hill in the 1840's was the first mayor of Oak Hill and served in that capacity for twenty five years. He was a lawyer, merchant and founder of the Oak Hill Savings Bank, then known as the Farmer's Bank. T. L. Hughes and John D. Davis (Manager) played an important part in the establishment and management of Jefferson Furnace. The Davis (Cool Hill) family were responsible for the development of the brick industry here.

In 1848 a large number of German settlers migrated to this region because of the Revolution of 1848 in their native land. Among those who came were Elcess, Stemshorne, Shrader, Grashel, Poetker, Flenup, Wasmer, Ernest, Metzler and Keitenbach families settled in south Oak Hill, which then became known as Dutchtown. They were a very energetic, industrious and self-reliant people.

With the building of the Band O Railroad in 1853, and the construction of the Furnaces many Irish and English families came in; also families from Kentucky.

All of these families have inter-married and they and their descendants have added much to the cultural, economic and spiritual development of our town of Oak Hill.

We can be eternally grateful to these first settlers who braved the dangers, isolation, sickness and the many other hardships of the wilderness to carve out the homes, churches, school farms and business which make up our community today.

MORE FOOD NEEDED, DESPITE
COMMISSION FINDING

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the energy shortages which we have recently been experiencing have amply demonstrated the fact that all phases of our economy have become dependent on adequate supplies of energy. And, there is probably no sector of the economy to which energy is as important as agriculture. We have witnessed the problems that lack of gasoline has caused to our American farmers. The steady stream of pleas for help which have come into my office from Idaho farmers, desperately needing gasoline, has convinced me that this crisis is far from over.

However, I believe that we may have been looking only at this facet of the energy-agriculture relationship, when actually there are other aspects which are just as significant. A July 16, 1973, article by Joseph R. Slevin in the Washington Post emphasizes one of them. Mr. Slevin, referring to the goal of returning to a level of U.S. trade surpluses rather than deficits, said:

Climbing oil imports will make it difficult. The United States will have to import

far more oil than it has and each barrel will cost much more than in the past.

And this is where agriculture comes into the picture. Quoting again from the article:

The hope is that American farmers will prove more than a match for the Arab oil sheiks and that world demand for bumper U.S. crops will prove the wherewithal to pay for essential imports of oil, gas and other fuels.

As our oil imports continue to grow, which appears to be almost certain for years to come, our trade deficit will also continue to grow, unless there is a large rise in farm exports to balance the books.

This is undoubtedly one of the reasons why Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz has announced that the Federal Government will be returning to production all land that had been set aside to limit surpluses. This action will add approximately 19 million acres to feed grain, soybean, wheat, and cotton farming, and is intended to increase supplies of food and fiber both to meet our own needs and for the export market. At a press conference on July 19, Secretary Butz said:

I think we will need all we can produce in 1974.

He also said that in addition to increasing the amount of farmland in use, he was attempting to stimulate crop production by trying to assure adequate supplies of fertilizer and of gasoline for harvesting and drying crops this fall, according to the July 20 Washington Post.

In light of these actions, with which I heartily agree, I find it extremely difficult to understand the conclusions of the National Water Commission, recently released in its final report. The Commission report states that—

There appears to be adequate productive capacity in the Nation's agriculture to meet the food and fiber demand under various alternative futures at least until the year 2000. In such case there would be no need in the next 30 years to continue federally subsidized water resource development programs "to increase the agriculture land base of the country . . ." This conclusion is based on the Commission's earlier statement that "Land reclamation measures such as irrigation and drainage of new land, protection of existing and potential cropland from floods, and provision of supplemental irrigation water for existing croplands" have added to the excessive productive capacity of U.S. agriculture.

I think that in light of our current economic situation and the stated goal of "all-out production in 1974," we need to carefully evaluate the validity of the Commission's position. The last thing we can tolerate during this critical period is action at direct cross purposes by different Government agencies, which, it appears to me, is exactly the case here.

ASKING THE HARD FOREIGN AID QUESTIONS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Fort

Myers, Fla., News-Press has protested the supergenerosity of our foreign aid dispensers to faraway lands while needs of great importance remain unfulfilled in the newspaper's home State.

I quote from the News-Press of last July 13:

Southwest Florida needs more telephone lines, as everybody knows. It's growing so fast that the United Telephone Co., despite its best efforts, can't keep up with the demand for service. If it could get \$4 million from Washington it would be able to build the needed facilities quickly, but it can't.

The Malagasy Republic can, though. (That's the island off the southeast African coast that used to be called Madagascar when France controlled it.) Malagasy got a \$2 million foreign aid loan in 1967 to expand and modernize its telephone system. Now it is getting another \$2 million to replace 622 miles of inadequate lines and build 90 miles of new lines.

The Washington aid people have a rationale for this sort of thing, of course—for the showering of U.S. tax dollars either in loans or grants on other countries while the need for them is urgent here at home. In Malagasy's case, the aid distributors say the new phone lines are in order because all-weather road connections there are poor and that, without good phone service, some communities might be isolated during part of each year.

I ask, however, why this situation has become an obligation for the American people to correct? France ruled Malagasy for many, many years and undoubtedly profited from the arrangement. Malagasy's first phone lines obviously were installed under French direction and with French financial help and, I suspect, in France's continuing business interest there. But now, so we see, this French responsibility has been shifted to us and at a time when we, with the world's greatest amount of debt on our shoulders and with our dollar still in serious trouble abroad, are far less able than France to bear it.

The Malagasy incident is not unique by any means. Senator LAWTON CHILES, of Florida, cited in a recent appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 10 such projects as examples of the enduring official zeal to share what wealth we have left or can borrow with peoples overseas and as additional evidence of the need of tighter controls on all aspects of the economic aid program. This program, I need not remind anyone, is continuing at the rate of \$1.33 billion a year under stop-gap authorization and that the Nixon administration has increased to \$1.64 billion in its new budget. How, indeed, can either figure be justified?

This country generally, in addition to southwest Florida, is in serious circumstances on necessary improvements. Electric power shortages are being proclaimed across the Nation and proved by recurring "outages" and "brownouts" during this summer season. Highways are jammed and in deplorable condition in many sections. My State of Pennsylvania is hunting money with which to pay the costs of filling potholes. Much-needed environmental protection plans are on the drafting boards without means of funding them.

And still, regardless of all this, our money continues to be taken from us and either loaned on dubious security, as experience has shown, or handed outright to countries abroad whose peoples have only fancied notions of the "improvements" contemplated for them. I have insisted for years that Congress has a prime duty to burdened Americans to pursue vigorously the complicated and long-delayed task of phasing out the "Great Giveaway" of their dollars. I am gratified that others, including the Fort Myers News-Press and Senator CHILES, are asking the hard questions about aid expenditures whose answers can lead to this accomplishment by pointing up the injustices and clearing away the confusion.

U.S. CUSTOMS HOLY NAME SOCIETY

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

U.S. CUSTOMS HOLY NAME SOCIETY

In the course of the extensive research involved in preparing this talk, by curiosity sent me to the dictionary to investigate the word "customs" as it applies to your occupation. For those who have not looked it up, I wish to report that its first meaning is "a habitual practice." By the fifth dictionary definition, it has come to mean "a customary tax or tribute due by feudal tenants to their lord." Under meaning number eight, we come upon this definition, which puts it in your field: "duties imposed by law on imported or, less commonly, exported goods."

We are all aware that once a tax of any kind is levied, it readily becomes "a habitual practice." Taxes are born with remarkable ease; they die hard. In fact, they almost never die, nor—unlike old soldiers—do they fade away. Once the government takes a piece of the traffic, whether it is on imports, exports, real estate, foodstuffs, whiskey, cigarettes, or whatever—and lastly, and most ingeniously, a person's income—the government never lets go.

It's like a second collection in Church. Once the pastor institutes it on the first Sunday of the month—perhaps for some dire emergency—he finds it a habit very hard to kick, and the ushers had better settle down without grumbling to an extra trip down the aisle with the basket. The best they can hope for is that he will not put in a *third* collection.

Such customs do not easily change. However, in recent years, a number of other customs have changed in the Church, to the joy of some and the consternation of others, and I would like to focus for a moment this morning on this phenomenon of change in the Church, what it has done to us, what it has done for us, and where it leaves us as Roman Catholics.

First of all, it has shaken us up. When you change people's symbols, especially their religious symbols, you really shake them up. I was talking recently with a very old lady who all her life has been a devout Catholic. Quite surprisingly, she said: "You know, I'm not really so sure as I used to be that there is a life hereafter." By way of explanation, she said: "They've changed so much in our religion. I used to love Mass in Latin; I knew

how to follow it in my missal. It was nice and quiet in Church and I got a lot out of going. I don't like all this singing and lay people reading the Bible at us." I laughed and replied: "Well, you really got back at them good—now you don't believe in a life hereafter. That's what I call getting even." I'm sure the lovely old lady still does believe in a future life—there isn't much religion left if you don't—and like the rest of us she will walk forward to meet it with that mixture of trepidation and faith which is the best that any of us can bring to the moment of death.

But her reaction is not untypical of many Catholics. The great danger is that in a time of change and upsetment, we will be tempted to throw out the baby with the bathwater. The Church has changed a great number of her customs. We don't have to eat fish on Friday, nor fast from midnight before receiving Holy Communion. If we like that kind of thing, we can get cremated instead of buried. An annulment is a little easier to obtain. Priests can leave the ministry without leaving the Church. Nuns can wear minis and maxis. We pray together with Protestants and Jews. In June, Cardinal Cooke will ordain a dozen married deacons. The list of changes could go on and on.

All these changes are *accidental* changes. They do not touch the substance of the Faith. It is essential that each of us have a firm grasp of that distinction. Basically, in her deepest essence, the Church we belong to is the Church of our forebears. The Church to which people belonged in France, or Ireland, or Germany, or Poland, whose tombstones bear 16th Century dates. The Church of the Middle Ages and St. Thomas Aquinas. The Church of the 5th Century and St. Augustine. The Church of lovable St. Peter and intrepid St. Paul. The Church finally of Jesus Christ, Our Lord.

Faith of our fathers, living still
In spite of dungeon fire and sword
Oh how our hearts beat high with joy
Whene'er we hear that glorious word
Faith of our fathers, holy faith
We will be true to you till death.

We still believe in the Apostles' Creed, every article of it. We still accept the ten commandments. It is still right to love and honor your wife and teach the Faith to your children. We still remain in perfect union with the Pope, who is the successor of St. Peter. Holy Mass, whether you call it the Liturgy or the Eucharist, is still the burning center of the Church. Without Our Eucharistic Lord, there is no Church, and all who would be living members must gather around the altar for the same Sacrifice. The Blessed Virgin Mary is still the First Lady of the Church, and indeed her Holy Mother and the Mother of all of us.

Nothing essential has changed. The Church has simply discarded certain customs in the hope of addressing the twentieth century more successfully.

You may question her wisdom in doing so. Personally, I think she has made some splendid moves. Just to take one example, I believe that the new Liturgy is a vast improvement over the Mass I knew as a boy. My brother argues with me about that. The new Mass is a matter of opinion, but so was the old Latin Mass. I had an experience a year ago in Quebec that confirmed me in my opinion. I had gone with a group of pilgrims to St. Anne de Beaupré. The day after the pilgrimage was over, I offered Mass in the Cathedral of Quebec. Three elderly people walked over from the hotel with me. When I got to the sacristy, I found that all the missals were in French, and my only option was to say Mass out of the old Latin Missal. I asked my three friends if they would like to attend a Latin Mass. They said:

"Oh, we'd love to!" I went through the ancient rite as it was twenty years ago, pronouncing everything clearly. When it was over, I asked: "How did you like it?" They said: "It was awful. We didn't understand one word you said!" I think the same kind of experience would cure a lot of people of hankering for the days gone by.

We've been moving forward and the future is not at all dismal. We are in a period of transition and, in many ways, a time even of revolution. But we shall come out of it stronger. In the process, some will fall away as some already have. But one has to wonder how strong their faith was to begin with.

We're doing a lot of right things; such as insisting that parents come for instructions prior to the baptism of their child. The same is being done for first Communion, Penance and Confirmation. These catechumenates, as they are called, are an effort to center the faith in the family, to let people know that the first Christian school is the home. If we are to have strong faith in the generations coming along, it will be enkindled by parents who themselves really believe and care about the religion of their children. The generation gap has to be faced where it is, within the family. Quite literally, our children's faith must be "the faith of our fathers" if it is to survive.

Incidentally, the name of the hymn is "Faith of Our Fathers"—not "Faith of Our Mothers." No one would ever downplay a mother's importance in the religious upbringing of children, but let us never forget the fundamental responsibility of the Christian father, who is the head of the small church that exists in his home and whose teaching and example of faith can mean so much to the faith of his children.

The dozen deacons whom the Cardinal will ordain are only a beginning, like the twelve Apostles. In the years ahead, deacons will hopefully perform very useful services in our parishes and in various other apostolates.

Things like marriage encounters have gained considerable popularity and may well prove very helpful in strengthening Catholic family life.

While parish missions have largely faded in popularity, weekend retreats have caught on with a great number of our lay people.

Parish Councils in many parishes (though unfortunately not in all) are putting new life into parishes.

These are just a few of the signs of vitality and hope that appear in today's changing Church. Singing the blues about "what has happened to us" is not at all in order. Much that has happened is wonderful.

Our Catholic Church is very ancient—20 centuries old. It is blessed with a perennial power to go through crises and come out stronger. Its Founder is God and He made a promise to His original Church: "I am with You all days." Our Church is not about to dry up and blow away. It's about to be reborn, as it has been dozens of times before.

So my message this morning is a very simple one: Don't be discouraged by "all the changes." Don't let your joy in belonging to the Church become tarnished at all. Get with it. Get with the Church. And stay with it through every trial.

TRADE REFORM ACT OF 1973

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, we are all pleased and excited about the recent

easing of tensions with Russia which our Government has managed to negotiate. The hope and potential for world harmony which these diplomatic achievements suggest are manifold.

Yet, although the atmosphere of confrontation is greatly relaxed now, our new relationship with Russia has presented some challenging and important problems to the American people.

Mr. Harold Light, first vice chairman of the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews, elucidated some of the dilemmas and implications which pending trade agreements resulting from the Trade Act may suggest in the future, in a statement to the House Ways and Means Committee on the Trade Reform Act of 1973.

I would like to submit Mr. Light's statement in the hope that my colleagues will thus become aware of some of the more far-reaching consequences of the act and will then take into consideration these consequences when determining their own position on the issue.

The text of the statement follows:

STATEMENT BY HAROLD B. LIGHT

My statement is to express opposition to the Trade Reform Act of 1973, as presented. I do, however, support the Bill H.R. 3910, introduced by Congressman Mills (Ark) and Congressman Vanik (Ohio) and others.

My general premises are mainly related to trade relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, and are as follows:

1. Trade between these two powerful nations can serve as an important medium for improved relations and detente.
2. Recognizing that the long term outlook will always include tensions and possible crises, monetary problems, labor conditions and national security risks should always be important considerations.

3. The Trade Reform Act of 1973 would transfer unprecedented powers to the Executive Branch, which would in effect, dilute or remove the control mechanisms from our elected Congressional legislators.

This writer's attention was originally drawn to the subject of Soviet trade due to an intense concern over the struggle for freedom of oppressed people in the Soviet Union, including but not restricted to its Jewish citizens.

After observing and studying East-West Trade over the past three years, and conferring with eminent economists, Soviet specialists, and labor leaders, I arrived at a general conclusion:

United States-Soviet Trade is not simply a Jewish issue, not a humanity issue, but is, rather a very serious problem, affecting the American public's strategic interests.

1. The Soviet Union will benefit from trade much more than the United States. The advantages of our granting Most Favored Nation treatment are one-sided, and even more so, the benefits of the U.S. credit guarantees. These credits, usually long term, often at low rates of interest, could from past experience amount to foreign aid (in Mr. George Meany's words) at American taxpayers expense.

2. Thousands of items, formerly classified as strategic materials, have been delisted by the Department of Commerce. I cannot agree that the United States should build the world's largest truck plant for the Soviets, lend them the money to finance the operation, knowing that truck factories can make tanks.

3. Most of the trade negotiations involve the construction of permanent facilities in the Soviet Union. The above mentioned truck factory, and the proposed building of a

multi-billion dollar pipeline will supply important capabilities which could easily be used against our country in any future emergency, or change in policy.

4. The spectre of "exporting jobs" has been raised by many labor leaders, who reason that many of the products involved are desperately needed by the U.S.S.R., and might be purchased here, made by American labor.

5. Past experience with the impact of Soviet purchases on our domestic markets is no recommendation for an open handed policy in granting the U.S.S.R. everything it demands. I cannot believe that when our administration authorized a \$500 million credit in July 1972 to buy our wheat that the results were beneficial to the average American citizen.

Recently, Dr. Henry Kissinger visited Moscow to discuss mutual problems. No doubt, SALT talks, nuclear disarmament, the United States dilemma in Southeast Asia were on the agenda. In these areas, can we expect more than the Soviets' traditional hard negotiating stance? Right now, our Administration has serious problems at home, and the Soviets' Mr. Brezhnev is well aware of that when he sits down to talk in Moscow or in Washington.

On the other hand, the United States holds an important "trump card", for the U.S.S.R. desperately needs the benefits of Most Favored Nation treatment for its prestige value, and the very real advantages of U.S. Credit to implement its trade deals. It is highly doubtful that American banks will grant loans, nor can most companies generate substantial capital internally, without the guarantee of the United States government.

The Soviets' multibillion dollar efforts to attain production parity with the United States have failed miserably, and the Kremlin leadership faces its own domestic problems, if it cannot deliver these benefits to their people. They suffer from severe shortages. Four major cities are now on food rationing. The hunger for tractors and tractor parts which they cannot produce will increase their crop deficits. Soviet leadership MUST succeed in increasing trade with our country, almost no matter what the cost. If they cannot deliver, that leadership might very well be toppled. Their internal prestige is on the line, and their economic turmoil could force them to back off from their hard negotiating stance on many issues of critical importance to the United States.

Both Houses of Congress have documented their opposition to the present direction of trade concessions, through their heavy support of the Mills-Vanik and Jackson legislation. This strengthens the Administration's hand immeasurably.

Mr. Brezhnev has already announced that the Soviet Union will repeal its "education tax" if it is granted Most Favored Nation treatment. We can expect other concessions on the emigration issue, as if that were the only reason for denying such benefits. However, it is important that the Administration use the trade issue to gain advantages on the other crucial problems, and it should use its negotiating strength before the United States delivers the benefits, not after they have been surrendered.

END OF FORMAL STATEMENT

Epilog: I must point out that for some time, I was troubled by the possibility that my concern for the Soviet Jews might be in conflict with my concern for the best overall interest of my American people. Trade was viewed as a panacea, a cure-all to attain detente. Administration spokesmen have continually stated that this humanity issue could best be handled through "quiet diplomacy". Fortunately, Congressmen Mills and Vanik and Senator Jackson did not share this view.

Their introduction of the free emigration matter into the granting of trade benefits created a time delay, so that the subject began to be more closely examined. As the facts emerged, the disadvantages became more clear, and today we hold a negotiating advantage we did not have before. It is apparent that the Soviet Jews have, inadvertently, performed a great service for the American people.

PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which sought to keep up the pressure on North Vietnam to help us secure a full accounting of all prisoners of war and missing in action.

The amendment simply stated calls for assurances that the Government of North Vietnam is cooperating fully in providing for a full accounting of any remaining prisoners of war, and all missing in action.

This proposal, which was adopted by an overwhelming majority would make any commitment of foreign assistance to nations seeking to establish trade with North Vietnam contingent on firm assurances from the President that North Vietnam is fully cooperating with the U.S. Government in providing a complete and accurate listing of our remaining prisoners of war and missing in action. There is no question about the effect that this amendment will have on the economic reconstruction efforts of North Vietnam, as many of the countries which would engage in trade with North Vietnam are themselves highly dependent on U.S. economic aid.

More important, this amendment would serve to forcefully remind the North Vietnamese that the matter of the safe return and full accountability of our prisoners of war and missing in action, is still a paramount issue in the mind of every American. We must continue to be firm in all our dealings with the North Vietnamese, and must be particularly cautious not to be hoodwinked into making any regrettable economic concessions to our recent enemy.

This amendment would also provide the beleaguered families and loved ones of those Americans missing in action with the necessary assurances that the U.S. Government has not abandoned their men. Although the war may be over in a military sense, the heartbreaks and anxieties of these families continues uninterrupted to this day. We must take every step possible to secure the hasty and safe release of these gallant Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this bill which we are considering today is one with far-reaching ramifications for our dealings with many countries in the world. Yet, our dealings with North Vietnam are particularly important in this crucial period. Let us not be swept up in the tide of post-

war euphoria, especially at the expense of those Americans who have sacrificed tragic numbers of years in defense of our country. I urge my colleagues to approve this amendment and by doing so demonstrate our continued commitment as a nation to achieving a full accountability of our prisoners of war and missing in action.

EXPOSING CUBA

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, last week a group of Communists, Socialists, and other revolutionaries sponsored an ExpoCuba in New York City. What they were really doing was exposing what they would like Cuba to be under their Communist regime—ignoring the real problems that country is having.

To have read their propaganda inviting Americans to see the "real" Cuba, one would have gathered all its sweetness and light on an island that has existed only through begging Russia for handouts. Yet, the group readily admitted that Cuba is "giving leadership and encouragement to the continentwide rebellion that has broken out against U.S. imperialism." They are particularly intent on the Panama Canal and independence for Puerto Rico.

The "mature revolutionary Cuba" is an interesting claim, but I hope the people who visited their exposition took the time to study the real situation. Mr. Speaker, the claims of sweetness must surely bring a bitter taste to the mouths of the thousands who have fled Communist tyranny in this little island.

OPEN GOVERNMENT ACT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today the Open Government Act—a bill which would replace and improve upon the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946. My bill is similar to the one offered in the Senate by Senator ROBERT STAFFORD of Vermont.

These are very difficult times for anyone who is an officer of the Government. Every day there are new revelations of advantages gained by some special interest because it in some way was able to influence the process of government for its own purposes. Many Members of Congress have expressed their concern that our Government is losing the confidence of the citizens it would govern. We can literally observe the erosion of the public's respect for the Government which has occurred over the past decade.

Much of this is due to the fact that the Nation's business has become incred-

ibly more complicated each year. No Member of Congress can hope to understand the full meaning of as many as one-half of the proposals which he is asked to consider. As a consequence, we have developed subspecialties and subgroups within the congressional process. These subgroups—committees—are naturally the object of considerable attention by very specialized sectors of society. The consequence of this arrangement is that the citizen cannot understand the facts of many specialized areas of policy with which the Congress deals, and he does not know what forces are being brought to bear upon the legislative process to achieve a specific policy goal.

The Regulations of Lobbying Act of 1964 does not begin to help either the citizen or the Member of Congress to cope with this complexity and specialization. In fact, under a Supreme Court decision, it probably does not even apply to some of the most active lobbyists and lobbying groups in Washington. For instance, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States finds that it is not required to register as a lobbyist under the act, and yet it is listed by learned observers as one of the leading forces in the defeat of the 1972 effort to establish a Consumer Protection Agency.

The Open Government Act, which I propose, would end the ambiguity of the 1946 act, and it would make available for all interested parties sufficient information to insure that a wider variety of opinion will be brought to bear upon the consideration of major policy. A citizen or a corporation cannot have the fullest right to petition the Government—as guaranteed by the Constitution—unless he knows when it is time to come forward and who the competition is.

Mr. Speaker, most students of government believe that it is critically important for the Congress to find some way to make the public aware of its processes. The people have a right to know in what manner influence is sought, and the degree to which money—and its sources—have real influence in the Nation's Capital. The Open Government Act will address this right.

TAX REPORT

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, during the tax reform hearings held last spring by the Ways and Means Committee, the committee heard testimony from Dr. Elvis Stahr, president of the National Audubon Society, on H.R. 4994 and H.R. 5095; these bills would permit tax-exempt charitable organizations to present their views to Congress without losing their tax benefits. H.R. 4994, which I introduced earlier this year, is identical to legislation which Congressman AL ULLMAN and I sponsored in the 92d Congress. As you may know, a 1962 pro-

vision of the Internal Revenue Code permits business associations and labor organizations to carry on lobbying activities using funds deductible by the tax-paying donor. By contrast, public charities, which often serve a watchdog function in the public interest, risk the loss of their tax benefits by engaging in the same type of activity. This inequitable state of the law is certainly in need of revision, and I urge the Ways and Means Committee to propose such a revision when it resumes consideration of tax reform this fall.

It may help the committee members in their deliberations to review the outline of a complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia by Tax Analysts and Advocates and Taxation With Representation. This suit seeks to do through the courts what H.R. 4994 seeks to do through legislation: enable tax-exempt charitable organizations to lobby Congress without losing their eligibility to receive tax deductible donations. Therefore, I submit a description of the complaint contained in the press release announcing it and an article on the suit which appeared in the Wall Street Journal:

SUIT FILED TO VOID RESTRICTIONS ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY BY CHARITABLE AND EDUCATIONAL GROUPS

Tax Analysts and Advocates, a Washington public interest tax law firm, filed suit on Monday, April 30, to avoid existing restrictions on legislative activity by tax exempt charitable and educational groups. The suit also seeks to establish tax deductibility for dues and contributions paid to "public interest lobbies" such as Common Cause, Taxation with Representation, and similar groups.

Legislative activity cannot, under present law, form a "substantial part" of the activities of tax exempt charitable and educational groups. But tax exempt business leagues, trade associations, labor unions, agricultural groups, chambers of commerce, fraternal societies and veterans organizations are all free to lobby as much as they wish—and they can use tax deductible funds for that purpose.

"The result," said Thomas F. Field, Executive Director of Tax Analysts and Advocates, "is to muzzle charitable and educational groups when they seek to speak out on legislative matters in the public interest, while giving free rein to lobbying efforts by groups serving narrower pocketbook interests. In our view, this is not just bad policy," he continued, "but a clear violation of the First Amendment's guarantees of freedom of speech and association and the Fifth Amendment's guarantee of equal protection of the laws."

The restrictions on legislative activity by charitable and educational groups date back to 1934. Their original focus was on a single organization, the National Economy League, which had been accused by some members of Congress of using its assets to promote the donor's interests through legislative activity. But no similar restrictions are imposed on tax exempt business, labor, and other groups that use tax deductible contributions to promote their members' interests.

"Our objective in this suit," said Field, "is to release charitable and educational groups from the irrational and unconstitutional restrictions now imposed on them. These groups can make a real contribution to the Nation's welfare by increasing the flow of unbiased information to Congress. But all

too often today, Congressmen hear only from special interest groups that have an axe to grind, rather than from charitable and educational groups designed to do scholarly research or otherwise serve the public interest. The results are one-sided Congressional debates, restricted information flows to and within Congress, and poorer legislative output than we have a right to expect."

The suit is also designed to end the existing disparity in the tax treatment of payments to public interest lobbies as contrasted with lobbies that serve private, pocketbook interests. At present, for example, petroleum firms can deduct their payments to the American Petroleum Institute—which lobbies on their behalf—but contributions to public interest lobbies are denied any similar tax benefit. "The result," said Field, "is that public interest lobbies have one hand tied behind their backs when they seek to do battle with special interest groups."

Joining Tax Analysts and Advocates in the suit filed Monday in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, are Taxation with Representation, an Arlington, Virginia public interest tax lobby, and Elliott Moss, of Washington, D.C., a contributor to both groups.

TAX REPORT: A SPECIAL SUMMARY AND FORECAST OF FEDERAL AND STATE TAX DEVELOPMENTS

Stacked Deck? A suit asks lobbying rights for "public interest" groups.

Current tax laws make it impossible for charitable and educational organizations promoting public causes to compete effectively for the attention of Congress with groups representing narrow economic interests, the suit charges. Filed by Tax Analysts and Advocates, a firm of public interest tax lawyers, the suit notes that a public interest group is exempt from paying taxes, and contributions to it are tax-deductible, only if the group doesn't devote a significant amount of its resources to lobbying in Congress. Business and labor groups representing special interests enjoy the same tax benefits under the law, but are free to lobby up a storm, the tax group says.

Tax Analysts claims it wasn't able to participate in recent House Ways and Means Committee hearings on tax revision because its tax-exempt status would have been endangered. A group affiliated with Tax Analysts, Taxation With Representation, does lobby. So donors to it can't deduct their gifts. This means it gets relatively few contributions and two years ago was able to spend only \$1,200 lobbying against tax breaks for exporters. Special interest groups with lobbying privileges, on the other hand, spent at least \$150,000 promoting the legislation, which is costing the Treasury more than \$150 million a year, Tax Analysts figures.

(Its suit asks the U.S. district court in Washington to declare the tax-exemption laws unconstitutional because they limit freedom of speech and deny equal protection of the laws.)

SOUTH BEND, IND., TRIBUNE EDITORIAL, "NIXON AND THE TAPES"

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the

RECORD an editorial published July 25, 1973, by the South Bend, Ind., Tribune entitled "Nixon and the Tapes."

The editorial follows:

NIXON AND THE TAPES

President Nixon may win the legal battle of Watergate but the price he will pay in loss of stature as our national leader is great.

His hard-line refusal to co-operate with the Senate investigating committee and Archibald Cox, the special Watergate prosecutor, by releasing secretly recorded tapes and pertinent documents has pushed him further into isolation.

He might have stepped forward in the role of moral leadership the country needs and helped purge the sickness that infested the White House.

Instead, he drew further into his shell at a moment when the full truth is required.

The technical legal arguments about the extent of executive privilege are of relatively little concern to the average American. He is more worried about the illegal and unethical behavior that has been revealed in the hearings, the disclosure of the bugging mentality in the White House, and the widespread adherence among the White House staff to the principle that victory for Mr. Nixon takes priority above all else.

The box in which the President finds himself trapped is largely of his own making. Instead of acting early and forcefully to purge his staff, he had given ground grudgingly. Now he has refused to give more.

Eventually the breadth of executive privilege will be determined by the U.S. Supreme Court. The sooner the issue can reach the Court, the better. Where Mr. Nixon is on thinnest ground is the fact that the Watergate and related "White House horrors" involve purely domestic political considerations.

Nothing directly related to national security was involved, nor anything concerning dealings with foreign countries. Yet the President has chosen to consider everything he does as protected by the blanket of executive privilege.

A veteran magazine editor once remarked that in his career he had found that most people had two reasons for doing something: a good reason and the real reason. By his refusal to disclose the contents of the pertinent tapes, Mr. Nixon makes himself susceptible to the accusation that his real reason for refusal is because the content of the tapes would be embarrassing to his contention that he didn't know what was going on among his high staff leaders concerning Watergate.

Valid or not, the claim that he is covering up will be widely heard. To judge from the recent public opinion polls, the American people already are disturbed and distrustful of Mr. Nixon's attitude. He has only made the uneasiness worse.

A cryptic statement in the letter he wrote to Sen. Sam Ervin will add to these doubts. He said that the tapes are entirely consistent with what he has stated to be the truth, then added, "However, as in any verbatim recording of informal conversations, they contain comments that persons with different perspective and motivation would inevitably interpret in different ways."

Somehow Mr. Nixon could have found a way to make public at least key portions of the tapes. His failure to do so is another lost opportunity for him to regain the confidence of the people who elected him.

CXIX—1725—Part 21

I AM THE NATION

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 200th anniversary of the birth of this great Republic we should be ever aware of what it means to be an American.

And while our country is far from perfect, because it is a very human society, it is still the greatest experiment in human freedom and dignity ever devised.

But its future is only safe and secure to the extent that people are willing to participate in civic affairs; indeed, self-government is the only safe repository for human freedom.

To the end that more may appreciate what America means, I submit for the RECORD this eloquent testimony to the fact that the real significance of this land is that though we are many, we remain one. For at no other time or place have more people from more racial, ethnic, or social backgrounds attempted to live together in harmony. I submit that America has been extraordinarily successful in this effort. Perhaps this tribute helps us understand why.

I AM THE NATION

I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is my birth certificate. The bloodlines of the world run in my veins, because I offered freedom to the oppressed. I am many things, and many people. I am the Nation.

I am 200 million living souls—and the ghost of millions who have lived and died for me.

I am Nathan Hale and Paul Revere. I stood at Lexington and fired the shot heard around the world. I am Washington, Jefferson and Patrick Henry. I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys and Davy Crockett. I am Lee and Grant and Abe Lincoln.

I remember the Alamo, the Maine and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called I answered and stayed until it was over, over there. I left my heroic dead in Flanders Fields, on the rock of Corregidor, on the bleak slopes of Korea and in the steaming jungle of Vietnam.

I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheat lands of Kansas and the granite hills of Vermont. I am the coalfields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania, the fertile lands of the West, the Golden Gate and the Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the Monitor and the Merrimac.

I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific . . . my arms reach out to embrace Alaska and Hawaii . . . 3 million square miles throbbing with industry. I am more than 3 million farms. I am forest, field, mountain and desert. I am quiet villages and cities that never sleep.

You can look at me and see Ben Franklin walking down the streets of Philadelphia with his breadloaf under his arm. You can see the lights of Christmas, and hear the strains of "Auld Lang Syne" as the calendar turns.

I am Babe Ruth and the World Series. I am 130,000 schools and colleges, and 326,000 churches where my people worship God as they think best. I am a ballot dropped in a box, the roar of a crowd in a stadium and

the voice of a choir in a cathedral. I am an editorial in a newspaper and a letter to a Congressman.

I am Eli Whitney and Stephen Foster. I am Tom Edison, Albert Einstein and Billy Graham. I am Horace Greeley, Will Rogers and the Wright brothers. I am George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster and Jonas Salk. I am Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman and Thomas Paine.

Yes, I am the nation, and these are the things that I am. I was conceived in freedom and, God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

May I possess always the integrity, the courage and the strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world.

This is my wish, my goal, my prayer in this year of 1973—one hundred and ninety-seven years after I was born.

LET'S MAKE WAGE GUIDELINES AND COST OF LIVING CHANGES APPLY TO CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think this House made a mistake yesterday when it voted down the rule on House Resolution 512. That would have allowed us to discuss the entire procedure by which congressional salaries are established.

I think that rule should have passed so that, among other things, we could have debated the Rhodes amendment and the entire Commission procedure. I am personally opposed to the Commission procedure and I think we should have changed it.

What we should have done was establish a procedure which would adjust the salaries of Cabinet, Government executives and Members of Congress on a cost-of-living basis.

The average worker is now limited to a 5.5-percent wage increase. I believe that kind of limit would make sense for Members of Congress. It is unrealistic to assume that because Members of Congress have not received a salary increase since 1968 the public would support a 25 to 30 percent increase in congressional pay now. They will not.

Congressional salaries, if they are to be adjusted, should be adjusted on an annual basis and limited to cost-of-living increases. That would insure Members of Congress being accorded the same treatment as anybody else, and it would be much more understandable to the people we represent back home. As things stand now, with the defeat of the rule, salary increases will still be recommended by the President with the advice of his Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries with no specific guidelines. That may be fine in theory, but the public does not trust it and it will not work. We should face that fact.

Future salary increases, when they come, should come in a way that would

create respect for the Congress on the part of the American public.

I hope the leadership of both Houses will look at this question and face the fact that the present system does not work—that it provides for multiyear huge increases which are not acceptable to the public, and gives the Congress a much worse image than it ought to have.

**PUBLIC NOT FOOLED BY OIL
PROPAGANDA BLITZ**

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the House may consider before the August recess H.R. 9130 which would grant a virtual monopoly over the Alaskan oil and the proposed trans-Alaskan pipeline to three oil giants, Arco, BP, and Exxon.

When considering this special interest legislation, I would urge my colleagues to pay particular attention to an interpretive report written by John M. Lee which appeared in the July 30, 1973, Washington Star-News:

**PUBLIC OPINION TURNS AGAINST OIL
COMPANIES**

(By John M. Lee)

NEW YORK.—One of the marvels of the American economy is the collection of giant corporations that make up the oil industry. No one else, not even Germany or Japan, has anything remotely like it. Indeed, these giants, with short signboard names like Exxon, Texaco, Gulf and Mobil, dominate the oil business not only in this country but in Western Europe, the Pacific and Latin America as well.

Vertically integrated from the oil fields of east Texas or Saudi Arabia to the gasoline pumps in Syracuse or Singapore, these corporations have exemplified efficiency, linking a multitude of sources with a multitude of outlets.

The only challenge to the Americans came from British Petroleum and Shell, the British-Dutch entity. But it didn't make much difference since the big companies were all interlinked anyway with joint exploration, production and transport ventures.

The oil industry has enjoyed a powerful, even privileged, position in this country, with strong political influence in Washington, at least on domestic matters. Profits of the giants were bolstered and national defense strengthened by restrictions on imports of cheaper foreign oil, only recently removed, and by tax advantages for producers (the depletion allowance).

Although international conditions are changing rapidly, favorable concession agreements abroad produced enormous profits there at least through the decade of the 1960s.

By the end of last year, the eight largest oil companies in this country had piled up assets of \$76 billion, and their 1972 profits totaled \$4.6 billion.

Despite recent highly publicized problems (such as the energy crisis and more demanding Middle Eastern governments) the oil industry has been doing better than ever. Oil stocks outperformed most other issues on Wall Street in the long market slide last spring, and the earnings reports last week showed the second quarter of this year was the most profitable ever for the industry.

But something has gone awry. After all these years of acquiescence, with only feeble critical jobs, public opinion seems to have turned sharply and abruptly against the industry. And the thing that seems to have done it is this summer's gasoline shortage. The industry is under attack as rarely before.

The greatest manifestation is the recent antitrust complaint brought by the Federal Trade Commission against the eight largest oil companies, charging them with the sins of monopolies, such as forcing the little guys out of business while reaping huge profits for themselves.

More significantly, perhaps, is the fact that Florida and Connecticut have also brought antitrust charges against an even greater collection of oil companies, with similar accusations. New York and Maryland are reportedly ready to follow with their own suits, and still other states are planning to join the lengthening caravan.

No one knows where all this will lead, but the view here is not very far. Predictions that the suits will bring on the greatest industry restructuring since the breakup of the Standard Oil trust in 1911 seem far-fetched. The FTC complaints, for example, doesn't even specify what it wants the industry to do, and the state complaints are similarly vague and in some respects ill-conceived. Efficient alternatives to the present integrated system are not yet in sight.

But whatever the outcome, the oil industry has lost the public relations battle. One recalls all those sober, wordy advertisements from the companies explaining what the energy crisis was all about and those self-righteous public service announcements telling us how to save on gasoline consumption. But it all seems to have backfired into massive public resentment.

Whatever the facts in the case, many people began to wonder whether the crisis wasn't really a colossal public relations effort to get approval of the Alaska pipeline, higher prices, fewer environmental restrictions on ports and refineries or what-have-you. When the abstract energy crisis became the very real gasoline shortage, attitudes, both popular and political, hardened.

The most telling aspect seemed to be not so much on gas purchases to 8 or 10 gallons at a time or even the Sunday closings but the charge that the shortage had been contrived or acquiesced in by the giant companies to force the little guy or independents out of business.

Maybe it was traditional American sympathy for the underdog, but this charge, whether true or not, seemed to reawaken the dormant suspicions of the oil grants and provided the environment for the antitrust charges. Congressional sentiment recognized a popular issue.

SYMBOL OF EXCELLENCE

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the accomplishments of one of the outstanding firms in my district. It is Continental Scale Corp., of 7400 West 100th Place, in Oak Lawn, Ill.

The employees and management have been singled out to receive Sears "Symbol of Excellence" in recognition of merchandise produced during 1972, dependability of supply, and initiative in devel-

oping new and improved products. Only 397 of the 20,000 major merchandising sources of Sears were recipients this year.

At a time when high product quality and dependable customer service have become thought of by some as a vanishing art, it is reassuring that companies like this continue to emphasize excellence in the marketplace. It reflects the ability, morale, and pride of employees and management alike.

It is indeed a pleasure to have such a fine firm in the Third Congressional District of Illinois. I would like to add my congratulations to them for their fine accomplishment.

**A SOUTH BEND, IND., EDITORIAL,
"ANOTHER OFFICIAL LIE"**

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of an editorial from the July 21, 1973, issue of the South Bend, Ind., Tribune concerning the secret bombing of Cambodia in 1969 and 1970.

The text of the editorial, "Another Official Lie," follows:

ANOTHER OFFICIAL LIE

Another official lie in Washington has been exposed. While the United States publicly asserted its respect for Cambodia's neutrality in 1969 and 1970, our Air Force secretly was dropping more than 100,000 tons of bombs on Cambodian territory.

Air Force officers acting on high level orders from Washington falsified the records to conceal the bombing.

The deception was carried on as recently as last month, when the Defense Department deliberately excluded the secret bombing statistics from a report sent to Congress on U.S. air activity in Indochina.

Is it any wonder that American citizens, and those abroad too, react to official statements from military and political leaders with skepticism? If you are lied to repeatedly, how can you take any statement as the gospel truth, even when it is?

The current Defense Department line is that the bombing was done at the request of Gen. Creighton W. Abrams to weaken Communist forces drawn up on the Cambodian side of the border with South Vietnam. Administration officials claim that Prince Norodom Sihanouk, then the ruler of Cambodia, didn't want the bombing publicized.

Naturally the North Vietnamese enemy knew that we were bombing Cambodia, because it was their troops we were trying to hit. The people being deceived were the American citizens who were paying the bill.

The story of deception came out not because Pentagon officials had a delayed twinge of conscience, but because an Air Force major told the Senate Armed Services Committee that he and other officers had deliberately doctored the mission reports under orders.

Faced with this disclosure, the Pentagon finally told the truth. But one is left wondering. By that time Congress had passed the Aug. 15 bombing cut-off law that will end aerial combat in Indochina. Had it not done so, would the Pentagon have lied again to keep its options open? Quite possibly.

Aside from the falsehood involved, the effectiveness of Air Force bombing is again brought into question. Despite this massive burden of explosives from the sky, the bombers failed to prevent the North Vietnamese buildup in Cambodia, and President Nixon was forced to order the invasion of that country which led to the widespread student protests and the tragedy of Kent State.

"THANKS" IS NOT ENOUGH

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, volunteer firemen are unselfish and courageous men who give of their time freely and often must risk their lives to protect their neighbors from the ravages of fire.

The historical tradition of the volunteer firefighter includes our early leaders such as Benjamin Franklin, founder of the first colonial volunteer fire company, George Washington, John Hancock, and Alexander Hamilton.

At the present time, in Connecticut, where the volunteer brigade is a colonial heritage, 425 of 584 individual fire companies are totally or partially staffed by volunteers.

The following editorial from the Express of Thomaston, briefly describes the role that Thomaston's volunteers played in joining with other companies to fight a destructive and costly industrial blaze in nearby Torrington. The cooperation of intertown groups, volunteer and municipal, is a tribute to the cooperative efforts of Connecticut neighbors helping each other in time of need. The editorial also includes a tribute to all volunteer firemen, originally published in the Litchfield Enquirer:

"THANKS" IS NOT ENOUGH

Thomaston's volunteer firemen deserve all the credit this town—and Torrington—can give them. The Thomaston volunteers, an estimated 30 of them all together, were right in the thick of things at Friday night's huge industrial fire in Torrington.

We saw them . . . right on the edge of the inferno with the ladder truck and up on the street relaying water with the pumper. That pumper, by the way, ran steadily for 22 hours, "purring like a kitten," the whole time according to one town official.

Judging by the cars parked by the firehouse all Friday night and into the morning Saturday, most of these volunteer firemen stayed on the job all night long. And if you saw their coats spread out to dry Sunday afternoon, you knew they weren't just standing on the sidelines during those long, hot and dangerous hours.

We think most Thomaston people are well aware of the fine job our firemen did helping a neighboring town. One South Main Street woman asked us to put in a special thanks from her "because my mother lives in Torrington Towers," the elderly housing project that was on the edge of the blaze.

In a way, Thomaston is lucky because it rarely has a real big fire. But then we miss seeing our firefighters in action against a "life or death" situation. Take our word for it, they were great, as were all the volunteer fire companies who came to help Torrington.

Especially fitting is the following item,

forwarded to us by Northfield correspondent Dorothy Johnson after it appeared in the Litchfield Enquirer. We trust that newspaper won't mind if we pass it along. It was originally sent in by a volunteer fireman's wife from Bantam.

"Volunteer firemen are a breed unto themselves.

"Whoever heard of a man who is willing to be on 24 hour duty without pay for the privilege of protecting his neighbor's property?

"Whoever heard of a man who will dash from his desk and ride a 'fire wagon' to the scene of the alarm ruining his suit, neglecting his business, risking his life and exhausting himself physically, not for money but because he believes in serving his community?

"Whoever heard of a man who will give up his favorite TV show, postpone some reading or some 'do-it-yourself' house chores he's been planning (plus sacrificing his evenings with his wife and children) just to attend a meeting where he learns how to function as a volunteer servant in behalf of his fellowmen?

"Whoever heard (in this day and age) of a man who is crazy enough to be worrying about the other fellow?

"Well if you don't know the answers to these questions, look around our firehouse.

"You'll see people who aren't out protesting and demonstrating and complaining because they're too busy living up to the image of a good American.

"You'll see people whose forefathers were made of the same stuff, and that's why we have inherited this wonderful land.

"You'll see people who do care what happens to their neighbors and their community and their country."

Yes, our volunteer fire department is a lot more than shining trucks, snappy marchers and gleaming trophies. It is men who really care, all the time.

BRUCE CORSELIUS, COMMUNITY LEADER, RETIRES AFTER 41 YEARS

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an event that holds great importance for the residents of my congressional district. Mr. Bruce Corselius, manager of Penney's Atlantic Square in Monterey Park, will retire in September after 41 years in the Penney organization. On September 19 he will be honored at a testimonial dinner given by the Monterey Park Chamber of Commerce, the Monterey Park Kiwanis Club, the Atlantic Square Retail Merchants Association, and Penney Associates of Atlantic Square.

Mr. Corselius has given freely of himself in service to his Nation and to his community. During World War II he served as a soldier in the South Pacific. Locally, he has served as an officer and active member of the Kiwanis Club, as director of the chamber of commerce, and as president of the Atlantic Square Retail Merchants Association.

Bruce Corselius has been the manager of Penney's Atlantic Square since its opening in November 1955. He is known

by hundreds of families in my district for his professionalism and fair dealings. Because of his many outstanding qualities, he will be sorely missed by residents throughout the Monterey Park area.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 1973 Captive Nations Week was once again widely observed in all sections of our country. The incoming results of the 15th observance demonstrate the politico-moral commitment of our people toward the 1 billion in Communist captivity. I submit for the RECORD the following examples:

First. The President's Proclamation of the week;

Second. The Proclamations of Governors William G. Milliken, of Michigan, Winfield Dunn, of Tennessee, and Patrick J. Lucey, of Wisconsin;

Third. A statement on the week by the Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch of the Triple Cities, New York.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

As a nation we seek no imposition of our beliefs. But as human beings, we must always keep alive the hope that our great heritage of freedom will one day be enjoyed throughout the world.

As we make progress toward world peace and security, let us continue to show our sympathies for others who aspire to liberty and self-determination. In support of this sentiment, the Eighty-Sixth Congress on July 17, 1959, by a joint resolution, authorized and requested the President to proclaim the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 15, 1973, as Captive Nations Week.

I call upon the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge rededication to the high purpose of individual liberty for all men.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirteenth day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-eighth.

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, PRESENTS THIS EXECUTIVE DECLARATION IN OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Since 1959, the people of the United States have observed the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, a time for expressing support through appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities, for the just aspirations of the captive peoples throughout the world.

A relentless desire for liberty and independence on the part of the people of the Albanian, Armenian, Bulgarian, Byelorussian, Croatian, Czech, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, Serbian, Slovak, Ukrainian, and many other nations which are dominated by the policies of Communist Russia, is important to people everywhere and is of particular concern to the

many people in America who trace their ancestry to these nations.

The freedom-loving people of the Captive Nations look to the United States as the capital of human freedom, and to the people of our nation as an aid and inspiration in their pursuit of freedom and independence.

Therefore, I, William G. Milliken, Governor of the State of Michigan, urge all citizens to join in prayer and hope for the people of the Captive Nations, and to dedicate their efforts to the goal of freedom and liberty for all peoples throughout the world.

Given under my hand this eighteenth day of July in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred seventy-three and of the Commonwealth one hundred thirty-seventh.

STATE OF TENNESSEE PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

Whereas, The greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas, This harmonious unification of our free society has led the people to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas, The submerged nations of the world look to the United States for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas, It is vital to the national security of our country that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive:

Now, therefore, I, Winfield Dunn, as Governor of the State of Tennessee, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15-21, 1973, as Captive Nations Week and urge our citizens to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Tennessee to be affixed at Nashville on this the 6th day of July, 1973.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas, people in many countries and nations throughout the world are deprived of individual freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States in July, 1959, recognized the existence of the captive nations and authorized the celebration of Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas, this week provides a suitable framework for American citizens to express their support for the just aspirations of freedom and liberty for all people.

Now, therefore, I, Patrick J. Lucey, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15 through 21, 1973 as Captive Nations Week in the State of Wisconsin, and I further urge all citizens to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the Capitol in the City of Madison, this sixth day of July in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy-three.

STATEMENT ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK (By Ukrainian Congress Committee)

As a result of an act of Congress in the spring of 1959, Public Law 86-90 gave the President of the United States the power to proclaim the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. The President asks that all people in America join their fellow citizens, whose homelands are captive, in commemo-

rating such a week and remembering that the freedom which they experience in the United States is not experienced the world over, and especially not in countries such as Armenia, Lithuania, and Ukraine, which are included in the Soviet Union.

Throughout the years, one of the greatest efforts on behalf of the leaders of the Soviet Union was to stop the issuing of the proclamation. Such an attempt proves that what is said in the proclamation is true, not just propaganda.

THE ABC'S ON RUSSIA AND THE USSR

During this Captive Nations Week, it is only proper to review some of the misconceptions about Russia and the USSR (Soviet Union).

The USSR is *not* Russia. The most common myth propagated in journalism and in our high government circles is the use of the terms "Russia" and "Soviet Union" interchangeably, as if they were identical in reference to territory and peoples. A quick glance at the Constitution of the Soviet Union would show that Russia is only one of the fifteen republics comprising the USSR. In language, history, culture, and religion, the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are as different from the Russians, as the French are from the Germans, or the Chinese from the Japanese. This mis-identification weakens our evaluation of the problems in the USSR and impedes our understanding of its major sources of weakness.

RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The only remaining empire in the world is the multi-national empire called the USSR. Russians are the masters in this empire, and they have kept up their colonialism in existence by terror, "kangaroo" courts, and concentration camps.

The New York Times of Sunday, June 17, 1973, printed a full page "Open letter to the American people", signed by some sixty-six American scholars in defense of the Ukrainian intellectuals. This letter gives an expose of the crass violations of human rights in Ukraine, which amounts to cultural genocide.

And Ukrainians are not alone in resisting oppression and Russification. Lithuanians, Latvians, the Tartars, the Azerbaizhanis, Jews, and the Russians themselves, are protesting against the trampling of their human rights, and challenging the Kremlin rulers despite the dangers of incarceration in concentration camps or insane asylums.

APPEAL FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Telegrams have been sent to our congressional leaders: Senator James L. Buckley, Senator Jacob K. Javits, and Representative Howard W. Robison. In these telegrams their support is asked for the following actions:

(1) To ask President Nixon that he instruct our U.N. Delegation to initiate a full scale debate in the United Nations on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. The need for such a debate is more urgent than ever, for the Russian genocide of the non-Russian Captive Nations will only strengthen Russian totalitarianism against the Free World.

(2) To start immediately a full-scale review in Congress of U.S. policy toward the USSR. Never in our history has Congress undertaken such a review. Such a review, we feel, would be most productive for our nation's course.

THE GROWTH OF EXECUTIVE POWER

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, if the current Watergate scandal has a beneficial

side, that may be found in the questioning of Executive power and the centralization of authority which has been occurring in American Government since the days of the New Deal.

People throughout the country are asking themselves the question: "Why are so many men in so many high places in Washington involved in so much corruption?"

More and more, people are coming to understand that government involvement in every aspect of the lives of American citizens has led to a situation in which the opportunities for corruption are multiplied a hundredfold.

If government did not have the power to set wages and prices, no one would feel the need to bribe anyone for a favorable ruling. If government did not have huge contracts to bestow, no one would think of paying politicians for a piece of the action. If government did not provide itself with the power to regulate, no one would feel the need to bribe anyone for or against a particular ruling.

In an article prompted by the Credit Mobilier scandal early in this century, E. L. Godkin, editor of the Nation, warned that the only lasting answer to bribery and corruption would be an end to the power of government to bestow great privileges upon private individuals or corporations. Godkin wrote:

The remedy is simple. The government must get out of the 'protective' business and the 'subsidy' business and the 'improvement' business and the 'development' business. It must let trade and commerce, and manufactures, and steamboats and railroads, and telegraphs alone. It cannot touch them without breeding corruption.

Most conspicuous in recent days has been the growth of the Executive Office of the President. Discussing this growth Dr. Daniel J. Boorstin, director of the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of History and Technology, noted:

There are hundreds of people who write on White House stationery. This is a new phenomenon. In fact, it's a phenomenon which has astonished, and properly astonished, some Senators who asked the counsellor of the President if he ever saw the President and he said he didn't. And I think there are something like 40 persons who bear some title such as counsellor to the President or assistant to the President or something of that sort. Now this is a relatively new phenomenon: the opportunity for the President to get out of touch with the people who speak in his name.

Dr. Boorstin declares that:

The Executive Office of the President has expanded beyond all bounds and has tended to supersede the executive branch of government. Some drastic reconsideration of that is in order.

I wish to share with my colleagues the thoughts of Dr. Daniel J. Boorstin about the growth of Executive power and insert into the RECORD at this time excerpts from an interview with him conducted by the Congressional Quarterly as they appeared in the Washington Post of July 21, 1972:

THE GROWTH OF EXECUTIVE POWER

(By Daniel J. Boorstin)

Q: Many Americans seem to feel that Watergate is just politics as usual. Others see the series of scandals as unprecedented in American political history, profoundly dif-

ferent and more serious than previous misconduct. What do you think?

A: Well, if we consider the problem of democracy to be essentially that of people in power refusing to use the power in ways that are not authorized and not decent and not constitutional. I would say that what makes this different from earlier problems in our society is that today the opportunities for the misuse of power are greater. Just stop to think for a moment about some of the central implements in the Watergate scandal. The most conspicuous was the Executive Office of the President. Why there are hundreds of people who write on White House stationery. This is a new phenomenon. In fact, it's a phenomenon which has astonished, and properly astonished, some senators who asked the counsellor of the President if he ever saw the President and he said he didn't. And I think there are something like 40 persons who bear some title such as counsellor to the President or assistant to the President or something of that sort. Now this is a relatively new phenomenon: the opportunity for the President to get out of touch with the people who speak in his name.

Q: One of the obvious effects of Watergate has been to undermine the effectiveness of the President very early in his second term. Are there any historical precedents for this and, if so, what are the implications for the balance of power between the Congress and the President?

A: One of the things that we've witnessed which has not been sufficiently pointed out is the great advantage that the nation has at the moment in having a fixed-term election. If this had been a parliamentary system the government would have fallen, there would have been, perhaps, another party put in power and then there would have been criminal prosecutions. The problem would not have been dramatized as a political problem. The members of Congress or Parliament as it might have been, who were in the party of the President, would have been interested to minimize the episode so that it wouldn't affect their re-election. They would have to go to the people to be re-elected. It would be in their interest to minimize.

Now, in the present situation, where we see such an even-handed concern among Republicans and Democrats over this problem, this is to no small extent due to the fact that they're in there and that they are re-elected for a fixed term, especially the senators—for a senatorial term—and that when they expose the misdeeds of the leader of their party in the White House, they are not thereby requiring themselves to go to the people and stand for election. So that there's a kind of antiseptis.

The separation of powers is proving itself in some interesting ways, and I would say that one of the consequences of this, in public opinion, has been that whatever effect this may have had on the prestige of the presidency, the respect of the American people for the Congress has been increased. They can see the Congress as a vigilant Congress. The virtue of vigilance is certainly dramatized so that in a new way we have seen the wisdom—in almost an unsuspected way—the wisdom of the writers of the Constitution in separating the powers this way.

Q: Watergate, then, to you, doesn't reveal any fundamental weaknesses in the present system that require change by Constitution or by law?

A: I think the passage of the 22nd Amendment in the Constitution (limiting presidents to two terms) was a mistake. I think that the proposal for a six-year term for the president is also misguided. I think one of the points in having a representative government is to have the elected person in power always subject to the possibility of being re-elected or not being re-elected. It's just conceivable that the President might have been more vigilant if he had known

that he was going to be a candidate in another election or at least might be a candidate in another election.

That was very shortsighted and, I think, malicious constitutional amendment. It doesn't belong in the Constitution. And I think that the notion that it is desirable to have a president who can give his full attention to the "presidency" and not worry about reelection is quite a mistake. What we want is a president who will be thinking about the prospects of re-election and will wonder what reaction the public will have to what he's doing as president. That's what we mean by representative government.

Q: What do you see as the ultimate result of Watergate? Will it change our political institutions in any profound manner? Where is this episode going to lead us as a nation or as a people?

A: As a historian I am inclined to be impressed by the continuity of our institutions, and I am extremely skeptical when I read the obituaries for our nation. There has probably never been a scandal in American history which was not decreed as the end of American civilization and the destruction of all public and private morality. I think this episode has probably had the effect abroad of dramatizing our concern with certain standards of public morality. And in that sense it's probably been a good thing. And it has dramatized the power of Congress. It has dramatized the integrity of our courts and it will probably have the effect of making anybody who sits in the presidential chair be more scrupulous of his use of the government—of the powers of the presidency.

In a practical way, one of the questions which should arise immediately is the question of the nature of the Executive Office of the President. I think that should be subject to investigation and scrutiny. Perhaps there should be some committee investigating that. The Executive Office of the President has expanded beyond all bounds and has tended to supersede the executive branch of the government. Some drastic reconsideration of that is in order. American citizens in general do not realize the extent of the Executive Office.

The dangers of that growth have been dramatized in Watergate, and in several ways. First, by making it possible for people to use or seem to use the authority of the President without his knowledge. And, then, by making it possible for a President to say (with some credibility) that he didn't know what was going on. That is an equally disastrous fact and one which should give us pause. The Executive Office of the President ought to be scrutinized. I cannot believe that the responsibility of the office is served by its proliferation. How many of these people and how many of these White House "positions" were simply superfluous? As I watched some of the Watergate hearings I kept asking myself what all these people—Dean and others—were doing there in the first place. Was there really an honest job there that needed doing?

BILL WOULD END BUGGING CRITICIZED BY U.S. JUDGE

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, I introduced H.R. 9667, a bill which would stop the recently revealed White House practice of recording the conversations of important Government officials, diplomats, and even White House staff members without their knowledge.

My bill would outlaw secret taping not only in the White House, but anywhere. Under my bill, all parties to a communication must be notified before the conversation may legally be recorded.

U.S. District Court Judge Gerhard Gesell, in a Washington Post article on July 28, characterized eavesdropping and bugging as "growing intrusions of privacy" which continue "to proliferate without judicial supervision."

I bring the full report of Judge Gesell's comments to the attention of my colleagues and urge their support for my bill:

BUGGING GROWTH DISMAYS JUDGE—GESELL
SAYS COURTS CAN'T STOP TREND

(By Donald P. Baker)

U.S. District Court Judge Gerhard A. Gesell expressed alarm yesterday at the growing use of electronic surveillance by the government, but said the courts are powerless to stop it when one of the parties, often a police informer, consents to the snooping, usually in return for a favor.

"Whatever incidental good flows from this invasion of privacy is submerged by the growing appearance of police surveillance so typical of totalitarian states," wrote Gesell.

His strong criticism, and an appeal for legislation to make the snooping illegal, were written as he denied a motion to suppress tape recording the government plans to use in pressing perjury and conspiracy charges against Montgomery County businessman Joel Kline and two associates.

Gesell found that the "consensual over-hearing in this case does not violate any provision of the Constitution or any statute . . . Only legislation requiring a warrant in these cases can correct the growing intrusions of privacy so central to the Bill of Rights."

Partially on the basis of conversations taped by an FBI informer, the three men were indicted May 18 on charges that they paid at least \$50,000 to witnesses in attempts to influence testimony in a Securities and Exchange Commission investigation into possible stock manipulation among Kline's vast holdings.

Kline, 34, of 4545 Willard Ave., Chevy Chase, once was a leading candidate for the post of Maryland bank commissioner. He became a multimillionaire land developer before the age of 30. He was indicted with Eric A. Baer, 44, of 6908 Nevis Rd., Bethesda, and Donald H. Abrams, 40, of 8707 Yarmouth Ct., Potomac.

In denying the defendants' request to suppress the tapes, Gesell said the practice of informers taping conversations "is now routine, as any experienced trial judge knows, and it continues to proliferate without judicial supervision."

Assistant U.S. Attorney Robert W. Oregon has said that a major witness against the three men will be John G. Lassise, president of Lassise & Co. 7316 Wisconsin Ave., Bethesda. In the indictment, Lassise was named as participating in many of the overt acts allegedly committed by the three indicated men, but was not charged with any crime.

Gesell said that "it is now conclusively established that the Fourth Amendment is not violated where, during an investigation, a government agent consents to record his private conversation with others who are suspect without revealing his true identity or purpose.

"This principle, laboriously and somewhat hesitantly fashioned in the give-and-take of many decisions involving covert over-hearing has practical consequences.

"Informers, in return for government promises or hope of favors, are equipped with recording devices and sent into the homes and offices of their friends and confidants to trap their words on tape and to turn incrim-

inating evidence over to law enforcement agents.

"Many individuals, without any knowledge of the government, secretly tape their own provocative conversations with others for ulterior purposes and use casual remarks to extort or intimidate . . .

"Highly accurate and sensitive devices are available. Conversations with the informer can be heard by the government through walls and even at some distance away, while government agents and others sit concealed and unobserved."

Gesell said that "in this case, the informer was apparently expected to have a lengthy conversation. The equipment carried on the informer's body was not capable of running for the expected duration of the talk.

"Thus, with his consent, he was also wired to a broadcasting device, and the entire conversation was broadcast to an FBI car in the street outside, where it was immediately also recorded and permanently captured for government use.

"Electronic gadgetry thus pushes the rationale of the cases to extreme. A government agent can plant a broadcasting transmitter in a person's home, car or office without court approval and transmit conversation of a consenting informer so long as the informer's presence is known and accepted by the other occupants, even though they are completely unaware of and indeed affirmatively misled as to the informer's purpose."

Gesell noted that an earlier ruling by him that such conversations were illegal was reversed on appeal, with the higher court "noting that the hunter i.e., the prosecutor, should be permitted to pursue the tactics of the hunted, particularly where the hunted is sophisticated."

The government has said it has "crucially incriminating tapes" of a private conversation at Kline's penthouse office, during the SEC investigation.

While conceding that the admission of the tapes "must be accepted by law," Gesell warned that "this is an enormously dangerous and insidious power to place in the unsupervised hands of the public and the police."

In another District Court criminal action that involves tape recorded conversations by an informer, Judge Oliver Gasch took under advisement yesterday a government motion to dismiss a perjury charge against indicted metropolitan police Lt. Harold F. Crook.

The U.S. attorney first sought to drop the charge last Oct. 21, but Gesell angrily refused, saying the action would make a "travesty of justice." Gesell withdrew from the case a week later.

Since his indictment along with seven other police officers in January, 1972, Crook has been cooperating with prosecutors, and he is expected to be a key witness in trials beginning this fall against 12 other police officers, including an inspector. Most of the evidence reportedly came from conversations between Crook and the indicted officers.

U.S. CUSTOMS HOLY NAME SOCIETY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to my colleagues' attention an important address by the Most Reverend Patrick V. Ahern, auxiliary bishop of the Archdiocese of New York, given at the 49th Annual Corporate Communion Breakfast of the Customs Holy Name Society for the port of New York.

In his remarks, his excellency points out the necessity for change and how all institutions, including the church, have changed in our society. Change for the better is not something to be feared, but should be looked upon as a means of improving vitality and responsiveness in the church, in government, in all institutions and individuals.

I hope my colleagues will benefit by the message presented in the following address:

U.S. CUSTOMS HOLY NAME SOCIETY

In the course of the extensive research involved in preparing this talk, my curiosity sent me to the dictionary to investigate the word "customs" as it applies to your occupation. For those who have not looked it up, I wish to report that its first meaning is "any habitual practice." By the fifth dictionary definition, it has come to mean "a customary tax or tribute due by feudal tenants to their lord." Under meaning number eight, we come upon this definition, which puts it in your field: "duties imposed by law on imported or, less commonly, exported goods."

We are all aware that once a tax of any kind is levied, it readily becomes "a habitual practice." Taxes are born with remarkable ease; they die hard. In fact, they almost never die, nor—unlike old soldiers—do they fade away. Once the government takes a piece of the traffic, whether it is on imports, exports, real estate, foodstuffs, whiskey, cigarettes, or whatever—and lastly, and most ingeniously, a person's income—the government never lets go.

It's like a second collection in church. Once the pastor institutes it on the first Sunday of the month—perhaps for some dire emergency—he finds it a habit very hard to kick, and the ushers had better settle down without grumbling on an extra trip down the aisle with the basket. The best they can hope for is that he will not put in a third collection.

Such customs do not easily change. However, in recent years a number of other customs have changed in the Church, to the joy of some and the consternation of others, and I would like to focus for a moment this morning on this phenomenon of change in the Church, what it has done to us, what it has done for us, and where it leaves us as Roman Catholics.

First of all, it has shaken us up. When you change people's symbols, especially their religious symbols, you really shake them up. I was talking recently with a very old lady who all her life has been a devout Catholic. Quite surprisingly, she said: "You know, I'm not really so sure as I used to be that there is a life hereafter." By way of explanation, she said: "They've changed so much in our religion. I used to love Mass in Latin; I knew how to follow it in my missal. It was nice and quiet in Church and I got a lot out of going. I don't like all this singing and lay people reading the Bible at us." I laughed and replied: "Well, you really got back at them good—now you don't believe in a life hereafter! That's what I call getting even." I'm sure the lovely old lady still does believe in a future life—there isn't much religion left if you don't—and like the rest of us she will walk forward to meet it with that mixture of trepidation and faith which is the best that any of us can bring to the moment of death.

But her reaction is not untypical of many Catholics. The great danger is that in a time of change and upsetment, we will be tempted to throw out the baby with the bathwater. The Church has changed a great number of her customs. We don't have to eat fish on Friday, nor fast from midnight before receiving Holy Communion. If we like that kind of thing, we can get cremated instead of buried. An annulment is a little easier to obtain.

Priests can leave the ministry without leaving the Church. Nuns can wear minis and maxis. We pray together with Protestants and Jews. In June, Cardinal Cooke will ordain a dozen married deacons. The list of changes could go on and on.

All these changes are *accidental* changes. They do not touch the substance of the Faith. It is essential that each of us have a firm grasp of that distinction. Basically, in her deepest essence, the Church we belong to is the Church of our forebears. The Church to which people belonged in France, or Ireland, or Germany, or Poland, whose tombstones bear 16th Century dates. The Church of the Middle Ages and St. Thomas Aquinas. The Church of the 5th century and St. Augustine. The Church of lovable St. Peter and intrepid St. Paul. The Church finally of Jesus Christ, Our Lord.

Faith of our fathers, living still
In spite of dungeon fire and sword
Oh how our hearts beat high with joy
Whene'er we hear that glorious word
Faith of our fathers, holy faith
We will be true to you till death.

We still believe in the Apostles' Creed, every article of it. We still accept the ten commandments. It is still right to love and honor your wife and teach the Faith to your children. We still remain in perfect union with the Pope, who is the successor of St. Peter. Holy Mass, whether you call it the Liturgy or the Eucharist, is still the burning center of the Church. Without Our Eucharistic Lord, there is no Church, and all who would be living members must gather around the altar for the same Sacrifice. The Blessed Virgin Mary is still the first lady of the Church, and indeed her holy Mother and the Mother of all of us.

Nothing essential has changed. The Church has simply discarded certain customs in the hope of addressing the twentieth century more successfully.

You may question her wisdom in doing so. Personally, I think she has made some splendid moves. Just to take one example, I believe that the new Liturgy is a vast improvement over the Mass I knew as a boy. My brother argues with me about that. The new Mass is a matter of opinion, but so was the old Latin Mass. I had an experience a year ago in Quebec that confirmed me in my opinion. I had gone with a group of pilgrims to St. Anne de Beaupré. The day after the pilgrimage was over, I offered Mass in the Cathedral of Quebec. Three elderly people walked over from the hotel with me. When I got to the sacristy, I found that all the missals were in French, and my only option was to say Mass out of the old Latin Missal. I asked my three friends if they would like to attend a Latin Mass. They said: "Oh, we'd love to!" I went through the ancient rite as it was twenty years ago, pronouncing everything clearly. When it was over, I asked: "How did you like it?" They said: "It was *awful*. We didn't understand one word you said!" I think the same kind of experience would cure a lot of people of hankering for the days gone by.

We've been moving forward and the future is not at all dismal. We are in a period of transition and, in many ways, a time even of revolution. But we shall come out of it stronger. In the process, some will fall away as some already have. But one has to wonder how strong their faith was to begin with.

We're doing a lot of right things; such as insisting that parents come for instructions prior to the baptism of their child. The same is being done for first Communion, Penance and Confirmation. These catechumenates, as they are called, are an effort to center the faith in the family, to let people know that the first Christian school is the home. If we are to have strong faith in the generations coming along, it will be enkindled by parents who themselves really believe and care about the religion of their

children. The generation gap has to be faced where it is, within the family. Quite literally, our children's faith must be "the faith of our fathers" if it is to survive.

Incidentally, the name of the hymn is "Faith of Our Fathers"—not "Faith of Our Mothers." No one would even downplay a mother's importance in the religious upbringing of children, but let us never forget the fundamental responsibility of the Christian father, who is the head of the small church that exists in his home and whose teaching and example of faith can mean so much to the faith of his children.

The dozen deacons whom the Cardinal will ordain are only a beginning, like the twelve Apostles. In the years ahead, deacons will hopefully perform very useful services to our parishes and in various other apostolates.

Things like marriage encounters have gained considerable popularity and may well prove very helpful in strengthening Catholic family life.

While parish missions have largely faded in popularity, weekend retreats have caught on with a great number of our lay people.

Parish Councils in many parishes (though unfortunately not in all) are putting new life into parishes.

These are just a few of the signs of vitality and hope that appear in today's changing Church. Singing the blues about "what has happened to us" is not at all in order. Much that has happened is wonderful.

Our Catholic Church is very ancient—20 centuries old. It is blessed with a perennial power to go through crises and come out stronger. Its Founder is God and He made a promise to His original Church: "I am with You all days." Our Church is not about to dry up and blow away. It's about to be reborn, as it has been dozens of times before.

So my message this morning is a very simple one: Don't be discouraged by "all the changes." Don't let your joy in belonging to the Church become tarnished at all. Get with it. Get with the Church. And stay with it through every trial.

PHILADELPHIA GENERAL HOSPITAL
STROKE CENTER

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic and serious illnesses known to man is stroke. However, at the Philadelphia General Hospital, the Stroke Center is using a new approach in the treatment of stroke patients. This breakthrough will increase the brain blood flow in the patient, a crucial consideration in the treatment of stroke.

I would like to congratulate Dr. Martin Reivich, director of the Stroke Center, and his staff on this new development. They may be proud that they have made a considerable achievement to their profession, but even more importantly, they may be proud that they have reduced the potential for suffering and illness among their fellow men.

I insert into the RECORD a statement from the city representative of the city of Philadelphia which describes this work:

PHILADELPHIA GENERAL HOSPITAL STROKE
CENTER

A new approach in the treatment of stroke patients is being conducted at the Philadelphia General Hospital Stroke Center. Ac-

ording to the director of the Stroke Center, Martin Reivich, M.D., this is a new method which enables a physician to study the rate of brain blood flow in direct response to medication given to the patient.

"A decrease of brain blood flow is usually the cause for the stroke," Dr. Reivich pointed out. He further explained that in the treatment of stroke patients, the ultimate purpose of medication given is to increase the brain blood flow. "This method measures the increase in blood flow and, therefore, the effectiveness of the medication," he said.

According to Dr. Reivich, this treatment is easily performed at the stroke patient's bedside. The patient breathes a small amount of radioactive gas mixed with air. The gas is completely harmless when used in this manner, the director emphasized. Because the PGH Stroke Center is connected by telephone to a computer at the University of Pennsylvania, the results are obtained at the Stroke Center within minutes.

"This allows us to use the results immediately in the treatment of patients. This saves several days delay in getting the test results which would occur without the direct hook-up to the computer," Dr. Reivich added. The doctors then know if they should continue the medication being used, he concluded.

The hospital team at the PGH Stroke Center consists of three neurologists, a neuro-radiologist, two cardiologists and special nurses trained for the care of stroke victims. The PGH Stroke Center, comprised of 19 beds, was opened in 1966, and the research being conducted is funded through the National Institute of Health.

WARSAW UPRISING DAY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, every American old enough to remember should recall vividly the high emotion which we experienced 29 years ago tomorrow when the people of Warsaw, Poland, united in one effort to overcome their Nazi oppressors. It was on August 1, 1944, that the free world listened avidly to radio reports and scanned the newspapers for further word on the uprising being staged in Warsaw. Unfortunately, the free world has become sated with the repetitious news of more and more Nazi atrocities and acts of violence. To have word of a brave and almost defenseless people rising up against the Nazi military might was indeed welcome.

We gloried in the reports of the Polish people as they began what was to be a futile 63-day battle against the overwhelming might of Hitler's forces. Our hearts warmed to the bravery of these men, women, and children and our prayers were lifted in their behalf. As the daily report of their losses grew to a total of more than 200,000, our sympathy deepened for the survivors. We were proud of the manner in which they fought for freedom with every type of weapon upon which they could lay their hands. We were saddened by the reports and pictures of Polish patriots, men, women, and children, lying dead upon the bloody streets of Warsaw while Rus-

sian Communist soldiers idly watched them being slain. Our resentment at the Nazi cruel and ruthless treatment of these patriots was equaled only by resentment and abhorrence of the atrocious conduct of the Russian troops who could and should have helped these people in their struggle to free themselves of oppression. Looking back in retrospect, we see now that the inhuman conduct of the Russians on this occasion was a clear indication of the type of callous indifference to human suffering which would characterize Communist Russia's treatment of millions upon millions of people over the ensuing years. The Russians demonstrated then as they have done ever since a complete disregard for law and order and an unceasing desire to subjugate all mankind to a life pattern of their own design and implementation—a goal to which they aspire with increasing intensity.

It irks me not a little and it gives me real concern that so many of our well-educated and apparently well-intentioned people fail to realize that the Communist leaders of the world are today just as callous to the suffering of people—just as indifferent to the rights and well-being of innocent people as were the scolding coldblooded Russian Communist soldiers during the Nazi subjugation of the Warsaw patriots.

Far too many of our people permit themselves to bathe in the roseate dreams of Soviet friendship—of peaceful coexistence and of a return of warm and mutually respected political and economic relationships.

It takes no foreign affairs specialist—no skilled political analyst to see through the smog of United States-U.S.S.R. discussions or negotiations that thus far the Russians have put out on the discussion table nothing of their own. Instead, they seek to bargain for items which we already possess and seek to keep. When the Russian Communists will volunteer the emancipation of their enslaved millions—when they will offer freedom to the relatives of the Warsaw victims and their survivors, there would be a reasonable basis to have confidence in their proposed treaties. When they demonstrate their desire to rectify some of their brutal acts of aggression, we could place a little more reliance upon their sincerity.

As we recall the tragic outcome of the Warsaw uprising, may we assess anew our previous dealings which the Red Communist regimes and keep our minds alert to the usual Communist perfidy. Mr. Speaker, we cannot be too careful.

CONSUMERISM ON THE MOVE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will make it much easier for individuals to get a settlement on their loss and damage claims

suffered with moving carriers. My proposed legislation will give the Interstate Commerce Commission the authority to adjudicate cargo loss and damage claims between private citizens and moving carrier companies.

In today's mobile society, many citizens use moving carriers to transport their belongings across the country. If a citizen suffers loss or damage to his belongings, and the moving carrier company is not cooperative toward settlement of the claim, the only course of action left to the citizen is to take his claim to court.

In today's fast-moving society, the citizen who takes his claim to court is faced with a fair but sometimes very slow course of action.

In today's high-cost society, the citizen who takes his claim to court is faced with nearly prohibitive legal fees. Many a citizen fails to take his claim to court for the simple reason that the cost of his legal fees may well exceed the amount at issue in the claim.

Many varied claims are filed with moving carriers, ranging from theft and pilferage to wreck or damage from excessive heat or cold. Thousands of claims are filed each year with moving carriers, and my bill will help many of the unsettled claims to be resolved in an expeditious and fair manner. In 1971, with 74 carriers reporting, 72,710 claims were still pending at the end of the year. Many of these claims could be settled speedily by the ICC under this legislation.

The problems consumers have with moving were forcibly brought to my attention by the horrifying experience suffered by a constituent of mine. This man moved his family from Maine to California, and the moving van transporting his belongings was involved in an accident on the Connecticut Turnpike and overturned—but he was not notified of the accident until 2 weeks after it had occurred. Many of his belongings were damaged—items that had been in his family for many years and had both sentimental and monetary value. The moving company was totally uncooperative in making good on the damage claim. I am pleased to introduce this legislation to help many other families who suffer cargo loss and damage.

The ICC has endorsed legislation, which, in similar form, was introduced in the Senate by Senator BIBLE. My proposal will eliminate the costly and time-consuming court procedure through which the individual must go in order to have his disputed claim settled. This legislation will enable the citizen to submit his written complaint to the ICC, whereupon the ICC will decide the claim between the moving carrier company and the private citizen. Other regulatory agencies have similar power to investigate problems between private citizens and business. For example, the Federal Communications Commission has the authority to investigate unsettled claims between individuals and communications common carriers. This legislation provides that either party may appeal the ICC's decision to Federal court.

My proposed legislation will aid the

private citizen and businessman by allowing him to bring his claim to the attention of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This bill will discourage the moving carrier companies from ignoring the smaller claims which the carrier companies may feel that the individual will not take to court because of the prohibitive legal fees. The citizen will have the opportunity to take the initiative in getting his own claim settled, instead of continuing the sometimes futile attempts to get the moving carrier company to act on the claim. I ask your support of this consumer protection legislation which affects an increasingly important aspect of our society.

THE NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION POSITION: NATIONAL LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in Congress a resolution adopted by the New York State Bar Association House of Delegates on June 29 of this year.

It concerns the establishment of a national legal services corporation—its scope, and its goals and urges the Congress to remove the restrictive amendments unwisely added to the bill by this body when it considered this measure last month. I hope that my colleagues will carefully heed the overwhelming advice of the professional bar on this matter.

I submit the full text of this resolution:

NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY HOUSE OF DELEGATES, JUNE 29, 1973

Whereas the New York State Bar Association supports the establishment of a national legal service corporation to take over the legal services programs presently funded by O.E.O.; and

Whereas, the House of Delegates adopted the following resolution in March, 1973,

Resolved that the New York State Bar Association reaffirm its support of a national legal services corporation as urged by the American Bar Association and ask the Congress and the Administration to join in the enactment of a law to establish a National Legal Services Corporation and to take such action as is necessary to assure the continuity and adequate funding of the national legal services program.

Whereas the Association believes that legal services lawyers should not be subject by law to limitations which unduly restrict or impair the kind and quality of legal services they can perform on behalf of eligible clients; and

Whereas the Legal Services Corporation Act passed by the House of Representatives on June 21, 1973 imposes significant restrictions upon the kind of cases legal services lawyers can take and upon the kind of representation they can provide and unduly restricts the corporation in its use and application of appropriated funds;

Now, therefore, The Association urges the Senators and Congressmen from the State of New York to support the establishment of a national legal services corporation that:

(a) is adequately funded to meet the com-

panying need for legal representation of eligible indigent clients;

(b) permits legal services lawyers to provide the same representation to indigent clients that the private bar provides to its clients;

(c) has sufficient flexibility in its personnel policies, and the use and application of its funds to permit an innovative attack on the problem of providing legal representation to the indigent; and

(d) is not restricted by statute in the kind of cases that it can take or the nature of the legal assistance it can provide to eligible clients.

EXECUTIVE LOBBYING ACT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill which will address an area of influence seeking not covered in current law or contemplated by other proposals to reveal the actions of lobbyists. I call the bill the Executive Lobbying Act because its focus is exclusively on the activities of lobbyists as they try to influence executive policy.

As we have seen in the daily press, the seeking of influence in the executive branch is a common activity—one which seems to yield uncommon dividends these days if it is successful. We are fortunate that an active press has called to our attention many of the worst examples of special interests which received favorable treatment from the executive in return for a consideration—often monetary. What we need is a law to protect the public from the activities of special interests as the business of government becomes more complicated.

The present Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act directs its attention exclusively at lobbying activity within the national legislature. State acts have a similarly narrow focus. Yet the wise lobbyist in any capital realizes that the most important time at which to make his wishes known is at the very beginning of the executive policymaking process—when the executive has been able to identify a problem but has only begun to cast about for a solution. Specialized knowledge brought to bear by an outside interest at this point can affect the entire subsequent course of policy. This is a particularly critical point, for example, for manufacturers of high-cost defense equipment, or for research-oriented corporations and "thinktanks." It is a key time for environmentalist and counter-environmentalist issues to be raised. In short, Mr. Speaker, for lobbyists it makes good sense to be in on the ground floor of any executive decision, helping to design specifications or regulations or to draft legislation. Lobbying in the Congress becomes a great deal easier if the Congress is already considering a proposal which includes the lobbyist's point of view. Winning a new production contract is easier if a representative of your corporation has helped the executive describe what it is that he wants to buy.

This suggests to me that the Congress and the public have a vested interest in knowing who is lobbying the executive at any point in time, what is the subject of his concern, from whom he gets his money, and precisely how he spends it to influence executive policy. To this end, I am pleased to introduce the Executive Lobbying Act—a bill which provides for the disclosure of certain facts by the special interests at work in the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, I feel bound to add one final remark: No one who comes to Washington to do business fairly need fear either the Executive Lobbying Act or the Open Government Act, which I have also introduced. All Members of Congress are most keenly aware of the rights of citizens to petition their Government, and in no way do we intend to restrict their right. Indeed, the whole Government might act less responsibly if special interests did not make their desires and expectations known. Everyone belongs to some special interest group. Disclosure of lobbying activities, as provided by both bills, would protect the right of the majority of citizens to petition by requiring that they be given enough information to know when to do so. Unless the lobbying part of the governmental process is revealed more completely, citizens will not know when their interests are in jeopardy, and the Congress will not know how to help them find protection.

FLEXIBLE HOURS EMPLOYMENT ACT

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a bill with 17 of my colleagues that will, if enacted, be a breakthrough in meeting the employment needs of thousands of Americans. It would institutionalize the practice of flexible hours employment positions for workers in Federal civil service jobs and help to end discrimination generated by the standard pattern of working hours.

The flexible hours employment option will be a step in providing job designs which further the advancement of women—especially working mothers—by offering them greater employment opportunities. Together with more comprehensive maternity benefits and greater availability of child care, the restructuring of job patterns such as this bill provides will help speed the implementation of the affirmative action programs to which we are all committed.

Many Americans cannot or do not desire to work on a full-time, 9-to-5 basis. Advantages of flexible hours employment exist for students who need time to pursue their educations, for older workers approaching retirement age who may want to ease their workloads, for handicapped individuals who may prefer shorter workdays as well as for working

parents who have childrearing responsibilities. Congress must not bypass this opportunity for productive utilization of the abilities and education of a large segment of our population.

The bill, which has been introduced in the other body by Senator TUNNEY, calls for a 5-year phase-in period, at the end of which 10 percent of all Federal civil service jobs will be on the flexible hours basis. This bill provides across-the-board permanent positions in which workers receive, on a pro rata basis, all benefits normally available to full-time employees in similar positions or grades.

I urge swift action on this bill. When enacted, it can serve as an example to many private and public employers, helping them to set up more flexible hour positions. Thousands of Americans will benefit from the increased flexibility in job options and the resulting enhancement in quality of work and family life.

Cosponsors of the Flexible Hours Employment Act are Ms. BURKE of California, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. WALDIE.

A text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9699

A bill to provide increased employment opportunity by executive agencies of the United States Government for persons unable to work standard working hours, 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 "Flexible Hours Employment Act".

SECTION 1. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "executive agency" means an executive department, a Government corporation, and an independent establishment, including the United States Postal Service;

(2) "flexible hours employment" means part-time employment, as for example, four hours per work day or, one, two, three, or four days per workweek, and includes such other arrangements as the Secretary establishes consistent with the policy set forth in section 2(a); and

(3) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 2. (a) It is the policy of the United States Government that, unless adjudged impossible by the Secretary, at least 2 per centum of the positions at each and all levels in all executive agencies shall be available on a flexible hours employment basis for persons who cannot work or do not desire to work full time within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, 4 per centum of such positions shall be available for such persons. Not later than three years after the enactment of this Act, 6 per centum of such positions shall be available for such persons. Not later than four years after the enactment of this Act, 8 per centum of such positions shall be available for such persons. Not later than five years after the date of enactment of this Act, 10 per centum of such positions shall be available for such persons.

(b) Each executive agency shall adopt and maintain procedures, continuously conduct activities and projects, and undertake such other efforts as may be appropriate to carry

out the policy of subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary shall promptly formulate and implement and thereafter supervise a program to assist executive agencies in carrying out such policy.

(c) Each executive agency shall report quarterly to the Secretary on the procedures, activities, projects, and other efforts undertaken to carry out the policy of subsection (a) of this section. The quarterly reports shall contain documentation concerning the extent to which the employment requirements of subsection (a) have been fulfilled and an explanation of any impediments to their fulfillment and of measures undertaken to remove these impediments.

(d) The Secretary shall report annually to the Congress on the procedures, activities, projects, and other efforts undertaken to carry out the policy of subsection (a). The annual reports shall contain documentation concerning the extent to which the employment requirements of subsection (a) have been fulfilled and an explanation of any impediments to their fulfillment and of measures undertaken to remove these impediments.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall carry out all his or her functions relating to the welfare of wage and salary earners through the Employment Standards Administration of the Department of Labor, or any administration of the Department of Labor that may, after the effective date of this Act, be charged with responsibilities similar to those of the Employment Standards Administration, including—

(1) the conduct of research and experimentation projects and any other activities designed to promote, in public and private employment, the advancement of opportunities for persons who are unable or who do not desire to work standard working hours;

(2) the promotion and supervision of programs for flexible hours employment in the executive agencies; and

(3) the encouragement of adoption of flexible hours employment practices by all public and private employers.

(b) The Secretary shall carry out all of the functions of this Act through the Employment Standards Administration of the Department of Labor, or any administration of the Department of Labor that may, after the effective date of this Act, be charged with responsibilities similar to those of the Employment Standards Administration.

SEC. 4. No person who is otherwise qualified for full-time Federal employment shall be required to accept flexible hour employment as a condition of new or continued employment.

SEC. 5. All persons employed in flexible hours employment positions pursuant to the policy established by section 2(a) of this Act shall receive, on a pro rata basis, all benefits normally available to full-time employees of all executive agencies in similar position or grade.

SEC. 6. No executive agency subject to the provisions of this Act shall, for the purpose of determining that agencies personnel ceiling requirement, count any employee employed on a flexible hours employment basis other than on a pro rata basis according to the percentage of hours such employee works in each forty-hour workweek.

SEC. 7. No person employed as an expert or consultant pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and no person who is employed for more than twenty hours in any forty-hour workweek by any employer other than an executive agency may be counted for the purpose of determining compliance with the policy established in section 2(a) of this Act.

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OP-
POSES ADMINISTRATION'S "BET-
TER SCHOOLS ACT"

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of a policy statement adopted at the June 29 meeting of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education with respect to the proposal of the Nixon administration for the so-called Better School Act of 1973.

The statement follows:

"While not necessarily opposed to the general concept of revenue sharing with the States, and to the application of that concept to some aspects of education, the Council cannot endorse the approach represented by the Better Schools Act.

"It does not feel that vocational education, at this point in history, should be included in an education revenue sharing package, without specific guidelines designed to assure that the funds will indeed be used to promote quality vocational education. The Council does not believe that the Better Schools Act contains that assurance.

"The recent progress in vocational education is a result of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. These acts offered a Federal incentive to meet urgent needs which were not being adequately met at the state level. Traditionally, vocational education has been at the bottom of the list of priorities, at both the Federal and state levels. It has had to fight against strongly entrenched educational interests to obtain adequate funding and facilities. That trend has begun to shift due to the incentives and procedures contained in the Vocational Education Act. The Act provides that the states must match Federal funds on at least a one-to-one basis. It provides that state plans be drawn to coordinate vocational education programs throughout each state. It also provides for a network of National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education to advise on and evaluate vocational programs, and to help create a positive image for vocational education. The latter point is especially important. The need for vocational education is undisputed, yet it is often ignored because it has a 'second-class' image. In many cases, the only advocates for vocational education are the advisory councils. Advocacy is important to vocational education at this point in time if the momentum which has been building up in recent years is to continue.

"The Better Schools Act would turn all vocational education funds over to the states to be spent without guidelines. There is no requirement for state-wide planning, nor provisions for evaluation of programs. Up to 30% of the vocational education funds could be transferred to other programs. Up to 100% could be transferred, if approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Within the vocational education category, the funds could be used for any purpose. It is possible, for example, that they could be diverted for teachers' salaries rather than actual program use.

"The Council believes that vocational education, under the Better Schools Act, would lose the momentum it has gained in the past decade. The Vocational Education Act is just beginning to demonstrate results, and it would be a mistake to switch horses just as vocational education is moving into the mainstream of education in our country.

"The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education recommends the full implementation of the Vocational Education Act and Part B, Title X of the Higher Education Act, as amended by the Education Amendments of 1972."

RESPONDING TO WATERGATE; RE-
SPONDING TO A SUBPENA

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in the July 19, 1973, Extensions of Remarks, I inserted the first section of a three part article by I. F. Stone that appeared in the June 28, 1973, edition of the New York Review of Books. Dealing with the question of impeachment, that article explored the legal bases for the subpoena and impeachment of a President.

Since that article appeared, we have seen the battle joined on this issue, between President Nixon on the one hand and Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox and Senator SAM ERVIN's committee on the other. In view of the renewed relevance of Mr. Stone's article, I insert this second part, dealing with precedents for impeachment. As I indicated at the time this article first appeared in the RECORD, scholarly research on this matter deserves the attention of every Member of Congress who has considered how to respond to the crisis of Watergate.

The second part of the article follows. Space limitations on extraneous material in the RECORD do not permit the inclusion of the remainder of the article:

II

Impeachment is a form of trial by legislature. Its roots go back to a dim past when parliaments in France and England were more courts than legislatures. As the political power of the English Parliament grew, it began to use impeachment against corrupt or tyrannical officers of the Crown. Charges were brought by the Commons and tried before the Lords. The first impeachment is usually given as the Earl of Suffolk's case in 1386. In the revolutionary seventeenth century, impeachment was used by the House of Commons to terrorize the King's ministers and finally to establish parliamentary supremacy. Once this was achieved, the use of impeachment for political purposes died out. The seven years it took the Commons to try Warren Hastings by impeachment (1788-1795) finally demonstrated that it was too cumbersome—and repugnant—a process for ordinary criminal prosecution. The last trial by impeachment in England was in 1806.

The Framers of the Constitution were well aware of the abuses which mark trial by legislature. They outlawed one form altogether: the bill of attainder by which earlier parliaments, with or without hearing evidence, simply found a man guilty by majority vote. This was a device much used by subservient Parliaments under Tudor despotism and again by a revolutionary Commons in the seventeenth century. The outstanding example was the famous Earl of Strafford case where—realizing that the House of Lords was not convinced by the evidence in his impeachment—the Commons dropped that procedure, voted the Earl guilty by bill of attainder, and had him executed. The Puritans, our spiritual ancestors, were often as ferocious as Bolsheviks.

In writing the power of impeachment into the Constitution, the Framers sought to shut the door firmly on such excesses. The Constitution forbids trial by impeachment for ordinary citizens and ordinary crimes. The impeachment procedure was limited to trials of the President, the Vice President, "and all civil officers of the United States." In case of conviction the penalty may not be more than "removal from office and disqualification to hold any office in honor, trust or profit under the United States." Any other punishment for any crime involved can be imposed only after separate trial in a court of law. Impeachment was to be a weapon for policing conduct in office.

The Framers were principally concerned with providing a check on the President. The other officers were added to the impeachment clause in the final days of the Convention as a last-minute afterthought and were accepted without debate. During earlier discussion of the impeachment clause, George Mason of Virginia—more responsible than any other statesman for the Bill of Rights—spoke of impeachment as a necessary weapon to deal with "attempts to subvert the Constitution."¹ The words seem to fit the revelations being generated by Watergate. When Senator Ervin, who has seen them, says the domestic espionage plans in the as yet unpublished Dean documents display "the same mentality employed by the Gestapo in Nazi Germany,"² the words Colonel Mason used are not too strong to be applied today.

Much fresh material for an exploration of the impeachment process and its history is provided by Raoul Berger and Michael Les Benedict. Benedict offers a new view of the politics in Andrew Johnson's trials, the only impeachment of a President. Berger's book brings together a fascinating collection of his law review articles on the tantalizing legal problems involved in impeachment. Both books began long before Watergate as recondite studies into long forgotten questions, but they come off the press as urgent and controversial, though neither foresaw, or could have foreseen, how rapidly unexpected developments like the burglary of Watergate would make impeachment a live issue again.

Berger—after a lifetime in government and private practice—has had an extraordinary second career since his retirement. Zest for controversy and love of learning shine through the pages of his law review articles and books. Now, at seventy-two, he is writing a book on executive privilege, a topic of even more immediacy than impeachment, and one on which he has testified brilliantly before several congressional investigations.³

He strongly opposes the inflated claims of executive privilege made in recent years, notably by then Attorney General Rogers under Eisenhower. Berger is also a strong opponent of the expansion in presidential war powers, a subject on which he published a law review article of first importance last year.⁴ Those two studies and a major law review article on impeachment⁵ which is embodied in his new book seem to have drawn their motivation from opposition to the Indochina war.

Berger's basic position might be described as that of a radical traditionalist, seeking to strip away false, distorted, or mythological precedents by a return to the Constitution, its sources, and its Framers, and fashion new conceptual weapons against current governmental usurpations. In this sense, he is like the late Justice Black and Senator Ervin a fundamentalist in constitutional law.

In two chapters of this new book on impeachment Berger considers the possibility of using impeachment to deal with the continuing Indochina war. In the first of these he discusses the impeachment of Andrew Johnson. "His impeachment," Berger writes,

Footnotes at end of article.

"poses an issue which may again confront us; is the President impeachable for violating a statute, for example, an act that prohibits the use of appropriated funds for maintenance of ground troops in Cambodia if in his judgment it violates his constitutional prerogatives?"

The restriction on ground troops in Cambodia was passed by Congress in 1971, and not openly flouted by the executive. But the question has again become urgent with passage by the Senate, and debate in the House, of the Eagleton amendment which would bar the use of any funds for continued bombing over Cambodia.

The parallel with the impeachment a century ago is this: The immediate precipitant of President Andrew Johnson's trial was his attempt to remove Secretary of War Stanton in defiance of the newly passed Tenure of Office Act. Johnson claimed he had a right to ignore the act because he considered it an unconstitutional interference with the President's right to remove his cabinet officers as he pleased. Nixon, similarly, has taken the position that a cutoff of war funds while combat of any kind is in progress would be an unconstitutional interference with his powers as Commander in Chief. Whether Nixon will dare cling to so extreme a position in a crunch, against the background noises of Watergate, remains to be seen.

Berger, who takes a rather conventional view of Johnson's impeachment, believes such a constitutional crisis should be resolved by an appeal to the Supreme Court rather than by impeachment, as happened in Johnson's case. But in his concluding chapter Berger advocates impeachment as a last resort when the President takes the country into war without congressional consent.

Berger ends his book with a plea that we not deduce from the failure—and the legal clumsiness—of the Johnson impeachment that impeachment has proven "its unfitness as an instrument of government." But he favors its use only "as a last resort" and "with extreme caution." The Framers, he writes,

"Foresew that impeachment might be subject to superheated partisanship, that it might threaten presidential independence; but recalling Stuart oppression they chose what seemed the lesser of evils. In our time the impeachment of President Truman, apparently for his conduct of the Korean War, was suggested by its staff to the Republican high command. There have been reiterated demands for the impeachment of President Nixon arising out of dissatisfaction with his program for disengagement from the war in Vietnam. . . . Those who are unwilling to concede that the President, without a congressional declaration of war, may commit us to a full-scale war with all its ghastly consequences may yet turn to impeachment as a curb on such presidential adventures."

Benedict's book on Johnson's impeachment devotes itself to rebutting the conventional view that it was the work of a radical Republican minority. His exhaustive analysis of the events which precipitated impeachment and of key votes during the trial shows that in fact Johnson's unwise and stubborn tactics drove the moderate Republicans into an alliance with the radicals though the former were lukewarm about any thorough Reconstruction of the South.

This is a useful corrective but it does not go far enough. The deeper issues were racial and class issues which disguised themselves in constitutional form. Basically the war was fought between contending white men; slavery was a moral and burning issue only for a minority of them. Otherwise the North would have imposed a thoroughgoing land reform on the South—as we did on a defeated Japan—and taken other basic steps to make a free landowning yeomanry of the blacks. To feel the agony of those issues for the newly emancipated and for great Republican radi-

cals like Sumner and Stevens one must still go to the pages of DuBois's *Black Reconstruction* however one feels about his political proposals. These deeper realities do not obtrude into Benedict's useful but sedate pages.

But Benedict does touch in his conclusion on a basic constitutional point, though he writes in a mood of what may be premature defeatism. He tries to rebut those historians who have seen in the Johnson impeachment an attempt to convert the American presidential system into one of parliamentary supremacy:

But in fact it had not been Congress but the President who had been claiming broad new powers. It was Andrew Johnson who had appointed provisional governors of vast territories without the advice and consent of the Senate, who had nullified Congressional legislation, who claimed inherent quasi-legislative powers over Reconstruction. *In many ways, Johnson was a very modern President, holding a view of presidential authority that has only recently been established* [italics added]. Impeachment was Congress's defensive weapon; it proved a dull blade, and the end result is that the only effective recourse against a President who ignores the will of Congress or exceeds his powers is democratic removal at the polls.

But what if the President uses his power to pervert the electoral process itself? What if he casts a pall on free discussion by setting up a secret network to buy and burglarize the opposition? These are new questions raised in the wake of Watergate.

In one respect, which would be crucial in any attempt to impeach Nixon, the events of Watergate, and its aftermath, have dated both books. To understand this change one must begin by observing that until now the central issue in impeachment has revolved around a famous phrase in the Constitution, Article II, which deals with the Presidency, says in its final section 4, that the President "shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and misdemeanors."

What are high crimes and misdemeanors? This question has embroiled every impeachment trial in American history whether of a President or of judges. No phrase in the Constitution is more Delphic. A glance at history is necessary to understand its ambiguities.

In the framing of the Constitution, Madison thought it "indispensable that some provision should be made for defending the community against the incapacity, negligence or perfidy of the Chief Executive." The impeachment clause, as reported out for debate by the Special Committee, provided for the President's removal from office by conviction on impeachment only for "treason or bribery," though an earlier version included "or corruption."

The Framers had already written special clauses on treason into the new Constitution to narrow its meaning and regulate its mode of proof and trial. Their purpose was to avoid the abuse of the treason charge in English law and in English impeachments. All kinds of retrospective and "constructive," i.e., inferential, treasons were used to suppress opposition and restrict fundamental liberties in both common law prosecutions and in impeachments by Parliament.

So in the debate on the impeachment clause, as reported in Madison's notes, Colonel Mason wanted to know why this was limited "to treason and bribery only." He said, "Treason as defined in the Constitution will not reach many great and dangerous offenses." He added, "Attempts to subvert the Constitution may not be treason as above defined." He therefore proposed to add "or maladministration." Madison objected, "So vague a term will be equivalent to a tenure during pleasure of the Senate," which sits

as a court to judge a bill of impeachment when brought by the House. So Colonel Mason withdrew "maladministration" and substituted "other high crimes and misdemeanors."

But just what are "high crimes and misdemeanors"? If the Framers were thinking of the Warren Hastings trial which had just begun in London when they wrote the phrase into the Constitution, the confusion was further confounded by that trial. The phrase may have been used in the bill of impeachment² as an over-all rubric, but no less an authority than the magisterial English legal historian Holdsworth tells us that the specific charges against Hastings were "serious breaches of the criminal law" and that in his trial the House of Lords rejected the view that it was not bound by the ordinary rules of evidence,³ as might well be the case in the trial of a nonindictable offense. This seems to demonstrate that by the time our Constitution was being written, English usage had already turned "high crimes and misdemeanors" into an empty phrase, making impeachable crimes no different from indictable crimes.

Is this what the Framers intended? What are impeachable offenses under this clause in the American Constitution? Unfortunately this question has never been conclusively answered. The standard authority for the House of Representatives, *Hinds' Precedents*, devotes thirty-eight closely printed pages to the question without arriving at any definite answer.¹⁰ "The meaning of the phrase, 'high crimes and misdemeanors,'" says Cooley in a footnote to Blackstone, "underwent much discussion in the case of President Johnson, who was tried on articles of impeachment in 1868, but the result of the case was not such that any authoritative rule can be derived from it."¹¹

The answer lies somewhere in a murky area bounded by two definitions, one usually put forward by those who desire to impeach, the other by the defenders of those whose impeachment is being sought.

The first definition was bluntly expressed in the aborted effort by the Republicans to impeach Mr. Justice Douglas, the most recent attempt at impeachment. This began April 15, 1970, in a speech in the House by Republican Leader Gerald Ford. "The only honest answer," he said, sounding like a Jacobin, "is that an impeachable offense is whatever a majority of the House of Representatives considers [it] to be at a given moment in history [and] . . . conviction results from whatever offense or offenses two-thirds of the other body [the Senate] considers to be sufficiently serious to require removal of the accused from office."¹² These are constitutional opinions he must regret as the possibility of a Nixon impeachment looms up. They embody exactly the same view taken by those who impeached President Andrew Johnson, but failed in the Senate by one vote of the two thirds required to convict.

The other equally classic definition, almost invariably put forward by the defense, was formulated by former Judge Simon H. Rifkind of New York as counsel for Mr. Justice Douglas. In a memorandum of law submitted to the House committee early in the proceedings, Judge Rifkind argued that only indictable offenses were impeachable, i.e., offenses against federal law. "There is nothing in the Constitution or in the uniform practice under the Constitution," he argued, "to suggest that Federal judges may be impeached for anything short of criminal conduct [emphasis in original]. And the prohibition against *ex post facto* laws, the notice requirement of due process, the protection of the First Amendment, and considerations of 'separation of powers' prevent any other standard."¹³

It is ironic—but not really strange—that this argument on behalf of one of the greatest liberal Justices in our history is identical

Footnotes at end of article.

in substance with that put forward in defense of one of the most hated illiberal—Supreme Court Justice Samuel Chase, whose removal by impeachment was sought—also unsuccessfully—for his conduct of trials under the Alien and Sedition Acts and the common law of seditious and criminal libel.

The House committee in its final report on the Douglas impeachment resolution concluded that it did not have to "take a position" on either of these two conflicting concepts of impeachment because "intensive investigation" had "not disclosed credible evidence that would warrant preparation of charges on any acceptable concept of an impeachable offense."¹⁴ The House accepted this verdict, clearing Mr. Justice Douglas.

But earlier in its report the House committee did take a position, and it was somewhere—though just where was not at all clear—between the prosecution's and the defense's interpretation of what constitutes an impeachable offense. It said the precedents showed "that the House of Representatives, particularly in the arguments made by its Managers [i.e., prosecutors] in the Senate trials [of impeachments], favors the conclusion that the phrase 'high crimes and misdemeanors' encompasses activity which is not necessarily criminal in nature."¹⁵ This is precise as description but inconclusive as doctrine.

Berger is critical of Johnson's impeachment and is downright effusive in praise of Johnson's defenders. But when it comes to the theory underlying the impeachment he agrees with Johnson's prosecutors. On the basis of a formidable inquiry into four centuries of English precedents, he concludes that "the test of an impeachable offense in England was not an indictable, common law crime." The Framers, Berger argues, separated impeachment from criminal process when they "withheld from Congress the power to inflict criminal punishment" by impeachment and limited the penalty on conviction by impeachment to removal and disqualification from office. His final argument is that the Constitution specifically provides that an official convicted on impeachment "shall nevertheless be subject to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment according to Law." Were impeachment a criminal process, this would be a violation of the double jeopardy clause.

There are additional arguments for this in the Federalist Papers. One of the arguments in the Federalist Papers for making the Senate rather than the Supreme Court the final judge of impeachments is that this would prevent an official convicted on impeachment from having to come before the same court if he were later prosecuted "in the

ordinary course of law." The same Federalist Paper also shows that the Framers were not thinking of impeachment as a criminal process when it said that the Senate, sitting as the court on impeachment charges, "can never be tied down by such strict rules, either in the delineation of the offense by the prosecutors, or in the construction of it by the judges, as in common cases serve to limit the discretion of the courts in favor of personal security." It is clear that impeachable offenses were not intended to be limited only to indictable crimes.

FOOTNOTES

¹ In Madison's "Notes" in *Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union* (Government Printing Office, 1927), p. 691.

² *Washington Post*, June 1, p. 1, in an interview the Senator gave in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

³ His two-part study, "Executive Privilege v. Congressional Inquiry," in the *UCLA Law Review* in 1965 (referred to above), is already indispensable for serious consideration of the problem.

⁴ "War Making by the President" in *The University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, November, 1972.

⁵ "Impeachment for 'High Crimes and Misdemeanors,'" *Southern California Law Review*, XLIV (1971), already cited in Benedict's book on Johnson.

⁶ *The Making of the Constitution*, by Charles Warren (Barnes & Noble, 1967), pp. 660-661.

⁷ Indeed Hamilton in the Federalist Papers (No. XXIV), answering the objection that the new Constitution as first presented contained no Bill of Rights, pointed to the treason clause as evidence of the Framers' concern for civil liberty. And Madison in No. XLIII explained that the purpose of the clause was to outlaw those "new-fangled and artificial treasons . . . by which violent factions, the natural offspring of free government, have usually wreaked their alter-native malignity on each other."

It is again timely to recall that the Framers, in dealing with treason, the greatest danger to national security, were concerned with protecting the individual from the abuse of this charge by the state, and therefore made its prosecution more difficult than that of ordinary crimes. They did not provide that, where national security was involved, normal constitutional and legal safeguards might be suspended. The Constitution does not, in this as in many other respects, embody the jurisprudence of Richard Nixon or of the late Joseph McCarthy.

⁸ *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th ed.) in its article on Hastings says he was tried for "high crimes and misdemeanors."

⁹ Holdsworth's *History of English Law* (London, 7th ed., 1956), vol. 1, p. 384.

¹⁰ See Sections 2008 to 2023, *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, Asher C. Hinds, ed. (Government Printing Office, 1907), vol. 3, pp. 321-359.

¹¹ Quoted in the *American and English Encyclopaedia of Law* (New York and London, 1900), vol. 8, p. 249, citing 4 Cooley's Blackstone 5, note.

¹² Associate Justice William O. Douglas, Final Report by the Special Subcommittee on H. Res. 920 of the Committee of the Judiciary House of Representatives, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, September 17, 1970, p. 36.

¹³ Legal Materials on Impeachment, Special Subcommittee on H. Res. 920 of the Committee of the Judiciary, as above, August 11, 1970, p. 24.

¹⁴ Final Report cited in footnote 30, p. 349.

1973 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, below is a tabulation of the results of my 1973 legislative questionnaire which was mailed to constituents this past June. The 11th District of North Carolina includes the 17 westernmost counties of the State. Asheville, with a population of about 100,000 in the greater area, is the largest city. The other towns range downward from populations of about 10,000 or less. Thus the tabulation reflects a fairly good cross-section of moderately urban and rural citizens.

Inflation appeared to me to be the issue of greatest concern to my constituents. The poll reveals that 88 percent of the respondents favored a return to stronger controls on prices, wages, and rents. Other responses revealed disenchantment with continued involvement in Indochina; support for stronger congressional war powers; and some very definite views on the death penalty, amnesty, and financial assistance to North Vietnam.

The questionnaire and results are as follows:

1973 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

[In percent]

	His		Hers		Cumulative			His		Hers		Cumulative	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		*Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Do you favor:													
1. Diversion of highway trust funds to supplement or replace funds now being provided from the general treasury for mass transit systems?.....	44	56	47	53	46	54							
2. Adoption by Congress of an annual spending ceiling which could not be exceeded by appropriations?..	88	12	87	13	87	13							
3. An income tax credit to parents for the tuition of their children in private or parochial elementary and secondary schools?.....	42	58	45	55	43	57							
4. Legislation which I am cosponsoring providing that in the future our Nation not be taken into any war except a purely defensive action for a limited period of time unless the war has been declared by Congress?.....	92	8	92	8	92	8							
5. A return to stronger controls on prices, wages, and rents similar to those contained in phase II?.....	88	12	88	12	88	12							
6. Giving the President broad discretionary powers to raise or lower tariffs in trade negotiations with other countries?.....	50	50	50	50	50	50							
7. News reporters being permitted to keep their direct sources of information confidential?.....	85	15	68	32	76	24							
8. The death penalty being restored nationally for such crimes as premeditated murder, wartime treason, and skyjacking and kidnapping which result in death?.....	91	9	88	12	89	11							
9. Broader Federal programs to curb air, water, and noise pollution even if it means higher taxes?....	72	28	72	28	72	28							
10. Financial assistance to North Vietnam?.....	7	93	6	94	6	94							
11. Construction of the proposed oil pipeline through Alaska?.....	89	11	88	12	88	12							
12. An increase in Federal gasoline tax as a means of reducing oil consumption?.....	10	90	10	90	10	90							
13. Amnesty for those men who fled the country or took other illegal action to avoid military service in Vietnam?.....	15	85	18	82	17	83							
14. Adding substantial additional portions of our national parks and forests to the National Wilderness Preservation System?.....	80	20	78	22	79	21							

TREATMENT OF SOVIET JEWS AND GRANTING OF THE MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Soviet Jewry is an issue of international concern. As a people, we cannot appear to condone actions committed by other nations that violate the humanitarian principles on which our own Nation was founded. While seeking to implement our ideals at home, we cannot ignore our responsibility to all people, regardless of nationality. Soviet Jews must be able to enjoy the right of free exit, without harassment, and as a people, we in the United States must help to insure that right.

It is sometimes claimed that for this House to establish a link between the grant to the U.S.S.R. of most-favored-nation status and the behavior of the Soviet authorities toward Soviet citizens wishing to emigrate, would constitute some form of interference in the domestic affairs of the U.S.S.R. Nothing could be more misleading or factually incorrect.

The right of citizens to leave their country freely, without harassment, penalization or interference is not a purely internal issue for the authorities of a particular state, but a solemn international obligation, specifically safeguarded by the International Charter on Human Rights, by which the U.S.S.R. is obligated no less than the other member states of the international community—nor do the Soviet authorities deny this fact.

What this House is demanding, therefore, is that the U.S.S.R., if it is to be a trustworthy partner is a whole new gamut of international relations with this country, should demonstrate that it is willing to cease violating, as it has been doing so harshly, its existing obligations to the international community and, specifically, its commitment under the Human Rights Charter, to let its citizens, both Jewish and other, emigrate without ransom taxes, intimidation, harassment, detention, arbitrary deprivation of jobs and income or coercion of relatives. For a nation of immigrants like ourselves this is so fundamental an issue, that it would constitute a betrayal of our very origins and beliefs to pass up an opportunity for doing a little in this direction.

The grant of most-favored-nation status is not purely a trade or commercial matter, which is somehow an automatic byproduct of commercial relations between countries. On the contrary, it is a political act of international meaning and significance, conferred by the U.S. Congress upon friendly nations as a stamp of U.S. approval of their international behavior. To grant the U.S.S.R. most-favored-nation status, under existing circumstances, unconditionally, would mean condoning actively the behavior of the U.S.S.R. in depriving so many of its Jewish and other citizens who have applied to leave, of this sacred right underwritten by the Human Rights Charter. In a sense, we ourselves, would be helping to violate this charter, if we acted in this way.

It is, therefore, not only our right but our duty to grant the U.S.S.R. most-favored-nation status under the specific stipulation that the Soviet authorities fully implement their international obligation to permit their citizens who wish

to leave to do so freely, without hindrance or harassment, and that the President of the United States of America be required to report to Congress at regular intervals that this stipulation is indeed being implemented to prevent future Soviet violations.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1973

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the conference report for the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1973 should come before this body sometime this week. For the general information of the Members, the following tables indicate the authorizations in the report and the approximate apportionments to the States for the Interstate, primary, secondary, urban extensions and urban systems for the 3 fiscal years of the bill—1974, 1975, and 1976.

The conference agreement includes a 3-year authorization for highway construction and highway safety totaling \$19.9 billion, \$9.75 billion authorization for the Interstate System beyond fiscal year 1976, and an additional \$3 billion authorization from general revenues of the Treasury for capital grants for mass transit. The \$12 billion of the total Interstate System authorization is a restatement of previous authorizations in the 1970 Highway Act. Total new authorizations for the 3-year period covered in the conference agreement therefor are \$20.66 billion.

The tables follow:

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATIONS

[Dollars in millions]

Program	Fiscal year 1974		Fiscal year 1975		Fiscal year 1976		Fiscal year 1977-79 HTF
	HTF	GF	HTF	GF	HTF	GF	
Interstate.....	2,600		3,000		3,000		9,750
Primary.....	680		700		700		
Secondary.....	390		400		400		
Urban ext.....	290		300		300		
Urban.....	780		800		800		
Min. interstate.....	50		50		50		
Subtotal.....	4,790		5,250		5,250		9,750
Other Programs							
Forest hwy.....	33		33		33		
Public hwy.....	16		16		16		
Forest dev. R&T.....		140		140		140	
P.L. dev. R&T.....		10		10		10	
Park R&T.....		30		30		30	
Parkways.....		60		75		75	
Indian roads.....		75		75		75	
Econ. growth centers.....	50		75		100		
Admin. expenses.....		1.5		1.5		1.5	
Virgin Islands.....		5		5		5	
Guam.....		2		2		2	
American Samoa.....		1		1		1	
Urban high density.....	50		50		50		
Min. "A" apportionment.....	17		15		15		
Priority primary.....	100		200		300		
Alaska hwy.....		58.67					
Bridges on dams.....		8.5					
Alaska assistance.....	20		20		20		
Rail relocation.....	10		16.7		33.4		16.6
Metro accessibility.....		65		8.3			
Rural transit program.....			20		10		
Great River Road.....	10	10.1	25	10	25	10	

Program	Fiscal year 1974		Fiscal year 1975		Fiscal year 1976		Fiscal year 1977-79
	HTF	GF	HTF	GF	HTF	GF	
Scenic hwy. study	.25						
Mass transit study		10					
Inter-American hwy.		10					
Subtotal	306.25	491.77	470.7	367.8	592.4	366.1	
Total title I	5,096.25	491.77	5,720.7	367.8	5,824.4	366.1	9,750
	5,588.02		6,088.5		6,208.5		

TITLE II—AUTHORIZATIONS—SAFETY

NHTSA:							
402	\$100		\$125		\$150		
403	42.5		55		65		
FHWA:							
402	25		30		35		
307(a) and 403	10		10		10		
Rail-hwy crossing	25		25		25		
Bridge reconstruction replacement	25		25		25		
Pavement marking	25		25		25		
Pavement marking research	10		10		10		
Drug use and driver behavior	10		10		10		
Projects for high hazard locations	25		25		25		
Roadside obstacle elimination	25		25		25		
Driver educ. eval	10		10		10		
Incentives:							
(a) Adaption of mandatory seatbelt laws	25		32		73.5		
(b) Fatality reduction	12.5		16		19		
Fed.-aid safer roads demonstration program	50		100		100		
Studies*	16						
Total	461.0		763.0		801.5		
Total title II	461.0		763.0		801.5		
Total title I and II	6,049.02		6,851.5		7,010.0		9,750

TITLE III—URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

[\$3,000,000,000 for 8/20 matching grants to local governments for capital investments in public mass transportation systems]

APPROXIMATE APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1974, 1975, AND 1976

[Thousands of dollars]

State	Fiscal year 1974 (\$2,635,134)	Fiscal year 1975 (\$3,040,536)	Fiscal year 1976 (\$3,040,536)
Alabama	51,443	59,358	59,358
Alaska			
Arizona	50,622	58,409	58,409
Arkansas	18,899	21,807	21,807
California	170,644	196,920	196,920
Colorado	51,642	59,587	59,587
Connecticut	72,284	83,405	83,405
Delaware	12,450	14,365	14,365
Florida	78,609	90,703	90,703
Georgia	61,951	71,482	71,482
Hawaii	25,771	29,736	29,736
Idaho	12,450	14,365	14,365
Illinois	122,732	141,613	141,613
Indiana	30,104	34,735	34,735
Iowa	26,543	30,627	30,627
Kansas	30,104	34,735	34,735
Kentucky	36,752	42,406	42,406
Louisiana	75,456	87,169	87,169
Maine	13,122	15,141	15,141
Maryland	95,317	109,981	109,981
Massachusetts	77,439	89,352	89,352
Michigan	88,992	102,683	102,683
Minnesota	57,917	66,827	66,827
Mississippi	22,285	25,714	25,714
Missouri	47,758	55,105	55,105
Montana	25,597	29,535	29,535
Nebraska	12,450	14,365	14,365
Nevada	12,450	14,365	14,365
New Hampshire	12,450	14,365	14,365
New Jersey	70,243	81,049	81,049
New Mexico	23,107	26,662	26,662
New York	95,715	110,441	110,441
North Carolina	45,467	52,462	52,462
North Dakota	12,450	14,365	14,365
Ohio	76,493	88,261	88,261
Oklahoma	18,077	20,858	20,858
Oregon	63,146	72,861	72,861
Pennsylvania	122,408	141,240	141,240
Rhode Island	22,285	25,714	25,714
South Carolina	20,493	23,645	23,645
South Dakota	12,450	14,365	14,365
Tennessee	34,561	39,878	39,878
Texas	114,042	131,586	131,586
Utah	29,083	33,557	33,557
Vermont	12,450	14,365	14,365
Virginia	108,140	124,777	124,777

State	Fiscal year 1974 (\$2,635,134)	Fiscal year 1975 (\$3,040,536)	Fiscal year 1976 (\$3,040,536)
Washington	89,341	103,086	103,086
West Virginia	57,320	66,138	66,138
Wisconsin	29,058	33,529	33,529
Wyoming	14,093	16,262	16,262
District of Columbia	60,357	69,643	69,643
Puerto Rico			
Total	2,525,122	2,913,599	2,913,599

APPROXIMATE APPORTIONMENT OF RURAL PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FUNDS—FISCAL YEAR 1974

[Thousands of dollars]

State	Rural	
	Primary (\$680,000)	Secondary (\$390,000)
Alabama	14,644	8,399
Alaska	35,549	20,388
Arizona	9,107	5,223
Arkansas	11,430	6,556
California	29,726	12,362
Colorado	11,010	6,315
Connecticut	4,984	2,858
Delaware	3,256	1,867
Florida	12,722	7,297
Georgia	17,988	10,316
Hawaii	3,256	1,867
Idaho	7,691	4,411
Illinois	20,535	11,125
Indiana	15,735	9,025
Iowa	16,300	9,348
Kansas	14,737	8,452
Kentucky	13,298	7,627
Louisiana	11,154	6,397
Maine	5,681	3,258
Maryland	6,789	3,894
Massachusetts	6,983	3,174
Michigan	20,105	11,531
Minnesota	18,469	10,593
Mississippi	12,654	7,257
Missouri	18,215	10,447
Montana	12,292	7,050
Nebraska	12,125	6,954
Nevada	7,346	4,213
New Hampshire	3,256	1,867
New Jersey	7,994	2,893
New Mexico	9,683	5,553
New York	24,596	12,330
North Carolina	21,058	12,077

State	Rural	
	Primary (\$680,000)	Secondary (\$390,000)
North Dakota	8,923	5,117
Ohio	20,620	11,826
Oklahoma	13,195	7,568
Oregon	10,753	6,167
Pennsylvania	24,651	14,138
Rhode Island	3,256	1,863
South Carolina	10,890	6,246
South Dakota	9,685	5,555
Tennessee	15,602	8,948
Texas	36,833	21,125
Utah	6,709	3,848
Vermont	3,256	1,868
Virginia	15,182	8,708
Washington	10,920	6,263
West Virginia	8,372	4,801
Wisconsin	16,419	9,417
Wyoming	7,323	4,200
District of Columbia		
Puerto Rico	5,075	2,911
Total	668,032	373,498

APPROXIMATE APPORTIONMENT OF RURAL PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FUNDS—FISCAL YEAR 1975

[Thousands of dollars]

State	Rural	
	Primary (\$700,000)	Secondary (\$400,000)
Alabama	15,075	8,614
Alaska	36,595	20,911
Arizona	9,375	5,357
Arkansas	11,766	6,724
California	29,726	12,679
Colorado	11,334	6,476
Connecticut	5,130	2,932
Delaware	3,352	1,915
Florida	13,096	7,434
Georgia	18,517	10,581
Hawaii	3,352	1,915
Idaho	7,917	4,524
Illinois	20,535	11,410
Indiana	16,198	9,256
Iowa	16,779	9,588
Kansas	15,170	8,669
Kentucky	13,689	7,822
Louisiana	11,482	6,561
Maine	5,848	3,342
Maryland	6,989	3,994

APPROXIMATE APPORTIONMENT OF RURAL PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FUNDS—FISCAL YEAR 1975—Continued
[Thousands of dollars]

State	Rural	
	Primary (\$700,000)	Secondary (\$400,000)
Massachusetts	6,983	3,256
Michigan	20,696	11,826
Minnesota	19,013	10,864
Mississippi	13,026	7,443
Missouri	18,751	10,715
Montana	12,653	7,231
Nebraska	12,481	7,132
Nevada	7,562	4,321
New Hampshire	3,352	1,915
New Jersey	7,994	2,967
New Mexico	9,967	5,696
New York	24,596	12,646
North Carolina	21,677	12,387
North Dakota	9,185	5,249
Ohio	21,227	12,130
Oklahoma	13,583	7,762
Oregon	11,069	6,325
Pennsylvania	25,376	14,501
Rhode Island	3,352	1,915
South Carolina	11,210	6,406
South Dakota	9,970	5,697
Tennessee	16,061	9,178
Texas	37,916	21,666
Utah	6,907	3,947
Vermont	3,352	1,915
Virginia	15,629	8,931
Washington	11,241	6,424
West Virginia	8,618	4,925
Wisconsin	16,902	9,658
Wyoming	7,539	4,308
District of Columbia		
Puerto Rico	5,225	2,985
Total	685,038	383,075

APPROXIMATE APPORTIONMENT OF RURAL PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FUNDS—FISCAL YEAR 1976

State	Rural	
	Primary (\$700,000)	Secondary (\$400,000)
Alabama	15,075	8,614
Alaska	36,595	20,911
Arizona	9,375	5,357
Arkansas	11,766	6,724
California	29,726	12,679
Colorado	11,334	6,476
Connecticut	5,130	2,932
Delaware	3,352	1,915
Florida	13,096	7,484
Georgia	18,517	10,581
Hawaii	3,352	1,915
Idaho	7,917	4,524
Illinois	20,535	11,410
Indiana	16,198	9,256
Iowa	16,779	9,588
Kansas	15,170	8,669
Kentucky	13,689	7,822
Louisiana	11,482	6,561
Maine	5,848	3,342
Maryland	6,989	3,994
Massachusetts	6,983	3,256
Michigan	20,696	11,826
Minnesota	19,013	10,864
Mississippi	13,026	7,443
Missouri	18,751	10,715
Montana	12,653	7,231
Nebraska	12,481	7,132
Nevada	7,562	4,321
New Hampshire	3,352	1,915
New Jersey	7,994	2,967
New Mexico	9,967	5,696
New York	24,596	12,646
North Carolina	21,677	12,387
North Dakota	9,185	5,249
Ohio	21,227	12,130
Oklahoma	13,583	7,762
Oregon	11,069	6,325
Pennsylvania	25,376	14,501
Rhode Island	3,352	1,915
South Carolina	11,210	6,406
South Dakota	9,970	5,697
Tennessee	16,061	9,178
Texas	37,916	21,666
Utah	6,907	3,947
Vermont	3,352	1,915
Virginia	15,629	8,931
Washington	11,241	6,424
West Virginia	8,618	4,925
Wisconsin	16,902	9,658
Wyoming	7,539	4,308
District of Columbia		
Puerto Rico	5,225	2,985
Total	685,038	383,075

APPROXIMATE APPORTIONMENT OF URBAN FUNDS—FISCAL YEAR 1974

State	[Thousands of dollars]		
	Urban extension (\$290,000)	Urban system (\$780,000)	1/2 percent planning
Alabama	3,607	9,348	231
Alaska	339	3,735	114
Arizona	2,605	6,758	209
Arkansas	1,631	4,225	114
California	34,155	88,508	2,911
Colorado	3,216	8,334	257
Connecticut	4,397	11,394	379
Delaware	743	3,735	114
Florida	9,944	25,769	745
Georgia	4,876	12,635	339
Hawaii	1,154	3,735	114
Idaho	601	3,735	114
Illinois	17,173	44,502	1,420
Indiana	6,142	15,916	432
Iowa	2,805	7,269	152
Kansas	2,577	6,678	142
Kentucky	3,002	7,778	202
Louisiana	4,338	11,240	307
Maine	827	3,735	114
Maryland	5,703	14,777	467
Massachusetts	9,006	23,337	781
Michigan	12,159	31,507	1,020
Minnesota	4,575	11,856	343
Mississippi	1,680	4,354	114
Missouri	5,983	15,505	465
Montana	608	3,735	114
Nebraska	1,648	4,272	114
Nevada	734	3,735	114
New Hampshire	752	3,735	114
New Jersey	12,093	31,338	1,096
New Mexico	1,258	3,735	114
New York	29,375	76,121	2,572
North Carolina	4,010	10,390	219
North Dakota	511	3,735	114
Ohio	15,003	38,877	1,198
Oklahoma	3,098	8,027	189
Oregon	2,503	6,145	117
Pennsylvania	15,480	40,114	1,248
Rhode Island	1,571	4,070	134
South Carolina	2,114	5,479	117
South Dakota	480	3,735	114
Tennessee	4,168	10,802	268
Texas	16,373	42,429	1,247
Utah	1,563	4,050	132
Vermont	244	3,735	114
Virginia	5,472	14,179	432
Washington	4,540	11,764	338
West Virginia	1,170	3,735	114
Wisconsin	5,290	17,708	373
Wyoming	320	3,735	114
District of Columbia	1,457	3,775	136
Puerto Rico	2,754	7,136	195
Total	277,730	746,996	22,811

APPROXIMATE APPORTIONMENT OF URBAN FUNDS, FISCAL YEAR 1975

State	[Thousands of dollars]		
	Urban extension (\$300,000)	Urban system (\$800,000)	1/2 percent planning
Alabama	3,732	9,467	253
Alaska	247	3,783	125
Arizona	2,698	6,845	229
Arkansas	1,687	4,280	125
California	35,333	89,643	3,188
Colorado	3,327	8,441	281
Connecticut	4,549	11,540	415
Delaware	769	3,783	125
Florida	10,287	26,100	816
Georgia	5,004	12,797	371
Hawaii	1,194	3,783	125
Idaho	622	3,783	125
Illinois	17,765	45,072	1,554
Indiana	6,354	16,120	473
Iowa	2,902	7,362	166
Kansas	2,666	6,764	155
Kentucky	3,105	7,878	221
Louisiana	4,487	11,384	336
Maine	856	3,783	125
Maryland	5,899	14,967	511
Massachusetts	9,316	23,636	856
Michigan	12,578	31,911	1,117
Minnesota	4,733	12,008	375
Mississippi	1,738	4,410	125
Missouri	6,190	15,704	509
Montana	629	3,783	125
Nebraska	1,705	4,326	125
Nevada	759	3,783	125
New Hampshire	778	3,783	125
New Jersey	12,510	31,339	1,200
New Mexico	1,301	3,783	125
New York	30,338	77,096	2,816
North Carolina	4,148	10,523	239
North Dakota	528	3,783	125
Ohio	15,520	39,376	1,311
Oklahoma	3,205	8,130	207
Oregon	2,589	6,569	194

State	Urban extension (\$300,000)	Urban system (\$800,000)	1/2 percent planning
Pennsylvania	16,014	40,628	1,366
Rhode Island	1,625	4,122	147
South Carolina	2,187	5,549	128
South Dakota	4,497	3,783	125
Tennessee	4,312	10,940	294
Texas	16,938	42,973	1,365
Utah	1,617	4,102	145
Vermont	1,252	3,783	125
Virginia	5,660	14,360	473
Washington	4,696	11,914	370
West Virginia	1,210	3,783	165
Wisconsin	5,473	13,884	408
Wyoming	331	3,783	125
District of Columbia	1,507	3,823	147
Puerto Rico	2,849	7,228	214
Total	287,306	756,573	24,977

APPROXIMATE APPORTIONMENT OF URBAN FUNDS—FISCAL YEAR 1976

State	[Thousands of dollars]		
	Urban extension (\$300,000)	Urban system (\$800,000)	1/2 percent planning
Alabama	3,732	9,587	253
Alaska	247	3,831	125
Arizona	2,698	6,931	229
Arkansas	1,687	4,334	125
California	35,333	90,778	3,194
Colorado	3,327	8,547	282
Connecticut	4,549	11,686	416
Delaware	769	3,831	125
Florida	10,287	26,430	818
Georgia	5,044	12,958	372
Hawaii	1,194	3,831	125
Idaho	622	3,831	125
Illinois	17,655	45,643	1,557
Indiana	6,354	16,324	474
Iowa	2,902	7,455	167
Kansas	2,666	6,849	155
Kentucky	3,105	7,978	222
Louisiana	4,487	11,528	337
Maine	856	3,831	125
Maryland	5,899	15,156	512
Massachusetts	9,316	23,936	857
Michigan	12,578	32,315	1,119
Minnesota	4,733	12,160	376
Mississippi	1,738	4,466	125
Missouri	6,190	15,903	510
Montana	629	3,831	125
Nebraska	1,705	4,381	125
Nevada	759	3,831	125
New Hampshire	778	3,831	125
New Jersey	12,510	32,141	1,202
New Mexico	1,301	3,831	125
New York	30,338	78,072	2,822
North Carolina	4,148	10,657	240
North Dakota	528	3,831	125
Ohio	15,520	39,874	1,314
Oklahoma	3,205	8,233	208
Oregon	2,589	6,652	195
Pennsylvania	16,014	41,142	1,369
Rhode Island	1,625	4,174	147
South Carolina	2,187	5,620	128
South Dakota	4,497	3,831	125
Tennessee	4,312	11,079	294
Texas	16,938	43,517	1,368
Utah	1,617	4,153	145
Vermont	1,252	3,831	125
Virginia	5,660	14,542	474
Washington	4,696	12,065	371
West Virginia	1,210	3,831	125
Wisconsin	5,473	14,060	409
Wyoming	331	3,831	125
District of Columbia	1,507	3,871	150
Puerto Rico	2,849	7,319	214
Total	287,306	766,150	25,025

AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS RISE FASTER IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE THAN IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in a recent study by the Division of Research and Statistics of the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services some facts came to

light which, I believe, will be of interest to my colleagues. The data compiled by the bureau concerns a comparison of the average weekly earnings of employees of the Federal Government and employees of private industry.

Not since mid-1957 have average weekly earnings in the Federal service been less than in private industry. At that time the earnings were about the same. At that time average weekly earnings in the State service—not including education—were well below both.

From mid-1957 to mid-1967 average weekly earnings in the Federal service gradually drew away from the average in industry. In the State service from 1957 through 1965 the increase did not keep pace with either Federal service or industry and the gap widened. However, in the period 1965-67, State service earnings moved upward a little faster, and by 1967 the gap between State service and industry was about the same as in mid-1957. The gap between Federal service and State service had widened significantly in the 10-year period.

From mid-1967 to mid-1972 the Federal service weekly earnings drew away from private industry and State service at a substantial rate. By mid-1972 average weekly earnings in the Federal service were \$229 a week; in private industry, \$166; and State service, \$155.50.

In the 15-year period, 1957-72, average weekly earnings in the Federal service increased by 225 percent; in private industry, 168 percent; and in State service, 182 percent.

WELCOME TO THE CLUB, WHITE HOUSE IS TOLD

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the old saw is "That the way to a man's heart is through his stomach."

We know in our heart that the wage price control program from phase I through phase IV has been a disaster.

Congratulations to Mr. Goldstein for helping get the message through to the White House that these controls on our economy should be scrapped and now.

Mr. Speaker, I share the following article from the Evening Star of July 31.

Three cheers for Mr. Goldstein. Maybe if we cut the controls we will all be able to cut beef together.

The article follows:

WELCOME TO THE CLUB, WHITE HOUSE IS TOLD
The meat shortage has been brought home to President Nixon—literally.

Bernard Goldstein, president of District Hotel Supply, Inc., the largest hotel and restaurant meat supplier in the city, yesterday turned down a White House order for 15 pounds of filet mignon and New York strip steak.

"We've been supplying the White House with meat for 16 years," Goldstein said, "and this is the first time we've ever refused them."

"But if Mrs. Housewife feels the meat shortage, so should the White House. They

started the shortage, and they should know about it. They don't deserve any better treatment than anyone else."

Goldstein said he offered the White House a lower quality meat instead—"I had no trouble filling their ground beef order," he said with a smile—but they said no thanks.

"We're talking principle here," Goldstein said, "I realize I'm sticking my neck out—I may even lose the account—but I feel I have a chance to do something to help the (meat) industry."

"I had an order from the number one household in the world, and I had to say no. I told them to take filet mignon off the menu until the freeze is over."

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING: A CRITICAL REVIEW

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, last week during the annual convention of the National Urban League in Washington, D.C., a session of the conference was devoted to revenue sharing. During this session Mr. Eddie N. Williams, president of the Joint Center for Political Studies, addressed the conference concerning the possible negative effects of special revenue sharing on minority and poor communities. From the response his remarks received, it is clear that the concerns he voiced are shared by a broad spectrum of black leadership. I present the text of Mr. Williams statement for the attention of my colleagues in the hope that it will be carefully considered and remembered as we act on the President's remaining revenue-sharing proposals:

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING: A SOCIOPOLITICAL EXPERIMENT WHICH COULD RIP OFF THE POOR AND BLACKS

(By Eddie N. Williams)

Special revenue sharing confronts us with the following dilemma: As a fiscal concept, we are told it offers a way of rescuing many state, county and local governments from financial disaster. On the other hand, as proposed by the Nixon Administration, it is a revolutionary social experiment, designed to re-distribute money and political power under the guise of improving program administration. It is an experiment in which the poor and the black might well end up at the bottom of the heap—deprived of the little economic and political influence they have now.

I will leave the fiscal arguments to economists and other experts. It is my intention to talk to you this afternoon about what I think will be the practical effects of special revenue sharing ON US. I am not concerned with the rhetoric of the Administration, but with how a proposal will work—for us or against us. I ask you, what does a community profit, if it is offered its fiscal life, but threatened with losing its soul? And the pun is appropriate.

Like so much else on the scene today—the new morality—the new individualism—the new federalism and its standard bearer, revenue sharing, is in fact not that new at all. The concept dates back at least to 1836 when 28 million dollars in federal surplus funds were returned to the states. In this century, Congressional attempts to secure federal tax sharing legislation goes back to 1949 and the

idea was pushed by economists in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

In his tax reform message to the 91st Congress on April 21, 1969, President Nixon emphasized that revenue sharing was a high priority program. Subsequent proposals for legislative action led to the passage of the General Revenue Sharing Act of 1972. This Act returns over 30 billion dollars to state, county and local governments over a five year period. The President's proposals also led to his version of special revenue sharing this year.

The most unique aspect of the Administration's special revenue sharing proposals is that they give governors, mayors and county executive wide latitude for flexible and unrestricted use of federal funds. Expenditure of funds in the four special revenue sharing areas—community development, law enforcement, education and manpower training—would be left to the wisdom and the interest of state and local officials with few federal standards or guidelines included to advance important national priorities.

The proposals of the Administration would merge about 70 existing federal grant programs, dealing mainly with urban problems, into the four broad areas I have just mentioned. They would replace Model Cities and Urban Renewal and many other existing categorical grant programs with which the Congress intended to provide money for the special needs of certain disadvantaged social and economic groups. Yet the special revenue sharing proposals, as presently drafted, are likely to hurt precisely the persons who were supposed to be the beneficiaries.

Those in favor of special revenue sharing argue that this new concept is needed. They say categorical grants are not working. They say some categorical programs drain off too many dollars for administrative costs; that they have frequently failed to answer local needs and that they have been buried under mounds of red tape. Their most popular argument, however, is that categorical grant programs often frustrate the will of the people because they do not provide nearly enough state and local say-so over program content and priorities.

While block grants go a long way toward answering the criticism of categorical grants, proponents of special revenue sharing feel they do not go far enough.

So what we have now is a heated national debate on whether or not special revenue sharing should supplant many existing federal grant programs. From the point of view of the principal beneficiaries of most of these programs—the poor, blacks and others who live in the urban environment—there are two gut issues that attract our attention to this debate:

1. Is the *unrestricted* expenditure of these funds by state, county and city governments in the best interest of the society as a whole? And

2. Who would get how much of what from whom in the Administration's revenue sharing proposals? In other words, would the actual benefits flow, for a change, to those people with the greatest demonstrated need?

It is the question of the *unrestricted* use of revenue sharing funds—the absence of relevant federal standards and guidelines, the absence of national objectives—the absence of assurances that funds will be applied to the most pressing urban needs—it is this unresolved question that many of us find so troubling.

It is only too obvious that the social experiment, called revenue sharing, is open to a wide assortment of political maneuvers which seek to bring power to the dominant elements in the society.

I make this observation in spite of the fact that I agree with Woodrow Wilson's comment about government authority at the federal level. "Centralization", he said, "is

not vitalization." It is a matter of judgement about where the greater danger lies—from our point of view. It seems to me that in a pluralistic society, particularly in one which admits having some hangups about the race, creed, color, national origin and sex of some of its people, unrestricted federalism, as embodied in the special revenue sharing proposals, could result in a tyranny of the majority.

Those innocents, who assume that the current version of special revenue sharing will assure the protection of minority interests, show little understanding of the political culture in which they live. Nor do they seem to realize that in both design and potential effect, special revenue sharing is reminiscent of the withdrawal of federal troops from the South after Reconstruction. I need not remind this audience of the disastrous consequences.

For any group which finds itself almost constantly in the minority—and blacks and the poor meet this test easily—the problem is one of gaining enough clout to influence the policy makers. It is also the problem of balancing minority hopes and interests against those of the majority when the funds that are available are limited.

At a time when there is much discussion of the so-called NEW federalism, when revenue sharing is a lively topic, it is instructive to recall the founding father's view of the original federalism. In one of the most perceptive of the Federalist Papers, James Madison spoke of the dangers of "faction", the danger of a group of citizens acting against the rights of other citizens. He was also vitally concerned about the effect of factions on the rights of a minority. Here is what Madison said:

"Complaints are everywhere heard from our most considerate and virtuous citizens . . . that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority."

Madison analyzed how factions tend to arise: "The most common and durable source of factions", he said, "has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of the government."

It is good to remember these words of Madison when we talk about special revenue sharing, because revenue sharing is simply another means of distributing the people's money, or what Madison called "property," while at the same time redistributing political power and creating new alliances and new "factions."

Any scheme which would cause a fundamental redistribution of money and power must be placed under a strong microscope by those with little power and little money. Any plan which lets the federal government off the hook in terms of assuring the welfare of all Americans, is an invitation to disaster. We can ill afford to lapse into complacency and be lulled into a false sense of security by the rhetoric of "power to the people"—whether it spills from the lips of Stokely Carmichael or Richard Nixon. The issue is whether special revenue sharing lets the intent of returning power to the people get in the way of such practical considerations as assuring that all of the people share in that power.

Certainly it is not reassuring to note that this rhetoric comes perilously close to the rhetoric of states' rights. Moreover, the way the Administration's special revenue sharing proposals were presented—in an atmosphere of budget cutting, housing freezes, declara-

tions of war on the war on poverty and an arrogance toward the problems of everyday people—all this provides ample justification for a healthy skepticism on the parting of the alleged beneficiaries.

Even a number of mayors and governors who were early and vigorous supporters of revenue sharing, as well as the National League of Cities, cried foul when they saw the Administration breaking its promise to maintain categorical programs, and saw the cities losing funds while the suburbs gained.

It is this conflict between rhetoric and reality, between intent and effect, that fires our skepticism.

The Administration's spokesmen on special revenue sharing ask us to let go of categorical grants—the little limb of survival that we are hanging onto for dear life. They ask us to have faith in the face of benign neglect. They suggest that we seek our salvation from state and local governments, many of which have been contemptuous of our problems in the past or incapable of responding to them.

Let's take a moment to glance back at the administration of programs that had little federal supervision.

Let's, for example, look at Title I of the Safe Streets Act of 1968. It created the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which is authorized to make block grants. The recipient states and localities have wide discretion over the use of these funds, though with greater federal oversight than would exist under the proposed Law Enforcement Special Revenue Sharing program. LEAA funds were to be used to support criminal justice reform programs in the States. However, a report issued last year by the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law revealed that "the federal reform program has become a fiscal relief program." It said that "in almost four years of operation and after the distribution of roughly \$1.5 billion, the LEAA program has not initiated a basic reform of the nation's criminal justice system." The Lawyers Committee reported that federal block grants were "going for such outstanding needs (or newly stimulated wants) as new communications equipment, information and intelligence systems, helicopters, night-vision equipment, new training facilities, crime labs and even night sticks, helmets and street lighting."

This is certainly not an encouraging precedent for the unrestricted state and local control of federal funds.

More recently, we have seen evidence that under the General Revenue Sharing program, some local communities are deciding to use the funds in ways that are not in the best interests of minority groups and the poor. Studies by the Office of Revenue Sharing, the Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee and the National League of Cities show that expenditures for public safety and capital improvements rank high, while expenditures for social services, libraries, health, etc. rank low on the plans of local governments.

Aren't you glad to read that "Tennis courts, bridle paths and a dog pound are among the (revenue sharing) proposals being seriously debated" by the community of Redding, Connecticut?

And what about Woodsburgh, Long Island, "a community of \$75,000 to \$150,000 homes on winding, tree-lined roads, which faced this problem not long ago: What to do with some \$3,500 (in revenue sharing funds)?"

I do not begrudge these communities their influence. Rather, I ask whether they should get revenue sharing funds while crucial problems go unsolved in other areas.

There is a lesson here also on special revenue sharing. If local perceptions of priorities are totally at odds with national goals which do recognize the needs of the poor and

minorities, then concern over local governments' willingness to meet these needs is heightened.

These examples are but the latest evidence that minorities and the poor cannot rely exclusively on the states and localities to see to it that their needs are met. Unfortunately, we must still look to the federal government to enforce our rights and to determine national program standards, even in a day when the federal government has been less than aggressive in its concern for our welfare.

Even if we could finesse our lack of absolute faith in the goodwill of state and local governments, the other crucial and related question remains: Who would benefit from the Administration's revenue sharing proposals, and are they the people with the greatest need? We can approach this issue within the context of the four proposals: community development or the Better Communities Act, education, law enforcement and manpower training.

One does not have to be paranoid to suspect the community development revenue sharing proposal when the President introduces it by declaring that "The hour of crisis has passed."

The Better Communities Act leaves us feeling the way one does after viewing "Last Tango in Paris"—there is much to be desired. First, and most troubling, is that when you look past the words in the allocation formula, which calls for double-weighting the poverty factor, you see a hurt put on the cities, where we are, and a bonanza for the suburbs where we ain't. At the end of the five-year period of the Act, and after the so called "hold harmless" requirement has been eliminated, central cities would experience a sharp drop or at best a slight gain from the revenues they presently get under the categorical programs. Urban counties, on the other hand, including many well to do suburbs, would receive much greater amounts.

For example, after five years Baltimore City's share would be down 46 percent, but Baltimore County's share would be up 237 percent. Pittsburgh's share would be down 46 percent while Allegheny County's share goes up 77 percent; Seattle's share down 46 percent; King County's share up 237 percent; St. Louis' share down 3 percent; St. Louis County's share up 293 percent.

What I am saying is that the proposed act does not provide machinery to assure that those, whose needs are being served by existing categorical grants, will continue to have their needs served under special revenue sharing. This, in spite of the fact that allotments to states, counties, and cities are justified, in part, by the existence of these needs. For example, communities where overcrowding and poverty—both factors in the allocation formula—are most serious would not be required to spend their federal funds in amounts proportionate to these problems. What's more, communities where the problems do not exist at all, the affluent suburbs, for example, still get funds.

Some small communities—such as black governed towns with under 50,000 population which have major problems would get no direct funds at all. They must rely on the discretion of their states to make funds available. Moreover, the proposed act does not require that funds be spent in accordance with often repeated national priorities.

There are no safeguards under the Act to assure that urgent needs are placed at the top of the list. Nor does the proposal contain any incentives to motivate state and local governments to use their special revenue sharing funds for humane purposes. Rather, it leaves such crucial decisions to the ebb and flow of the political culture, a culture in which minorities and the disadvantaged have the least influence.

Under these circumstances, one would assume that the proposal would at least re-

quire active citizen participation and an enforceable review process. It does not. You hear a lot of lip service paid to community participation under revenue sharing, but what we also hear are stories of citizens denied the right even to attend city council meetings in Alabama; citizens unable to get budget data from local governments in upstate New York; reports of council hearings in Indiana where, despite overwhelming citizen opposition, revenue sharing money was put into cost overruns on a sports stadium. In fact, the Office of Revenue Sharing's own report found little public participation in decision making on how general revenue sharing money is to be spent.

Why should we expect the picture to be different under the Better Communities Act? Clearly the weak 60-day review process is inadequate. While civil rights provisions in the special revenue sharing proposals are certainly better than those under general revenue sharing, they are still not strong enough.

Another disturbing aspect of the Better Communities Act is that it would merge the Model Cities program, which provided for both social services and physical development, with exclusively physical development programs. It is true that the Act also includes a clause which would permit a locality to spend all of its money on "the provision of community services", but experience tells us that money is more likely to go into structures than into services.

Finally, I must point out that while programs under community development do not include subsidized housing, they are obviously intimately related. Many Members of Congress seem to think this relationship is so intimate that they want to make community development revenue sharing contingent on subsidized housing programs which have been frozen since the beginning of this year. While this position may be a matter of strategy, I must say that I, too, find the freeze on subsidized housing intolerable. New, effective and adequately funded subsidized housing programs must be put into effect immediately.

Education Special Revenue Sharing was an unmitigated disaster. Its critics charged that it was a scheme to cut back on federal funding for education; that it would weaken programs aimed at disadvantaged students; that it would give too much authority to the governors; that it would hurt urban areas, and, as an overall charge, that it was an abdication of federal responsibility in the crucial field of education.

Despite the Administration's initial hard-line refusal to compromise on its plan, it has agreed to discuss an alternative proposal with Congress.

If Education Revenue Sharing was still-born, law enforcement revenue sharing died in infancy. The LEAA block grant system is close to the revenue sharing concept. However, unlike special revenue sharing, it provides for federal review of plans. Current problems in the LEAA block grant remain to be ironed out.

In any case, the House Judiciary Committee, on June 5, rejected the revenue sharing approach and voted to extend LEAA for two years. In doing so, it calls on LEAA to exercise more—rather than less—control over the expenditure of funds.

So little information has been circulated on manpower revenue sharing that it is difficult to comment on it. Through executive action, the Administration plans to combine existing categorical programs in the manpower field and give direct funds to state and local governments with over 100,000 population. Some existing categorical programs would remain, however.

This litany of my concerns may leave you with the impression that I am opposed to special revenue sharing. I am not, really. I agree with many of the concepts implicit in

the notion of giving states and localities more flexibility in spending federal money. The question that must be answered is: How much more and under what circumstances?

Perhaps I am too politically oriented. Perhaps I am too conscious of the effects of past discrimination. Perhaps I am unfair because I do not want to see the fox guarding my chicken coop. Whatever the reason, I cannot support a revenue sharing concept which gives unrestricted powers to those levels of government which have historically been the least responsive to our needs.

I am concerned about a power redistribution which, in effect, would put me in a hatchet fight without a hatchet.

I worry too about the decline in national moral leadership, about the attitudes that if we sweep our problems under enough separate rugs they will in fact disappear.

Instead, I would suggest that any move toward block-type grants must be accompanied by a continuation and a refinement of categorical programs aimed at specific purposes. It is absolutely essential that block grants or special revenue sharing programs meet these four key tests:

One) They must contain explicit national goals which take into account the needs of the poor and of minorities. Where possible they should also provide financial incentives to governments which strive to meet these goals.

Two) There must be a reasonable application and review process which will ensure that those localities most needing funds actually receive them and that those that receive them actually use them consistent with the national objectives.

Three) There must be explicit and binding civil rights protections written into the law, which take full account of the continuing need for Federal enforcement. And

Four) There must be strong provisions for effective community participation in the decision-making process.

As I said earlier, revenue sharing has the effect of redistributing political power. One major aim of the New Federalism is to lodge more power at the state and local level where elected officials, community groups, and vested interests will have substantial influence on the decision-making process. Their power will determine how much revenue sharing money is spent and on what programs.

A former Nixon Administration official, who was involved in the development of revenue sharing proposals, told me recently that blacks shouldn't worry about the decentralization that would occur under revenue sharing. After all, he said, your own figures show that you have plenty of political power at the state, county and city level to influence decisions on the use of this money.

I agreed with the hope implicit in his theory but pointed out the pragmatic distinction between "plenty" of political power and "growing" political power.

Analysis of the number of black elected officials, the size and distribution of the black voting age population and its potential in certain cities and certain congressional districts, does indicate that our political power is growing.

According to the latest National Roster of Black Elected Officials, published this week by my organization, the Joint Center for Political Studies, the number of black elected officials has more than doubled in the last four years. There are now 2,625 in offices ranging from local school boards to the United States Congress. In 1969 when the first annual roster was compiled, there were 1,185. Today there are almost that many in the South alone.

In time, coalitions may be formed between the poor and the minorities to resolve the problems which afflict us all. Perhaps Tom Bradley's election signals a new era in which voters will demand that their

candidates address themselves to gut issues which bridge white-black differences, such as jobs, housing, day care, health care, and honesty and integrity in government.

In closing I would like to remind you once again that we have two interests to pursue. The one, which I have discussed at some length this afternoon, requires that we look searchingly at programs like revenue sharing which affect who gets what, how much and from whom. The other interest we must pursue is the one to which the Joint Center for Political Studies is dedicated: Increasing participation by blacks in the politics of this country, in every way and at all levels.

It is the relationship between these two interests—power and official position—that James Madison had in mind when he said:

"It is vain to say that enlightened statesmen will be able to adjust these clashing interests and render them all subservient to the public good. Enlightened men will not always be at the helm."

After we have done all we can to make sure that grants in aid, as well as other programs, and public policies in general are responsive to our needs, we must go out and use the political process to nail down what we have won. Together we can make a difference. And this will be our new federalism.

FREE ENTERPRISE'S FORGOTTEN VIRTUES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, John A. Davenport has performed a great service in helping make the case for free enterprise in the July 27 Wall Street Journal. He offers compelling evidence that the business community has a massive educational undertaking before it as do we in the Congress.

Rejecting the conventional sole defense of capitalism as efficient and productive, Davenport makes the case for free market economics on higher grounds—freedom and order. The basic postulate of an enterprise economy is that the consumer is king. The consumer's vote in the economic arena is as important as in the political arena. The value determined in the marketplace, the profit-and-loss system, capital expansion—each is a concept about which information and education are in dangerously short supply. The business community must begin to mobilize public opinion to understand the proper role of business and Government:

The tragedy of our times is that governments have mistaken and disregarded their essential functions while dabbling in ventures which no bureaucrat has the wisdom or ability to handle.

If business had no firm basis upon which to make its case, no underlying philosophical strength, no practical history to demonstrate the vitality and virtues of the enterprise system, that would be one thing; but that is not the case. As Davenport says:

(The business community) . . . can with reason and good conscience argue that the market economy and limited constitutional government stand or fall together and that

both are deeply rooted in the Nature of Man.

Business has an implicit responsibility as do we in Government to constantly attempt to educate and enlighten the public we seek to serve as to the value of the capitalist economic system. Indeed, it is a system to which we all owe a great deal in terms of freedom of choice. John A. Davenport states the case remarkably well. I include the entire article at this point:

FREE ENTERPRISE'S FORGOTTEN VIRTUES
(By John A. Davenport)

It is a noteworthy fact that business executives themselves are today increasingly worried by the hostile attitude of the public toward American business enterprise and are casting about for means to rectify the situation. James M. Roche, former board chairman of General Motors, B. R. Dorsey, president of Gulf Oil, spokesmen for the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, have one and all been sounding the alarm, and their concern seems well grounded.

According to a recent survey of the Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, some 60% of those questioned have a "low" opinion of American business in general and woeful ignorance of the function of profits in particular. The public, according to this survey, believes that profits run to some 28% of sales, from which it follows that greedy producers should be regulated if not severely punished. In fact, average after-tax profits run to only about 4 cents per dollar of sales and play an indispensable role in maintaining a high employment economy.

More ominously, business enterprise is being blamed for continued inflation, and even the once conservative Nixon administration was driven last spring to reinstate a price freeze and has now imposed its Phase 4 system of price controls. All past experience indicates such controls distort production and distribution while distracting public attention away from the main causes of inflation—namely, huge government spending, over-issue of money by the Federal Reserve Board, and the monopoly practices of labor unions.

REASON FOR CONCERN

Faced by these restrictions and distortions of fact, businessmen have reason to be concerned. Unfortunately their efforts to defend the enterprise system from its detractors all too often resemble the efforts of King Canute to arrest the tides of the sea. The reasons for this failure are multiple but in part go back to a paradox. Businessmen are master salesmen of automobiles, refrigerators and widgets. They are something less than articulate spokesmen for basic economic, political and moral principles.

Indeed, in their very rush to sell widgets businessmen are unwittingly today promulgating a highly unsavory image of the business system. The teenager, glued to the television screen, is not apt to form a highly laudatory opinion of General Motors, General Electric and Standard Brands as a result of commercials which these companies actively finance. Even oldsters must goggle at the lengths to which Madison Avenue goes to make us familiar with quick cures for ancient stomach disorders, or the virtues (or sins) of this or that feminine deodorant. At best one is apt to turn away from the boob-tube with the conviction that the goals of business are purely materialistic, if not squalid.

Even when businessmen turn aside from promoting their own particular products and sincerely seek to sell the public on the worth of the enterprise system itself, they all too often fall into the same kind of trap. The standard defense of capitalism is that it is

the most efficient system of production yet devised, and in a world wracked by poverty and food shortages efficiency is surely not something to be sneered at. Yet with the U.S. gross product now running over the trillion dollar mark, efficiency of and by itself has lost some of its old appeal. The young, in particular, are not apt to be impressed by massive statistics on steel output or million digit figures on kilowatt hours generated and consumed (the more so since the country has been suffering from brownouts and fuel shortages). The young are looking for significance in their lives in this bewildering world of gadgets and mass communication. Man does not live by bread alone.

The true case for enterprise rests on higher grounds. It is that in providing bread it also yields two things which men in all ages have craved—namely Freedom and Order. In a Socialist economy where government owns the means of production, the bureaucrat must decide what goods are to be produced and where and how men should work. Sad experience has shown that this is the road to tyranny whether under Communist or Fascist banners. The same is true of any system of planned economy all too often favored by our woolly-headed liberals and technocrats. The planners may think they know what people want or should have. The people themselves are denied choice in the matter.

By contrast, the enterprise economy, working within the framework of strong but limited government, does provide freedom of choice and voluntary collaboration. Its basic postulate is that the consumer rather than the producer or bureaucrat is king and should be given a vote in the economic arena no less than at the ballot box. The means to this end is the much maligned price, wage and profit system which is a signalling device for translating consumer demands into productive output. If consumers want more meat, as has been the case recently, the price of meat not only will rise but should rise, and farmers in their own interest and in quest of profit will produce more hogs and beef cattle. So too, with all other commodities and manufactured products from automobiles to hairpins. In such a system even the biggest corporation must respond to the public will or go under.

The market is also a means for organizing and coordinating the most precious thing a man has to offer society, namely his own skill and ability. In the Soviet Union and other Socialist societies men are driven to work at such times and places as commissars choose, when they are not actually subject to slave labor camps. In Western societies men are still free to sell their work where it will fetch the highest return (unless prevented by union restrictions and government minimum wage laws). As Walter Lippmann put it in his book "The Good Society": "The market is not something invented by businessmen and speculators for their profit, or by classical economists for their intellectual pleasure. The market is the only possible means by which labor that has been analyzed into its separate specialties, can be synthesized into useful work. Failure to understand that truth is a sure sign of failure to understand the technical principle of production in the modern world."

Unfortunately, today many have failed to understand Mr. Lippmann's basic insight. Such failure is manifest in the public's demand for price controls while letting the real forces making for inflation go unchecked. It is manifest in organized labor's absurd demand "to take wages out of the market," which carried to its logical conclusion must leave us without guide or rudder as to how the world's work should be performed.

Above all, public misunderstanding of the market system is manifest in the constant attack on profits which though a tiny part of the national income are the vital enzyme in

the economy's metabolism. In a complex economy such as ours someone must undertake the risks of bringing labor, materials and capital together before a single bushel of wheat or a single automobile can be produced. That function falls to the businessman. If he is right in judging the market, his reward will be profit. If he is wrong he will suffer loss. On the short-run ours is not a profit economy but a profit-and-loss system. (Ask Penn-Central!) On the longer run a continuous flow of profits is essential to capital formation on which rising living standards and all welfare schemes depend. To talk of profitless prosperity is really a contradiction in terms.

It is up to the businessman to articulate these principles and to do so in such a way that the public will understand their importance. In doing so he will do well not to underestimate the essential role of government. In an economy based on contracts, private property and competition, it is obvious that business requires government to enforce the rules of the road. In a system where all exchanges are made and all prices are determined in terms of money, it is essential that government provide the economy with a stable monetary order both domestic and international (something that governments seem to have no intention of doing).

GOVERNMENT'S TASK

Finally, government has the immemorial constitutional tasks of insuring "domestic tranquility," caring for the "common defense," and promoting the "general welfare." Surely governments all over the world have enough to do in carrying through these great tasks without bothering themselves about the "windfall" profits of Corporation X or telling the consumer what he should pay for a gallon of gasoline.

The tragedy of our times is that governments have mistaken and disregarded their essential functions while dabbling in ventures which no bureaucrat has the wisdom or ability to handle. The result is not a "mixed" economy but a mixed-up economy in which inflation rages while government officials tinker with the thermometer. Meanwhile the business community is urged to take on "social responsibilities" which it cannot reasonably fulfill.

Businessmen have a chance—perhaps a last chance—to help mobilize public opinion toward a different outcome where government and business will each attend to their respective roles. They can no longer claim that capitalism is some kind of God-given dispensation. They can with reason and good conscience argue that the marked economy and limited constitutional government stand or fall together and that both are deeply rooted in the Nature of Man.

This is no doubt a difficult and high-sounding mission. It is also one that can be based on hard common sense. The hour is late. The need pressing. The funds for such an educational campaign are available. What in the world are businessmen waiting for?

WE SHOULD NOT FORGET CZECHOSLOVAKIAN SUPPRESSION

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the past few months have been some momentous changes in the relations between the great powers of the world. Our people cannot help but be hopeful that the easing of international

tensions will lead to increased understanding and a flourishing climate for peace.

There is one element in this hopefulness, however, which requires increased pressure and concentration from this Congress. I refer to freedom, Mr. Speaker, the most vital element in the brotherhood of man and nations.

Unfortunately, freedom is still being denied to our Czechoslovakian friends where Soviet troops since the Prague spring of 1968 have trampled it with the heavy boots of dictatorship.

Let us continue to call attention from this chamber that better relations with any nation carries the price tag of freedom in order to give brotherhood among nations a durable meaning.

To our friends and neighbors in this free land of Czech and Slovak descent, I say, Mr. Speaker,

Let the world note that this Congress has not forgotten and will not forget that freedom suppressed anywhere is freedom suppressed everywhere.

McCORMACK ENCOURAGES ENERGY CONSERVATION THROUGH CONTROLLED USE OF ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that ominous predictions for crippling energy shortages have not overtaken us so far this summer, it is nevertheless critical that each of us exercise as much control as possible in our consumption of energy. To help individuals, the Science and Astronautics' Subcommittee on Energy, which I chair, recently published a small booklet itemizing steps each of us can take to limit unnecessary use of energy with our cars and home appliances. A limited number of these booklets are available to Members of Congress and their constituents.

Another extremely useful pamphlet, which complements the subcommittee's print, has been put out by Public Service Indiana, the principal electrical energy distribution service in the State of Indiana. I would like to take this opportunity to commend Public Service Indiana for this outstanding service, helping the citizens of this country in their overall effort to prevent overuse of scarce energy. The pamphlet's tips range from proper insulating and use of heating and cooling devices to kitchen and laundry appliances. The pamphlet entitled, "A Guide to Electric Waste-Watching," follows:

Trim wasteful uses of electric energy and you help two ways: You conserve limited natural resources and you save money in your electric bill.

There's no need to do without the comfort and convenience that electricity makes possible. But there are ways we can all squeeze more work out of the energy we're now using.

The suggestions for waste-watching of-

fered here—if followed regularly—will help you get the most for your energy dollar.

Electric service has always been a big bargain in your family budget. We want to keep it that way.

THE HOT AND COOL OF IT

Heating and cooling offer some of the biggest waste-watching opportunities around your home. You can conserve energy use in many ways—but insulation holds the key during hot weather as well as cold.

First, some ideas for saving energy in the winter . . .

You lose lots of heat through walls, ceilings or floors if they're not well insulated. A good investment is to install 6 inches of insulation in the ceiling, 4 inches in the walls, and 2 inches under the floor.

Storm windows and storm doors can cut heat loss by 20%. And what they save in heating costs will more than pay for them.

Have a closed-door policy. Keep attic and basement doors as well as doors of adjoining garages shut to hold in the heat.

Weatherstrip around windows and doors; caulk cracks between door and window frames and the wall.

If you have a fireplace, but sure and close the damper as soon as the fire is out; block the flues of unused fireplaces.

Have your heating system checked and cleaned each fall.

Don't be a thermostat jiggler. Set it and forget it. At night, don't turn down the thermostat setting more than 5 degrees or it will use more heat to bring temperature back to normal in the morning.

Clean and replace furnace filters at least every sixty days. Clean filters will mean cleaner air in your house, too.

When the sun's shining, open the draperies and let it in. At night, close them and reduce heat loss through the windows.

Use portable heaters only for supplementary heat. They aren't designed to warm large areas.

Don't overheat. Every degree over 70° will add 3-5% to your heating bill. A sweater's cheaper!

Don't block heat registers or ducts with furniture or curtains.

KEEPING YOUR COOL

Many of us feel that hot weather comfort is just as important as cold weather comfort. Some heating tips apply as well to air conditioning—such as keeping filters clean, a hands-off policy on the thermostat and adequate insulation. Here are some more ideas for keeping your cool.

Make sure the air conditioner you buy is the most efficient. Here's how you can figure the energy efficiency of a particular model: Divide the cooling capacity of the unit (expressed in BTUs, or British Thermal Units) by the wattage. For example, a unit with a capacity of 12,000 BTUs and a wattage of 1,200 would have an energy efficiency ratio (EER) of 10. An EER of 10 or more is great; 8-9 is good, 6-7, passable. If it's under 6, keep looking.

Select the right size unit. Too big a one costs more to own and run, cools too fast, won't dehumidify. Too small a unit won't provide the comfort you're paying for.

Proper wiring for the unit you choose is a must. An older home may require a low-amperage unit. It may cost a little more but it won't overload your wiring.

Attics are heat collectors. Move the hot air out with an exhaust fan or protect your living area from attic heat with ample ceiling insulation.

A fast draw on your draperies and window shades to keep out direct sunlight can reduce heat gain by as much as 50%. Awnings and overhangs are great beat-the-heat devices, too. Storm windows left on year-round don't stop radiant heat but help hold the cool air in.

Nature can help screen the heat out of your house with well-placed trees and shrubbery. But keep greenery around the exhaust of your cooling system trimmed.

A light roof and exterior colors reflect heat. Dark colors tend to absorb it. You can't do much about your roof color, of course, until you have to replace it.

Save "moisture-making" jobs for cooler early morning or nighttime hours. Mopping, dishwashing, laundering and bathing add to humidity problems. (Make sure your clothes dryer is vented to the outside.)

Don't add unnecessary heat. Turn off lights, TV, radios not being used.

Don't block air flow from cooling units with curtains, shades, pictures or furniture.

KITCHEN CONSERVATION

More electric servants are used in the kitchen than any other place in the home. So when you're looking for ways to conserve electricity, it's an obvious target area. Here are some general ideas on getting the most from your appliances at the least cost . . .

Frosty Facts:

Locate your refrigerator away from direct warm air, such as a range or heating equipment, as well as sunshine, and it won't use as much energy.

An air-tight case a refrigerator must be. Close the door on a piece of paper; if you can easily pull the paper out, the seal is not good. A new gasket will keep cold in, heat out.

Plan ahead and take out as many items from the refrigerator at one time as possible. Each opening of the door wastes energy.

Clean the condenser fins often; dust reduces their efficiency.

Defrost your refrigerator BEFORE the ice deposit exceeds ¼-inch.

A frost-free refrigerator will use about \$2 to \$3 a month more electricity than a manual defrost model.

A side-by-side refrigerator freezer uses about 45% more energy than a conventional two-door upright.

Ice-cube and water dispensers, too, use more energy. Whether they're necessities or frills only you can decide.

COOK'S TOUR

At home on the range or using the oven, energy waste-watching can be a profitable game.

Use a pressure cooker. It cuts down cooking time and energy use.

Keep your lid on—the pots and pans, that is. Use flat-bottomed pans that cover the heat element.

When cooking with water, use as little as possible. One cup is plenty for just about anything. Most foods, especially vegetables, will need much less.

Don't be an oven-peeper. Each time you open the door, you can lose up to 20% of the heat.

Don't preheat your oven when cooking foods that take more than an hour of cooking time. It's not necessary.

Use the right combination when oven cooking. Select different dishes that require similar heat levels. Use extra oven space to cook food to be frozen or refrigerated for later use.

Abandon your range! Many times it's more economical to use small appliances for special jobs—toasters, frypans, crockpots, grills.

LAUNDRY LIST

When you use the dishwasher or clothes washer, wait for a full load to accumulate. You'll save electricity and hot water.

Try to install your clothes dryer in a "warmish" area of your home—at least along an inside wall. Don't overload the dryer. Clean the lint filter after every load.

Don't overdry your clothes. It wastes energy, increases fabric wear and makes ironing more difficult.

SEEING THE LIGHT

Energy for lighting is a relatively small part of your electric bill—probably no more than 6%. Still it shouldn't be wasted. A 60-watt bulb burning for a year uses up 600 pounds of coal and would cost about \$15 in energy.

Old and darkened bulbs give less light. Use them in attic, cellar and garage areas where they are infrequently used. Put bright new bulbs where you need most light.

Dusting bulbs and glass shades regularly gives you up to one-third more light for the money.

Use lower wattage bulbs where bright light isn't necessary.

Fluorescent lighting is more economical—watt-for-watt—than incandescent. Fluorescent lamps give five times the light and last up to 10 times as long as ordinary bulbs. They're cooler, too.

Switching shortens fluorescent lamp life but not incandescent bulbs. So turn off fluorescents only if you'll be out of the room more than 30 minutes but snap incandescents off even if you leave the room briefly.

Long-life bulbs are a bargain only where you need long life. While they may cut down on replacement time and inconvenience, they give off only 80% of the light for the same energy. Use them in hard to reach places.

Multiple switches make it easier to turn off lights when leaving a room. Dimmer switches reduce energy use when brightness isn't important.

Buy bulbs by light output. Lumens is the measure of brightness. Compare and you'll find that a 100-watt bulb produces 50% more light than four 25-watt bulbs for the same amount of energy.

A word to the wise waste-watcher:

A new appliance tends to use less energy than an old one to do the same job. But be careful . . . the least expensive model in any manufacturer's line is often the least efficient energy user.

Any energy use you can schedule during off-peak hours—during early morning, late evening or on weekends when the total demand for electricity is less—helps us make the best use of our system. And helps us hold the line on costs.

THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT AND THE ALASKA PIPELINE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Alaska pipeline right-of-way bill reported out by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs contains provisions intended to prevent any court from reviewing the question of whether the pipeline project is in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

To obtain the views of some of the Nation's leading conservation organizations with respect to these provisions of the bill, I addressed a letter to the member groups of the Natural Resources Council of America, assembled at their meeting on July 26, 1973.

Twelve organizations have responded strongly favoring an amendment to remove the NEPA-override provisions. These organizations are:

American Fisheries Society.
American Forestry Association.

American Institute of Biological Sciences.

Friends of the Earth.

Izaak Walton League of America.

National Audubon Society.

The Nature Conservancy.

Sierra Club.

Sport Fishing Institute.

The Wilderness Society.

Wildlife Management Institute.

The Wildlife Society.

For the information of my colleagues, I include my letter to the NRCA, and the responses, at this point in the RECORD:

JULY 25, 1973.

Mr. GEORGE ANDERSON,
Secretary, Natural Resources Council of America, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: H.R. 9130, the Alaska pipeline right-of-way bill, has been ordered reported by the House Interior Committee with a provision barring further judicial review of the pipeline under the National Environmental Policy Act.

When the bill reaches the House Floor, an amendment will be offered to remove this provision and to insure that the Alaska pipeline is not exempted from any provision of NEPA. I strongly believe that we should not start making special exemptions from NEPA as H.R. 9130 would do.

By this letter, I would like to request the views of the member organizations of the Natural Resources Council of America on this subject. Would your organizations favor an amendment along these lines, to prevent the override of NEPA?

I would appreciate having the replies of NRCA member organizations by Monday, July 30.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

JULY 26, 1973.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: This is in response to your letter of July 25, requesting our views on an amendment to H.R. 9130, the Alaska pipeline right-of-way bill. The amendment you cite would delete the provisions barring judicial review of the pipeline under provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The undersigned organizations strongly favor an amendment to insure that the Alaska pipeline fully complies with NEPA, and that the courts will have the opportunity to settle the question of compliance.

We believe it would be extremely unwise to give the Alaska pipeline a special exemption from NEPA. Many projects with far less environmental impact than this pipeline are under consideration throughout the United States. To give a special exemption on one of the biggest projects of all would pave the way for further exemptions on other projects.

We take a stand in favor of full compliance with NEPA by every major federal action that is within the scope of that Act.

Sincerely yours,

George Alderson, Legislative Director,
Friends of the Earth; Michael McCloskey, Executive Director, Sierra Club; Fred G. Evenden, Executive Director, The Wildlife Society; Elvis J. Stahr, President, National Audubon Society.

Raymond C. Hubley, Jr., Executive Director, Izaak Walton League of America; Patrick F. Noonan, President, The Nature Conservancy; Daniel A. Poole, President, Wildlife Management Institute; Richard H.

Stroud, Executive Vice President, Sport Fishing Institute.

William E. Towell, Executive Vice President, American Forestry Association; Richard A. Wade, Executive Secretary, American Fisheries Society; Stewart M. Brandberg, Executive Director, The Wilderness Society.

JULY 30, 1973.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: During a recent meeting of the Natural Resources Council of America, the American Institute of Biological Sciences and other member organizations of the Council were informed of the provision in H.R. 9130 that would bar further judicial review of the Alaska pipeline under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The American Institute of Biological Sciences, speaking for its 41 constituent scientific societies, strongly urges that an amendment be offered to insure that the Alaska pipeline will fully comply with NEPA, and that the courts will have the opportunity to settle the question of compliance. To do less will surely weaken the NEPA as an aid in future legislative and judicial struggles to protect our environment.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. OLIVE,
Director.

CANADIANS PROFIT FROM PHASE IV

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, for months I have been pointing out that food prices are high because of food shortages and that you do not solve the problem of food shortages with freezes on food prices. That makes about as much sense as saying that we have a shortage of teachers and we can solve the teacher shortage by putting a ceiling on teachers' salaries. I also objected to continuing the same freeze on beef that was such a dismal failure in the area of pork and poultry. I pointed out that such a freeze helped no one—the producer, consumer or our economy. Now I learn that it is in fact helping someone.

It is no secret that packing plants around the country are closing and it should be obvious that the cost of these closings will eventually be passed on to the consumer. They are closing because they are caught in a squeeze between the phase IV ceiling and the cost of cattle. They are also caught in another squeeze.

It seems the one group of people benefiting from all of this artificial price-fixing situation are Canadian businessmen who are buying American beef, shipping the cattle to Canada for slaughter, and then selling this same beef back to us at prices not covered by the freeze. Strange as it may seem, American beef prices are frozen, but imported beef is not. The American consumer is going to pay extra three ways. She is going to buy so-called imported beef at prices above the freeze level, with added costs of running them through Canada like some

people run money through Mexico. She is going to eventually pay for the heavy costs of packing plant closings when they reopen. She is also going to be bidding against other consumers for a smaller supply of beef—which means much higher prices—because these freezes have discouraged increased production.

In visiting with the Sioux City market today, I learn that by 11 a.m. this morning, with less than 100 loads of cattle being offered, that over 20 loads had already been purchased by Canadian buyers. Information from the Omaha and Sioux City cattle markets yesterday indicated that from 20 to 25 percent of the total supply of beef cattle available at these two markets were purchased by Canadians.

Today I urged the President to take immediate action to plug this loophole in his ill-conceived continued freeze on beef. At the present time, foreign businessmen are lining their pockets at the expense of packing plants and consumers while higher prices that should be going to producers to produce more beef are being eaten up by the expense of shipping American beef cattle to Canada for slaughter and then shipping it back to us as imported beef at inflated prices.

I also urged the President to realize the economic folly of continuing a beef price freeze which is no way to solve problems of beef shortages and works only to discourage increased beef production. If the President waits until September 12 to lift the freeze—something I find hard to comprehend he will do—we will have the boycotters being boycotted by cattlemen because few cattle will be shipped only weeks before the freeze is to be lifted.

I urge the Members of this body to join me in urging the President to both close the loophole in the freeze immediately and to act quickly in ending this counterproductive beef price freeze.

CANADIANS SAY HANOI BROKE PACT

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the test of any peace agreement is how well the parties to the agreement abide by its provisions. We know they are not complying with article 8 relative to MIA's and I have introduced legislation to remedy this problem. The Washington Post on July 22, 1973, reports that the North Vietnamese are also not complying with article 7 of the agreement that states:

From the enforcement of the cease-fire to the formation of the government provided for in Articles 9(b) and 14 of this Agreement, the two South Vietnamese parties shall not accept the introduction of troops, military advisors, and military personnel including technical military personnel, armaments, munitions, and war material into South Vietnam.

The two South Vietnamese parties shall be permitted to make periodic replacement

of armaments, munitions, and war material which have been destroyed, damaged, worn out or used up after the cease-fire, on the basis of piece-for-piece, of the same characteristics and properties, under the supervision of the Joint Military Commission of International Commission of Control and Supervision.

The article from the Post details the violations as reported by the Canadian truce supervisory team. This, together with the ominous news in Cambodia bodes ill for the future of peace in Southeast Asia as Communist aggression continues. The article follows:

CANADIANS SAY HANOI BROKE PACT

(By Thomas W. Lippman)

CANTHO, SOUTH VIETNAM, July 21.—A Canadian truce supervisory team has accused North Vietnam of "massive" and "unrelenting" infiltration of troops into South Vietnam's Mekong Delta since the January cease-fire, in deliberate violation of the Paris truce agreement.

The strongly worded report says that thousands of fresh troops have come and are coming into the South, never having heard of the Paris accords, the various peace-keeping forces or the departure of U.S. troops. These North Vietnamese soldiers left their own country just about the time the Paris agreement was signed, the report says, and were instructed to keep coming, although Article 7 of the agreement expressly prohibits such movements.

Confirming information obtained earlier from other sources, the report also says the truce team has learned that large groups of North Vietnamese civilians, including doctors, lawyers and engineers are coming into Vietcong-held territory in the South "to practice their professions."

The truce team's report, forwarded to the Saigon headquarters of the International Commission for Control and Supervision (ICCS) in Saigon earlier this week, was based on interrogations of captured North Vietnamese soldiers. The soldiers said they entered the South in June after a five-month hike down the Ho Minh Trail in Laos and Cambodia.

It is unlikely that the report will ever bring any action by the full ICCS, from which the Canadians are withdrawing after six months of frustration. It was made available by a Canadian official here who said he believed it should be published but knew that it "would never see the light of day" after it was discussed by the commissioner's Polish and Hungarian members.

Although there have been reports of infiltration since January, the earlier reports came mostly from South Vietnamese and American sources. The Canadian report, at least in theory, has the weight of impartiality behind its conclusions.

"Based on the testimony of captured North Vietnamese soldiers," the report says, North Vietnam "without being deterred one scintilla by the Paris agreement has been infiltrating massive armed North Vietnamese troop units into Cambodia and South Vietnam in order to conduct military operations against the Republic of Vietnam. . . . It can also be concluded that there never has been the slightest indication during the four and a half months following the cease-fire that the Democratic Republic of [North] Vietnam has modified its infiltration policy."

The report tells of an "unrelenting" drive by the North to move men and equipment down the well-organized Ho Chi Minh trail system. Canadian officials who participated in the interrogations said in private conversations that they fully believe the tales told by the prisoners, which generally corroborated each other and fitted in with information obtained from other sources.

The interrogated prisoners said they had

crossed into South Vietnam from Cambodia in the second week of June by swimming a canal into Chau Doc Province, a well-established infiltration route.

As quoted by the Canadian report, the prisoners said they had had almost no contact with any officials or soldiers of the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front during their trip, except when they changed from North Vietnamese to Vietcong uniforms at the border. That, the Canadian team concluded, shows once again that the military operations in the delta are controlled by the North Vietnamese, not the Vietcong.

It is not clear exactly how many North Vietnamese troops are believed to have come into the delta since January. The prisoners said that the incoming troops moved down the trail in groups of 500, and that at one time as many as 20 of these groups were "stacked up" as a rest station because the trail ahead was interdicted by U.S. bombing.

Maj. Gen. Nguyen Van Nghi, commander of all South Vietnamese forces in the delta, said in an interview that four infiltration groups had come into the country's southernmost provinces, south of the Bassac River, since the ceasefire, and that five more are on the way.

The infiltration "has been a problem" for government troops, he acknowledged, but he insisted that "Our troops are moving to block the routes: we are reacting to stop it."

What that means, other sources said, is that South Vietnam has been pounding the infiltration routes with artillery fire, apparently with some success, and has also used air support in its effort to block the North Vietnamese.

"If no further divisions infiltrate into the delta, we can handle it," Gen. Nghi said. But there is "still a threat" because of the concentration of North Vietnamese troops in Cambodia. "That threat will be increased when the U.S. stops bombing" in Cambodia next month, he said.

Gen. Nghi said the decision on whether South Vietnamese troops would cross the border to take on the North Vietnamese in Cambodia after the bombing halt had not yet been made. He noted, "We have operated in Cambodia before. We are ready to go back at any time, and we are able to."

The soldiers interrogated by the truce team said they had made their way south on a narrow jungle trail, staying off the hard-surfaced parallel roads that were used for truck and tank traffic, which they saw only from time to time.

At various places along the trail, they said, they would rest and receive supplies at rest stations operated by North Vietnamese support troops and decorated with banners welcoming the soldiers. Some of these stations, they said, included small farms. They were undisturbed by bombing in Laos, they said, but were often forced to take cover from air strikes in Cambodia.

CIVILIAN GROUPS

They reported seeing at least six groups of about a hundred civilians each, also heading south; 8 per cent of the civilians, they said, were women.

The interrogations were conducted at the request of the South Vietnamese by Canadian and Indonesian members of the ICCS. The report, however, contains only the finding of the Canadians, since the Indonesians forwarded their own separate report to their chief in Saigon and it has not been made public.

The Hungarian and Polish delegations in Cantho refused to take part in the investigation, following a pattern they have adhered to consistently of ignoring the infiltration issue altogether. It was their refusal to participate in an earlier interrogation, and the Canadians' insistence on going ahead with a discussion of their own findings at a meeting in Saigon, that led to an impasse that paralyzed the ICCS for a month.

The Canadians have shut themselves out of all further investigations as of yesterday, preparing for their departure next week. "What that means" one of their officers said, "is that there won't be any more investigations of infiltration. We're the ones who forced the issue."

Canadian Ambassador Michel Gauvin and the Canadian truce observation team were biased in investigating ceasefire violations, the North Vietnam newspaper People's Daily said in Hanoi yesterday.

In an editorial, the paper said: "Since the Paris agreement took effect, the PRG (Vietcong) and the DRVN (North Vietnamese) have scrupulously implemented it. On the contrary, the U.S. and Saigon sides have systematically violated (it). The Canadian delegation, however, has always turned a blind eye to the fact."

In Saigon, the Vietcong said they want the ICSS to remain a four-nation body and are trying to find a replacement for the Canadian team, which is leaving at the end of this month. Canada ordered its team to take no part in the ICSS after noon yesterday.

The leader of Indonesia's delegates to the ICSS said the work of the truce supervisors would go on with three countries if no replacement for the Canadians could be found. He did not rule out the possibility that Poland or Hungary might withdraw from the Commission.

EMIGRATE TO ISRAEL

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, at the end of May, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Dr. Isaac Poltinnikov concerning the attempt he and his family have made to leave the U.S.S.R. and emigrate to Israel. That letter chronicled a series of events which can only be termed "harassment," in connection with the Poltinnikovs' desire to leave the Soviet Union.

Recently, they wrote a constituent of mine concerning their further problem which seems to be tied in with their attempts to emigrate. This second letter is further evidence of a policy I would hope all men find reprehensible.

The letter follows:

A LETTER FROM DR. ISAAC POLTINNIKOV

(The following is a translation of a letter by Dr. Isaac Poltinnikov of Novosibirsk to Ruth and Maurice Tyson of Los Angeles, Calif. (Transl. Si Frumkin.)

DEAR FRIENDS RUTH AND MAURICE: We received your letter of June 19, 1973 and I hasten to answer it. We thank you, Ruth and Maurice, and we thank all our friends who are so actively involved with our fate.

We were very interested to read the clipping from the Congressional Record-House of May 5, 1973 which contained my letter to Y. and E. Paller. I was happy to note that the letter was reprinted in its entirety—without changes—and that it was well translated into English.

I must tell you that since that letter was written our situation has not improved. It was written on March 17, and on March 18 we received word of a serious illness of my father-in-law which was followed on March 21 by the news of his death. Our urgent appeal to the Novosibirsk authorities requesting permission to leave at once was fruitless.

We were refused in the most categorical manner. What were we to do? We launched our protest in the only way that was open to us—we started a hunger strike that lasted for almost 6 days. Our physical condition deteriorated quite seriously, but still, we received no reply to the wires we had sent to the government.

We were called in 2 months later and told that the previous decision remains in force, that is that we could not leave. I must tell you that we had hoped during the latter part of March, to be permitted to leave in the near future. One of the responsible officials in charge of emigration told me that our problem would be resolved in the near future, and that he personally felt that I should be permitted to leave. After being encouraged in this manner we had notified our father-in-law that our case was about to be concluded. However, he did not have enough strength left to wait for us. His death and the attitude of the authorities upset and demoralized us.

On June 14 our entire family went to the office of the head of the All-Union OVIR—this is the organization that is in charge of emigration for the entire country. This was far from our first appeal to the head of this organization Mr. Verein. Earlier we had asked that the exit permissions for the two parts of our family be coordinated, that is that those of us who lived in Kiev could leave with those from Novosibirsk. Then, after Eleanor and Mark and their grandfather left, we asked that our exit visas be speeded up, since we knew that our father could not live apart from us. And now our third request. This time we were told that we would be leaving, but we could not be told when exactly—possibly in a month, possibly in three months. The most important condition, however, is that we leave Moscow at once and behave ourselves, and that otherwise we would be arrested.

The conversation took place in the evening and already the following morning we were stopped near our house by members of the militia, taken to the airport, and forced to leave Moscow by plane.

It is interesting to note that during our conversation Verein spoke in very openly negative terms about those Jews who want to leave for Israel. He called them crooks who had sold themselves for money and traitors to the fatherland. He spoke about our perversion and incorrect interpretation of Declaration of Human Rights and that while everyone has the right to leave any country, this right has to be regulated by the State in the interests of the State. We had already heard similar views expressed at meetings and during private conversations, but in this case these views were expressed by a high official and must reflect the official point of view. This is very frightening.

On March 15 and 16 our family held a two-day hunger strike as a protest against the oppression against Jews who wish to emigrate to Israel. We feel that these promises by Verein of a speedy permission to leave were caused simply by his desire to get us to leave to Moscow, to scare us and to silence us. In view of his hostile remarks about the Jews who are trying to leave in accordance with their rights under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights these promises do not look very convincing. What is terrible is that we are now in a position of human beings whose fate is being decided during the conversations that are taking place right now between the USA and the USSR. Will they agree or will they not, and what will it all mean to us? It is time to end this letter, since I am afraid that it won't reach you anyway.

Our whole family sends you, dear friends, our most heartfelt wishes for wellbeing, peace and happiness,

Yours,

I. POLTINNIKOV.

RATINGS SOAR FOR WATERGATE

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, since there has been a great debate concerning the value of public television, I was delighted to read that the Watergate hearings have succeeded in helping public television find its role.

One of the positive aspects emerging from the Watergate hearings has been a greatly increased public interest in Government. Public TV coverage of Watergate has given the people an inner look at how our Government really operates.

The article which I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is from the June 20, 1973, edition of the Los Angeles Times. The impact of the article lies in a statistic: 92 percent of the Nation's public television outlets are now covering the hearings, with unusually high ratings when rebroadcast in the evening.

The role of the electronic media, in this instance, has been to foster a greater insight into the processes of Government, while simultaneously strengthening America's fourth network.

The article is as follows:

RATINGS SOAR FOR WATERGATE ON PBS

(By Cecil Smith)

The Watergate hearings are the best thing that has happened to public television since Sesame Street. "It's given us a second chance," said Jim Karayn. "But there are no guarantees. A year from now, we could be back in the ditch."

Karayn is president of the National Public Affairs Center for Television (NPACT) in Washington, which is telecasting the hearings gavel-to-gavel nightly in prime time over the PBS network (and KCET, Channel 28, here). The hearings in Washington, D.C. have been postponed this week because of the visit of Leonid I. Brezhnev; they will resume televised hearings Tuesday.

The response has been phenomenal. PBS stations are drawing audiences five and six times above normal. Boston chortled that Watergate has higher ratings than "Elizabeth R—"Sam Ervin is outdrawing Glenn-Jackson!"

Letters by the tens of thousands pour into the local stations and the offices of NPACT many of them containing checks. More than \$300,000 raised by various stations in the last few weeks is directly attributable to the Watergate coverage. KCET's pledge nights last week during breaks in the hearings netted the station \$31,198 from 1,172 viewers an average well above the \$15 norm. Karayn said a woman in New York sent in \$6,000 saying that she had given \$3,000 to the Committee to Reelect the President and she felt the least she could do was double it for the Watergate hearings.

"It's costing us \$14,000 a day to do the hearings," said Karayn. "We have no money. We have no idea from one day to the next where the money will come from. But we do know we'll find it somewhere and we will continue the presentations."

Karayn has scheduled coverage of the hearings on PBS through July (except for the holiday week of July 4 which Sen. Ervins Senate Select Committee is taking off; he said NPACT coverage will continue until the committee report is finalized next February. For anyone to be talking of NPACT in the

terms of next February—or even next month—would have been utterly bizarre last spring. Nothing in public television was as dead as NPACT.

President Nixon's would-be TV czar, Clay T. Whitehead, wrote its obituary when he declared that public television should not carry public affairs. In the brazen attempt to take over the public channels and remake them into an Administration propaganda pipeline, Henry Loomis, the Administration's handpicked president for the Corp. for Public Broadcasting (CPB), arrogantly announced that NPACT and the programs it produces, such as Washington Week in Review, Black Journal, Behind the Lines, America '73, plus such brilliant NPACT specials as the Emmy-winning "VD Blues," as well as other PBS programs critical of the Nixon Administration, notably Bill Buckley's Firing Line, would no longer exist because they simply would not be funded.

"To illustrate how the atmosphere has changed," said Karayn. "I have just received a letter from Loomis praising the Watergate coverage and saying this is precisely what public television should do!"

THE STENCH OF SCANDAL

The various White House maneuvers in regard to the public television have the stench of another Watergate scandal. Thomas Curtis, a distinguished conservative Republican, quit as CPB chairman in disgust at White House meddling in public television affairs; Dr. James R. Killian, the eminent educator and former president of MIT, only agreed to succeed Curtis as CPB chairman if the White House would stay out of CPB affairs and if public affairs would be a prime PBS program priority. Ford Foundation grants for fall include \$1.5 million for NPACT and CPB has now added another \$800,000. However, funds are hopelessly inadequate.

But with peace declared between CPB and PBS and its 230 public TV stations, there's hope of a more realistic funding program. Congress is now preparing a bill for a two-year \$120 million appropriation for public TV, similar to the bill President Nixon vetoed last year, Karayn says. Sen. Howard Baker, vice chairman of the Ervin committee, has "assured me that if the President vetoes this bill, it will be passed over his veto."

"The real importance of the public acceptance of the Watergate hearings is internal within public television itself," said Karayn. "There is suddenly vitality again, and excitement, extending through the whole apparatus. It's like being reborn."

"When I told PBS and the member stations that NPACT was going to cover the Watergate hearings in full, gavel-to-gavel, as we did the Republican Convention, you should have heard the reaction."

"They told me: 'You finally had it, you've decided to commit professional hara-ki!' The first poll we took as to whether stations would carry our coverage in prime time was highly discouraging. Only 52% were interested. Now, 92% are carrying it, a wider clearance than any other program has in PBS except Sesame Street (97%)."

A JOURNAL OF RECORD

"I think this is what public TV should be: a journal of record. There will be other hearings open to television. Congress and its committees will open up for camera coverage. Eventually, the Supreme Court will allow its arguments telecast."

"But other hearings and debates will not be as sexy as Watergate, which is full of spies, midnight raids, malfeasance in high office. The energy crisis hearing, which will mean a great deal more to everyone of us than Watergate, will undoubtedly be as dull as hell. Commercial television won't touch it. I think the three commercial networks should underwrite public television to cover these things in full, supplying them with excerpts and highlights for their newscasts . . ."

Portly Jim Karayn cut his journalistic teeth in commercial TV. A native of Los Angeles and a graduate of USC ("Some of my classmates figure prominently in the Watergate hearings"), Jim built a solid reputation in news here, particularly at KTLA. As news director of KTLA, he developed such a news image for the station that at one time whenever a catastrophe struck Los Angeles, flood, fire or earthquake, one automatically turned to Channel 5 to find out what happened. Jim was lured East by NBC News, left in 1965 to join NET and its attempt to build a viable public affairs department without the taint of commercialism under the guidance of Fred Friendly. Jim has been president of NPACT since its founding two years ago.

"Remember," he said, "that Friendly quit as president of CBS News when that network refused to run the Fulbright hearings on Vietnam in 1966. That was the beginning."

RESPONSIBLY OUTRAGEOUS

"I have always felt," he said, "that the function of public broadcasting is to be responsibly outrageous. Its great enemies are cowardice and caution, brought on in part by insecure financing. Stations were at first afraid to run the Watergate hearings for fear of annoying some of the prominent Republicans on their boards or in fear that they might lose some membership or donations from conservatives. None of that happened."

"Fear pervades the thinking. Look at the number of stations afraid to run 'Steambath'. Good Lord, that is exactly the kind of programs we should do—there were stations afraid of offending with 'VD Blues,' a program that had more impact than anything shown on either commercial or public television last year."

"There must be an independent source of financing. Public television should be like, say, the cancer society or some other major national cause, wherein a giant kitty could be established into which corporations and foundations and government could funnel money without strings attached. Maybe it will happen now . . ."

Karayn, who was here for the TV Academy board of trustees meeting last week, added thoughtfully: "Remember, we have had everything going for us with Watergate. The writers strike even helped. The commercial networks have nothing on but reruns. PBS has been so entangled with internal fighting that it has no schedule for fall, much less for summer."

"If we had to interrupt a 'Forsythe Saga' or an 'Elizabeth R,' we might be in trouble with our viewers. But there's nothing else to watch."

"Watergate is the only show in town!"

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AND HIGH INTEREST RATES PUT A SQUEEZE ON HOME BUYERS

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, since July 5, when the Federal Reserve Board allowed banks to raise interest rates on certain types of its deposits, a rate war has been raging between commercial banks and other financial institutions. The Federal Reserve Board permitted banks to increase rate payments as part of a scheme to bring intensified competitive pressures on the savings and loan institutions across the country. Although increased competition generally

benefits everyone and advances the interest of the people, the action by the Federal Reserve Board has had the opposite result and will have devastating effects through the country if allowed to remain in effect.

Traditionally, savings and loan associations have been the source of housing funds for the vast majority of the people and particularly for low- and moderate-income families. But, because the Federal Reserve Board's high interest rate policy has prevented the savings and loan associations from attracting new funds and permitted existing funds in these institutions to be withdrawn and placed in banks, the availability of funds for residential housing has dramatically declined. In some areas, home mortgage funds have disappeared.

A policy which produces such results only harms those who are least able to protect themselves. While it may be too early to determine just who is benefiting from the Federal Reserve Board's high interest rates, it is clear that the homeowners and prospective homeowners, construction workers, homebuilders, and, in some cases savings and loan associations are suffering greatly.

So that the Members may be aware of the scope and the effect of the problem, I would at this time like to insert in the Record excerpts from just a few of the many letters I have received:

I want to inform you of what I consider a dangerous savings rate war which has been started by the Federal Reserve Board in its attempt to ball out major banks of the U.S.

The savings and loan industry faces a major emergency if some change is not made. Home builders and realtors will be put out of business if something is not done. Unemployment in the construction industry will begin shortly unless action is taken.

I hope you will agree that construction workers, realtors, home builders, surveyors, and the people employed by the home building industry, should not be forced out of their jobs as a sacrifice to a few major banks who have overcommitted their loan funds. Signed: J. H. Spearman, Chairman of the Board, Gate City Savings, Greensboro, North Carolina.

The Federal Reserve's action has been the start of a dangerous rate war with the consumer carrying the burden of increased costs of money. He cannot be expected to absorb more inflation and maintain a normal and respectable life.

If the high rates are allowed to continue, home buyers are going to be obliged to pay 8% or 9% for mortgage money, if and when it is available.

Today we have discontinued closing mortgage loans for one reason only—no funds available. Signed: Miles L. Wilson, President, First Federal Savings and Loan Association, Wabash, Indiana.

Recently Congress extended until August 1, 1973, the rate control authority of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. These agencies immediately increased the rate ceilings which are permitted to be paid by savings and loans and banks. It is obvious that these agencies failed to realize the adverse effect which would be felt in the local and national housing markets. Their action has also created a destructive influence in the savings market and has caused confusion and chaos. In addition, it has created unfair competition causing a clear inequity to the savings and loan business by giving special privileges to the commercial banks.

The local mortgage market in Broward

County, Florida is already extremely tight and on the verge of being critical. The increased savings rates alone have forced the interest rate on mortgages up by at least one half of one percent. The specter of reduced savings could make the situation so bad that only the rich will be able to afford housing in the coming months. Signed: Robert W. Fox, Senior Vice President-Treasurer, Atlantic Federal Savings and Loan Association, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

On July 5th, California Federal Savings and Loan Association was advised that the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has issued new rate schedules. These rate changes were not totally unnecessary, it was obvious they would decrease the amount of homebuilding in our country, feed the fires of inflation, and create havoc with the Savings and Loan Industry. As expected, this is happening!

I hope you, personally, will note the results of the rate changes upon our institution, which is typical of the industry. While our savings increased during the first half of 1973, they were well below 1972. In May, we did experience a \$12.9 million increase but, in June, we actually had a cash outflow of \$3.5 million. During July, through the 21st, our net savings outflow has already reached \$10.5 million. This latter decrease has been caused by the disintermediation that is the direct result of the increased rates.

These new rate schedules have reversed the flow of savings from a positive to a negative position, increased home interest rates, increased the cost of housing, and slowed down home construction which will hasten an uncalled-for downturn in the economy. Signed: Robert R. Dockson, President and Chief Executive Officer, California Federal Savings, Los Angeles, California.

Single family housing is very acute in the Charleston Area, as well as most of West Virginia...

We are alarmed at prospects for future financing, with the so called wild card category of savings, now advertised by one of our local banks, with four years certificates at 7½%. It is my understanding there is no ceiling, or maximum on this certificate. This will rob our Federal Savings and Loan Associations of funds normally available for home financing, as it would be impossible for the Savings and Loan Associations to pay 7½% on savings and make mortgage loans at 8% which is the ceiling in West Virginia.

Since the appearance of this advertisement in the Charleston Daily Mail, Friday, July 20, the local Savings and Loan Associations (that I have contacted) have indicated they cannot make a definite loan commitment until they have some idea of the impact of withdrawals by their depositors. Signed: O. T. Orr, President, Old Colony Company, Charleston, West Virginia.

We are outraged at the patently transparent and self-serving actions of Mr. Burns in recently allowing banks to jump interest rates.

Mr. Burns, the Federal Reserve Board and the major banks are obviously sharing the same bed.

What this does to smaller banks, savings and loans and lending rates is an insult to all 210 million Americans. No one with any intelligence could accept Mr. Burns public justification of this action.

This effective abolition of Regulation Q will create chaos, restrain competition and work great hardships upon the entire citizenry.

Please do whatever you can to set this great wrong right! Signed: Bill Greif, Bill Greif and Associates, Burlingame, California.

CXIX—1728—Part 21

A CONGRESSMAN RETIRES

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, last week our friend and colleague JOHN ZWACH announced that he would not seek reelection to Congress from Minnesota's Sixth District. That announcement caused great sadness to me and many of JOHN's friends. At the same time, since we know it is JOHN's own decision, we congratulate him on it and on his four terms of dedicated service to the people of this country.

Many of his colleagues probably are not aware that JOHN served 32 years in the Minnesota Legislature, many of those years as majority leader in the Minnesota Senate. When he retires, he will have served the people of Minnesota for 40 extraordinary years.

As one who has leaned on JOHN ZWACH for advice, counsel, and assistance both in the Minnesota Legislature and the U.S. Congress, I will particularly miss him. I take this opportunity to thank JOHN ZWACH for his service and to place in the RECORD the editorial of the Minneapolis Tribune of Thursday, July 26, which comments on JOHN ZWACH's impending retirement in a detached but positive sort of way. I also insert the editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer-Press of the same date, which makes similar comment. These papers are two of Minnesota's principal dailies with extensive coverage in JOHN's district:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, July 26, 1973]

JOHN ZWACH'S RETIREMENT

John Zwach, someone once said, was "last in the alphabet, first at work." In his 32 years in the Minnesota Legislature and 6½ in Congress, he has been a dedicated worker—too dedicated, perhaps, in the opinion of his doctor. This week, explaining that the doctor had ordered him to slow down, Zwach announced his retirement from Congress when his term ends in 1974.

Although relatively inconspicuous in Congress—in sharp contrast to his front-and-center role as majority leader in the state Senate—Zwach has been an earnest, conscientious congressman, devoting himself to agricultural affairs with the evident approval of his 6th District constituents, who elected him four times.

In fact, Zwach has never lost an election, serving 12 years in the Minnesota House and 20 in the Senate before moving to Congress. In the Legislature he advanced to the powerful posts of chairman of the Rules Committee and majority leader. The familiar high-pitched, raspy voice could be heard in virtually every debate on the floor as he wheedled and coaxed, rather than attempting to overpower, while pushing for Conservative legislation or opposing the DFL's.

Zwach's decision to retire may have been influenced by what seems to be the increasing liberality of his district, which reapportionment has stretched to the Twin Cities area. He won in 1972 by only 4,582 votes over the DFL's Richard Nolan. But Zwach said this week that he simply wanted to "get out of the swift stream of government and observe the scene from the peace and quiet of

our Minnesota countryside." We think it's a well-deserved rest after 40 years of public service.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer-Press, July 26, 1973]

A CONGRESSMAN RETIRES

It is with mixed emotions that we greet Rep. John Zwach's announcement that he will retire from public life at the end of his current term as Minnesota's Sixth District congressman.

Zwach's retirement will mark the end of 40 years of energetic service as an elected official. He began his public service in the State Legislature in 1934 and served continuously until he was elected to Congress in 1966. He has been reelected three times in a district that has been one of the toughest political battlegrounds in the state.

Zwach has always been a man of dedication and integrity, and his work in Congress has contributed to solving many agriculture and rural problems.

We are sorry to see a man of Zwach's character and experience retire from public service. But we are happy that he still has the vigor to "explore some new horizons," as he put it. We wish him good hunting.

MAJOR CHANGES IN OUR APPROACH TO FOREIGN AID

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, the Mutual Development and Cooperation Act of 1973, passed by the House on July 26, involved extensive rethinking of our approach to foreign aid.

I am glad to place in the RECORD several press articles which point up some of the major changes in our approach to foreign aid:

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1973]

MAJOR FOREIGN AID CHANGE ASKED IN A KEY HOUSE BILL

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 30.—A proposal for a major transformation and effective increase in the foreign economic aid program was made today by a majority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Representative Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat of Wisconsin, introduced a bill sponsored by 23 of the 40 committee members intended to be substituted for the \$1-billion foreign aid authorization measure sent to Congress by the Nixon Administration.

The new bill would not affect military aid or the special proposed program of reconstruction and other help for Southeast Asia.

Like the Administration's bill, the legislation introduced today would also authorize \$1-billion in economic aid in the fiscal year beginning July 1. But the key new element would be a large fund to finance exports of United States goods at low interest rates and easy repayment terms to the world's poorest nations—those with a per capita income of less than \$200 a year.

STUDY NEXT MONTH PROBABLY

The House Foreign Affairs Committee is expected to act favorably on the new approach when it begins considering foreign aid, probably next month. The Administration's attitude toward the proposal has not yet been disclosed.

Under the new approach, which is backed by both Democrats and Republicans, the proposed "export development credit fund" would operate outside the budget and would raise its funds by selling Government-guaranteed bonds in the private capital markets, just as several other quasi-governmental agencies now do. It would begin with a five-year authority to finance up to 4.5-billion of exports.

American suppliers of equipment of all kinds would be able to offer foreign governments or other purchasers in the low-income countries very favorable terms. The following purposes would be served, according to the bill's sponsors:

American exports to these countries, now declining, would be aided because this nation's suppliers could compete more readily with suppliers from Western Europe and Japan.

Development of the poor countries would be aided without saddling them with an intolerable debt burden.

The other major feature of the transformed aid program would end the last vestiges of "development assistance"—involving projects such as ports and electric power—in the United States aid program and would earmark the \$1-billion of economic aid proposed by the Administration for "human-oriented" programs in the areas of food, rural development, population control, health and education. The trend of the aid program is already in that direction.

The \$1-billion figure, left intact in the proposed new bill as the total for economic aid, does not include proposed aid of more than \$600-million for reconstruction and other assistance in Southeast Asia. That is a separate part of the aid bill.

Under the new approach, "development assistance" of the major project type in the less-developed countries would be left to the World Bank and other international lending agencies.

HOW CREDIT WOULD BE SET UP

The new export development credit funds would be set up in such a way that no appropriations would be required. Thus the House Appropriations Committee, which has regularly slashed foreign-aid funds under the leadership of Otto E. Passman, Democrat of Louisiana, would be by-passed.

The interest "subsidy" involved in the export financing would be paid for by using the money regularly received by the Treasury each year in payment of interest and principal on past foreign-aid loans.

Mr. Zablocki estimated that the envisioned expansion of exports to the poorest countries that would be made possible by the fund would create 80,000 United States jobs while "at the same time transferring to developing countries resources needed for their development."

A possible Administration objection might relate to the proposed financing of the new fund by issuing bonds in the capital markets. Government "agency" financing—by such borrowers as the Federal National Mortgage Association and Federal Home Loan banks—has risen rapidly in recent years, by adding to the total demand for credit, such borrowing, just like regular Treasury borrowing to finance the budget deficit, places upward pressure on interest rates.

However, the financing of the new export development credit fund would be relatively small, averaging less than \$1-billion a year.

As a symbol of the change in the aid program desired by the sponsors of the new bill, the bill would change the name of the law from the "Foreign Assistance Act" to the "Mutual Development and Cooperation Act" and would change the name of the present Agency for International Development to the Mutual Development and Cooperation Agency.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 8, 1973]

REDIRECTING FOREIGN AID TO POOREST OF THE POOR

(First of two articles by Harry B. Ellis)

WASHINGTON.—Getting United States foreign aid down to the poorest people in the poorest countries is the thrust of a sweeping new proposal by key congressmen.

Growth rates of developing nations often are impressive, the sponsors point out. But generally, within those same countries, the income gap between rich and poor steadily widens.

The existing structure of U.S. foreign aid, experts agree, does little to help millions of Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans mired in the deepest poverty.

A proposal by a majority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee would revamp United States bilateral foreign aid by zeroing in on the root problems—nutrition, health, education, population control, rural development—linked with poverty.

Their bill, introduced as amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act, would not cost American taxpayers more money, but it would redirect the flow of U.S. aid.

IN LINE WITH NIXON

The bipartisan sponsors, numbering at least 26 of the committee's 40 members, stress that their recommendations are in line with President Nixon's own suggestion, voiced in his "State of the world" message of May 3, that aid should move in this direction.

The new House proposal agrees with the Nixon administration's foreign assistance bill now before Congress, that \$1 billion should be allocated to bilateral economic aid in fiscal year 1974, beginning July 1.

This \$1 billion is apart from military assistance proposed by the White House. Also separate is the administration's request for \$600 million for reconstruction work in Southeast Asia.

Sponsors of the House measure, headed by Clement J. Zablocki (D) of Wisconsin, do not seek changes in military aid or the Southeast Asia funds, but would channel the \$1 billion of economic help into projects for the very poor.

These are defined as "food, rural development, and nutrition; population growth and health; and education and human resources development."

"Projects," says a statement by the House sponsors, "would be selected which most directly benefit the poorest majority of the people in these countries. . . ."

"We are learning," the statement adds, "that if the poorest majority can participate in development by having productive work and access to basic education, health care, and adequate diets, then increased economic growth and social justice can go hand in hand."

Experience shows that spurts of economic growth in developing lands, spurred by injections of foreign aid, often enrich a relatively small class of people, but do not "trickle down" to the very poor.

The way that social and economic power is shared in many Asian, African, and Latin American countries, experts concur, prevents newly developed wealth from being shared fairly between the urban elite and the rural poor.

PROJECTS AIMED AT POOR

Countless millions of the latter, in the words of Robert S. McNamara, president of the World Bank, "lie beyond the reach of traditional market forces and present public services."

How to reach them? Neither the World Bank, nor the United States Government, nor any other donor, can order a power elite in a developing land to change its way of doing business.

But a beginning can be made, note the

House sponsors, if economic aid is aimed specifically at projects directly benefiting the poor.

The problem of equity, or making the "trickle down" work, now is universally regarded as a challenge facing every industrialized nation, or agency, giving aid to backward lands.

Mr. McNamara, sketching the world at the end of this century, foresees affluent Western countries enjoying average incomes per person in the range of \$8,000, while some 2.5 billion people in the developing world may receive less than \$200 each, and 80 million of these less than \$100.

So there is a double gap—between rich and poor nations, and, within the poorlands, between the power elite and the rural majority.

In an effort to keep the rich-poor nation chasm from widening, the United Nations established as a reasonable principle that rich countries should give to poor ones 0.7 percent of their gross national product (GNP).

Collectively, Mr. McNamara told the annual meeting of the World Bank in Washington last year, affluent nations are falling far short of that standard, giving, on average, only half of 0.7 percent.

The United States, whose aid as a percentage of GNP has declined steadily in recent years, does even worse. By 1975, at the present rate, said Mr. McNamara, the U.S. is expected to share only 0.24 percent of its GNP with developing nations.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 12, 1973]

UNITED STATES EYES EXPORTS TO POOR LANDS

(Second of two articles by Harry B. Ellis)

WASHINGTON.—Last year the United States exported \$16.3 billion worth of goods to developing countries, almost as much as the U.S. sold to Japan and the enlarged Common Market combined.

Poor countries, in other words, now buy about as much from the United States as 10 of the world's richest lands together do.

But there is a curious skew to these sales to the "third world," according to a majority of members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, who hope to revamp the U.S. foreign aid program.

Sales of American goods to the "richer" developing lands, those with per capita annual incomes above \$200, indeed are growing. But exports to the poorest countries, those with incomes below \$200, are shrinking.

A major reason is financing. The more affluent developing countries, like Mexico, Brazil, Korea, and Taiwan, can afford to borrow money to pay for American goods from the Export-Import Bank.

BANK TERMS TOO STEEP?

The poorest lands, including India, Pakistan, and many African nations, cannot afford standard Eximbank terms. "In many cases," states the House committee panel, lack of financing on competitive terms, rather than price or quality, explains the U.S. inability to compete for this market."

Meanwhile, exports by Japan, Canada, West Germany, Britain, and some other Western lands to developing countries grow faster than those of the U.S., again partly because of financing.

Other nations, notes the House study, often make it easy for poor countries to borrow money. Trade flows in the wake of this borrowing.

"This market of about 1 billion people (low income countries, excluding Communist areas), whose gross national product has been increasing approximately 5 percent annually, is important at present and promises to grow more important in the future.

NEW AGENCY PROPOSED

"Europe and Japan," continues the House committee report, "apparently believe this and offer vigorous and steadily increasing government financing programs which help develop their markets in these countries.

"If the United States wants to avoid further losses and perhaps increase its share in this market, there will have to be increased government financing on terms that compete."

At least 26 of the 40 members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee believe this should be done through the creation of a new agency, the Export Development Credit Fund.

These congressmen, including Clement J. Zablocki (D) of Wisconsin and several other Midwesterners, have introduced a bill to this end. Their measure is offered in the form of amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act.

In addition to creating the new credit agency, the amending bill would focus \$1 billion of U.S. economic aid, requested by President Nixon for fiscal year 1974, on projects helping the poorest people in the poorest lands.

80,000 NEW JOBS?

The proposed credit agency would, in the view of its sponsors, "kill several birds with one stone" by enabling U.S. exporters to compete in the poorest lands and extending credit that the latter could afford.

One result, the sponsors believe, would be the creation of "an estimated 80,000 new U.S. jobs," through expansion of American exports.

The fund, which would operate at a level of about \$1 billion yearly, would, like the Export-Import Bank, be authorized to borrow from the U.S. Treasury or the public.

This money would be borrowed by the fund at market interest rates. The fund then would finance U.S. exports to the poorest countries on competitive terms, perhaps 30 years' maturity at 3 percent interest, with 10 years of grace.

The gap between the fund's soft-term loans and its harder term borrowing would be covered by repayments of past foreign aid loans now flowing into the Treasury.

MARKET ACCESS WIDER

American taxpayers would not be shouldering an additional burden. U.S. businessmen would have access to wider markets and, in the process, new jobs would be created in the United States.

Over a period of time, according to the bipartisan proponents of the measure, aid-recipient nations, as their economies grew, would tend to increase their purchases of American industrial goods.

The sponsors point to Taiwan as an example. In 1960, they note, U.S. exports to that island nation totaled \$100 million, 90 percent of which were U.S. aid-financed. Last year the United States sold more than \$800 million worth of goods to Taiwan, very little of which was financed by U.S. credits on concessional terms.

The proposed credit fund, its sponsors suggest, might be administered by the Export-Import Bank, by the Department of Commerce, or independently. An inter-agency advisory committee would oversee its operations.

PROPOSALS IN THE HOPPER

Separately the committee majority proposes to change the name of the existing Foreign Assistance Act to "the Mutual Development Act," administered by the Mutual Development and Cooperation Agency.

All these proposals now go into the congressional hopper, along with President Nixon's request for \$1 billion in economic aid, \$600 million for reconstruction work in Southeast Asia, and \$1.31 billion for military assistance.

The last two figures are not affected by the proposals emanating from the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which concentrates on the agreed figure of \$1 billion for bilateral economic aid.

The committee sponsors want to see that \$1 billion redirected to help the poorest Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans, and supplemented by a soft-loan credit agency.

THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, quite recently Arab terrorism set a new precedent by foully murdering Josef Alon, an Israeli military attaché, in front of his suburban Maryland home. This is the first time that such a political assassination has been carried out in this country. Alon was a brave soldier who never had need to strike his foe from ambush without warning or deprive them of a chance to defend themselves. He fought in all of Israel's wars, acquitting himself nobly. It would have been difficult to find a man and a soldier who better personified the glittering emergence of Israel and the Jewish people as a force to be reckoned with, and as a democracy able to withstand the onslaughts of a bloodthirsty foe.

Now Josef Alon is dead and buried, cut down by the hand of an assassin who struck from ambush in the dark. We can add him to the list of those, including American Ambassador Cleo Noel and his chief deputy, G. Curtis Moore, who have been butchered without any chance to defend themselves. Only the fanatic mind of the terrorists has been able to justify these deeds and boast of them around the world.

Tragedies? Of course. Worthy of bitter condemnation? Without a doubt. Yet we must not let this event terminate at this point. For it offers a stark message to the entire American people, and I do not say this merely because Alon's murder happened here, within minutes commuting time of this Chamber.

Such murders are blazing illustrations of a mentality rife throughout the Arab world. These terrorists are financed, trained, armed, and vocally supported by most Arab governments. They travel and hide because of abuse of diplomatic passports and immunity. In Arab countries they are heroes, acclaimed by one and all for their deeds. In fact, they form an establishment within themselves. Americans of all walks of life should bear this in mind carefully in light of the energy crisis.

There is a school of thought here which clamors for an accelerated relationship between the United States and oil-producing Arab States. Many oil and gas industry types claw frantically at the public mind through public advertisements, stressing the necessity of more oil and gas imports from the Arab world.

I believe such a course can be largely

avoided or indefinitely delayed because of the alternatives already being brought into focus. What we must avoid, at all costs, is a rush into the arms of regimes reflecting the mentality of these assassins. Such governments have never publicly disowned the terrorists or their tactics. Do we wish to mortgage our energy equation to this kind of mentality?

A glance at the solemn contractual relationships between Arab oil states and major corporations is revealing. One contract after another has been arrived at and signed with appropriate ceremony. Again and again the regimes involved have cavalierly broken these agreements, demanding more money and renegotiation of the agreements. Ordinarily such irony would be a source of amusement to those who have been victimized over the years by the oil companies cartel. The American public has been on the receiving end of price-fixing and monopolistic practices, courtesy of the oil and gas industry. However captive, the oil companies are doing their best to convince America to mortgage its energy future to these civilized gentlemen.

Do we wish to allow the same people who countenance, finance, and shelter bushwhackers to place their thumbs on America's economic windpipe? Will we be any better off by allowing them to assume a commanding position regarding our energy supplies? Will America gain anything at all by becoming vulnerable to this mentality?

Suppose, for some reason, some dictator decides one morning to turn off the valves and prevent shipment of oil? Suppose he prevails upon his compatriots to present a common front with him? What will we do then?

We cannot allow these individuals to have any influence over our destiny. To do so would be an act of total irresponsibility to every American and future generations as well.

Soon the Congress will have an opportunity to do something about additional oil sources of our own. The development of the oil fields in Alaska and the building of the Alaska pipeline gives us this opportunity. We dare not miss it.

A TRIBUTE TO KEN SANDERS

HON. DICK CLARK

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Iowa lost a distinguished and dedicated journalist last Thursday, July 26, when Ken Sanders of Sioux City died after 44 years in the news business. Mr. Sanders had retired in April 1972, as managing editor of the Sioux City Journal.

Mr. Sanders' interest in journalism came at an early age. His father, the late Carl Sanders, was prominent in the weekly newspaper business in South Dakota and two of his brothers, Keith and Dean, are publishers of the Creighton, Nebr., newspaper.

After graduating from high school in South Dakota and attending South Dakota State University, Mr. Sanders began working for the Sioux Falls Press. In 1928, he joined the Associated Press, a job that took him to bureaus in Bismarck, N. Dak., Columbus and Cleveland, Ohio, and Washington, D.C.

Mr. Sanders began his career with the Sioux City Journal in 1948 working first as city hall reporter and then as local copy editor, becoming day news editor in 1961 and managing editor in 1963.

While he was a news reporter, Mr. Sanders won the Iowa Associated Press Managing Editors Award for best spot news story in 1949 for an account of an explosion in a church at Marion, S. Dak. He later served as chairman of the Iowa Associated Press Managing Editors.

Ken Sanders was dedicated to journalism, and even after his retirement from the Journal, he maintained an active interest in its operation. He will be missed by his colleagues and friends in the news business, and I wish to extend my sympathy to his widow, Jane, and to his family.

NATIONAL TAY-SACHS SCREENING AND COUNSELING ACT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill for myself and 37 other Representatives, entitled the National Tay-Sachs Screening and Counseling Act. This bill seeks to protect the health and welfare of all citizens by establishing a national program for the diagnosis, control, and prevention of Tay-Sachs disease.

Tay-Sachs disease is a killer disease of children who are born seemingly healthy. When a child with Tay-Sachs disease should begin to learn motor skills, he cannot even raise his head or chest, and is unattentive. As the child ages, his condition worsens until he can only lie still. Death usually occurs 2 years later, at age 3.

This unfortunate and tragic condition is caused by the lack of an enzyme whose normal function would be to metabolize brain fats. When this enzyme is not present, intermediate, unmetabolizable fats accumulate in nerve cells and destroy them.

Approximately 700,000 Americans are afflicted with this ailment and Tay-Sachs disease will affect 25 percent of all children born to parents who both carry the mutation. This means that 1 out of 30 Americans of Eastern European Jewish origin, who make up 90 percent of the U.S. Jewish population, are carriers of the gene lacking this vital enzyme.

Presently, there is no cure for Tay-Sachs disease, and traditionally, treatment for it has been lengthy and futile. The annual cost for caring for a child suffering from the disease is approximately \$55,000.

Rarely does medical research advance

in a very short time from a position of virtually no knowledge about a disease to a foreseeing of its complete eradication in the offing. But this is exactly the outlook for Tay-Sachs disease.

In 1969, a major step forward occurred on the road to conquering Tay-Sachs disease. The absence of a newly discovered enzyme, hexosaminidase, usually called Hex-A, was shown to be the direct cause of Tay-Sachs disease.

This discovery is important because it is now possible to identify adult carriers. Carriers are themselves normal and healthy, but if two "carriers" marry, their children have a 1-in-4 chance of actually having Tay-Sachs disease.

Mr. Speaker, while there is little hope for children who have already inherited this disease, identifying methods now make it easy to closely watch the mother of a couple who carry the mutation.

Tay-Sachs disease is very conducive to mass screening purposes and recent developments have made it possible to harmlessly identify even embryonic cases.

For three reasons, Tay-Sachs disease is conducive to mass screening programs. First, it is peculiar to a population group. Second, carriers can be identified by a simple blood test which can spot the absence of Hex-A enzyme. Third, by a process called amniocentesis, an affected fetus can be detected in the uterus in a harmless fashion.

Mass screening projects have already proven successful in preventing numerous cases of Tay-Sachs disease. Such programs also help insure that a couple who are both carriers can choose to have as many healthy children as they may wish.

As I have said, there is no cure yet, but there now exists the practical and proved possibility of preventing 90 percent of all Tay-Sachs cases in the United States. Thus, widespread, effective mass screening can eliminate most of the high medical costs, unnecessary deaths, and family suffering which accompany the illness. Also, transfer of knowledge gained by Tay-Sachs research to approximately 30 other related disorders would be an added benefit of this program. Among other similar diseases which doctors believe could benefit from a screening program such as this are cystic fibrosis and sickle cell anemia, both of which are fatal to thousands of Americans each year.

From the 6 million members of the American Jewish population, about 100 "bed years" per year are taken up by Tay-Sachs patients. The total cost, which could be almost totally foregone, is \$5,500,000 per year. The total cost of a Baltimore-Washington pilot screening program is approximately \$100,000, which is about one-third the cost of treating just one Tay-Sachs child.

The major provisions of this bill are: First, through existing health centers, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is to initiate voluntary Tay-Sachs screening and counseling centers, as well as information dissemination programs.

Second, \$3 million is authorized to develop the program and assemble the informative material.

Third, stipulations for those eligible

for grants, based on existing genetic blood disorder programs as established by law, are set up.

Fourth, all participation is voluntary.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, there is a good possibility of preventing 90 percent of all Tay-Sachs cases in the United States. But for this forecasting to become reality, this program must be made known to all persons involved, especially to the medical profession, and to all lay and religious Jewish organizations.

Already this bill has received substantial support from various organizations concerned with effective, preventative public health programs, including the National Tay-Sachs and Allied Diseases Association, and the National Capital Tay-Sachs Foundation.

I hope that my colleagues on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will study this measure with extreme scrutiny, as it is of utmost importance to all involved, and bring forth legislation in the near future which will curb this dread disease.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 25 the Public Affairs Council, a professional organization of public affairs and Government relations officers of over 200 major U.S. corporations, issued a 10-point resolution calling for reforms in political campaign laws to eliminate abuses and bring about tighter controls.

The recommendations of this group are somewhat similar in concept to the recommendations of the House Republican Task Force on Election Reform and to the Senate bill passed yesterday. Obviously there are many differences in detail, and differences in what the limitations figures should be, but I believe the three separate and independent actions are unexpectedly close in tone and direction.

I hope that all three of these actions will be of interest to the Members and that they will serve both as an impetus for speedy House action and as examples of possible election reform. The recommendations and report of the Public Affairs Council follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Integrity, openness and public confidence in this nation's election processes are fundamental to the success of our government and country. In enacting the disclosure and other segments of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, the Congress recognized this fundamental requirement. But subsequent events and recent federal and congressional investigations of them have demonstrated the need for further legislative improvements, including the need for new mechanisms to insure vigorous and even-handed enforcement of the election laws.

The Board of Directors of the Public Affairs Council has addressed itself to these needs, studied the assortment of reform proposals now pending in Congress, and resolved

to endorse a comprehensive program designed to limit abuses of our political processes.

In doing so, the Board fully recognizes the dangers inherent in what is commonly referred to as reform. First, many proposals add to the already significant advantages of incumbency. Second, efforts to regulate campaigns and campaign finance raise some thorny constitutional problems. Finally, the history of reform demonstrates that there are no simple answers to such problems, and that the risk is that one set of problems may be traded for another. But the status quo is not satisfactory; and change itself may help to restore confidence in the system.

Members of the Council's Board are professional participants in the nation's political and legislative processes. Neither they, the corporations they represent, nor any responsible segment of society have a stake in a secret system or one that the unscrupulous can corrupt. Their dedication is to working within a system that is open, honest and deserving of the confidence and respect of the American people.

The Council's Board of Directors has therefore resolved to support campaign and campaign finance reform measures which would:

1. CREATE A SINGLE, STRONG AND INDEPENDENT FEDERAL ELECTIONS COMMISSION WITH ENFORCEMENT POWERS

The enforcement powers under the 1971 Federal Elections Campaign Act are presently shared by the Clerk of the House, Secretary of the Senate, the General Accounting Office, and the Justice Department, a division of responsibility which militates against uniform administration and complicates both reporting and meaningful disclosure. A number of bills have been introduced to create a Federal Elections Commission. These bills vary most significantly in whether they would empower that body to initiate and prosecute court actions.

We strongly support the creation of a Federal Elections Commission to centralize all reporting and enforcement activities, such commission to have the power of subpoena and authority to initiate actions against alleged violators.

2. LIMIT USE OF CASH IN ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

The utilization and accounting of campaign finance should measure up to the highest standards of accepted business practice and propriety. Abolishing large cash contributions—which evoke suspicion in the public's mind—would be one useful step in restoring credibility to campaign politics.

We strongly associate ourselves with efforts to legislate a ceiling of cash contributions. We are prepared to support a ceiling of \$100, the figure often mentioned, or even a lower limit, provided it is not so restrictive as to prohibit small, out-of-pocket contributions by interested citizens. In addition, cash disbursements by and for candidates—perhaps all those over \$100—should be fully reported as to source and purpose.

3. REQUIRE FEDERAL CANDIDATES TO ESTABLISH A SINGLE CENTRAL COMMITTEE FOR REPORTING OF ALL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES

For a variety of tax, legal and political reasons, a profusion of committees to collect and disburse political funds has been a traditional part of many congressional, senatorial and presidential campaigns. Multiple committees *per se* are not objectionable, but the usual practice of separate reports by each committee on its contributions and/or expenditures, complicates one key objective in campaign finance reform—full, clear, readily available information.

Each candidate for federal office should be required by law to designate a single "official" committee which would be held accountable for rendering full and complete disclosure of all contributions in support of, and expenditures by, committees supporting a single candidate.

4. LIMIT CONTRIBUTIONS WHICH ANY INDIVIDUAL IS PERMITTED TO MAKE TO A SINGLE CANDIDATE

While many large contributors to a single campaign give for entirely selfless reasons, large contributions are subject to misinterpretation, and our political process will be best served by the broadest possible base of small private contributions.

We, therefore, support efforts to impose a reasonable dollar limit on the amount any person can contribute to or expend on behalf of any federal candidate. These limits should be lower for a candidate for U.S. Representative or Senator than for a candidate for President or Vice President.

5. RAISE EXISTING LIMITS ON TAX DEDUCTION OR TAX CREDIT WHICH TAXPAYERS WHO MAKE POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS MAY CLAIM

The present law provides that individuals may claim a federal tax deduction of up to \$50 (\$100 in the case of a joint return), or a tax credit of up to \$12.50 (\$25 for a joint return) against their political contributions. In the interest of encouraging a broad base of giving, these provisions should be liberalized.

We recommend that the allowable tax deductions be increased to \$100 (\$200 for joint returns), and the tax credit be raised to \$50 (\$100 for joint returns).

6. CONSIDER MEASURES TO ESTABLISH LIMITS ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Although some believe the aggregate expenditures for political campaigning are modest (an estimated 400 million dollars or less than four one-hundredths of one percent of our Gross National Product, for all campaigns in the U.S. in 1972), questions have been raised regarding the large amounts expended in a number of congressional, senatorial, and particularly the presidential campaign expenditures by candidates for federal office, and the 1971 Federal Election Campaign Act did, in fact, impose limitations on expenditures for the use of communications media in federal elections.

The imposition of ceilings on total campaign expenditures, however, raises many practical—and constitutional—problems. Because it is important to re-establish the credibility and openness of our political system and to broaden the access to public office by restricting the financial burden of campaigning, we support the principle of reasonable limitations on amounts which candidates for federal office may expend in any primary, special or general election campaign, provided that such limitations: (a) do not restrict candidates' right to free speech; (b) do not assure incumbent office holders of permanent advantages over challengers; and (c) are structured to offer a reasonable certainty that the controls can be enforced.

7. LIMIT THE LENGTH OF POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Politician and citizen alike concede public concern about the length of our political campaigns. A number of other democracies have imposed time limitations on political campaigns without apparent violence to the chief object of campaigns—to inform the public. Yet any time limitation could work to the advantage of incumbents, raise constitutional issues and present difficult questions of interpretation.

While recognizing that no legislative remedy proposed to date would entirely resolve such dilemmas, we nevertheless urge that means be sought to impose reasonable time limitations on the allowable period for both primary and general election campaigning.

8. CLARIFY CONTRADICTORY SECTIONS IN THE 1971 FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT

Section 610 of the 1971 Act authorizes unions and corporations to establish "separate segregated funds" supported by individual contributions. In an apparent oversight, the Congress contradicted this provision in Section 611 by outlawing "government contractors"—which includes

many corporations—from direct or indirect political actions, including the establishment of such funds.

Since a careful reading of the floor debate when 611 was enacted makes it clear that it was the intent of Congress to permit separate segregated funds, and since the present law obviously discriminates against some unions and corporations, we urge Congressional action to clarify the contradiction and thus to provide equal opportunity for all unions and corporations. We believe these funds to be an excellent and fully accountable means of broadening individual participation in the electoral process.

In this connection, in that we have recommended specific limitations on contributions to a candidate by an individual, it should also be stated that we favor a limitation on contributions to a candidate by any separate segregated fund. The maximum amounts could be higher than those specified for individuals, but there should be a considered relationship between the two. Also, restraints would be necessary to prevent either a company or a union from avoiding the ceilings by establishing multiple separate segregated funds. No change is recommended in the long-standing prohibition on the contribution of corporate or union funds to candidates for federal office.

9. REPEAL "EQUAL TIME" PROVISIONS OF SECTION 315 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT AS IT APPLIES TO CANDIDATES FOR THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The "equal time" section obliges broadcasters to provide equal time for all presidential and vice presidential candidates, no matter how spurious. Therefore, broadcasters have been inhibited in offering substantial amounts of free time to significant candidates.

Free access to radio and television by significant presidential and vice presidential candidates is in the public interest: we support repeal of the equal opportunity requirements of Section 315 with respect to candidates for the office of President and Vice President.

10. SUPPORT BROAD-BASED PRIVATE FINANCING OF POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS, BUT ACCEPT ADDITIONAL STUDY OF PUBLIC SUBSIDIES

It is our present judgment that the public interest will best be served if political campaigns continue to be financed primarily by private individual contributions, rather than from government sources. We believe the impact of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, plus the adoption of proposals along the lines of those embodied in previous sections of this statement, can remedy a majority of the problems existing in political finance. We believe the system can be strengthened further by expanded efforts to encourage more people to participate in selecting candidates and financing political campaigns.

We recognize there are many serious proponents and proposals for some sort of public financial support of political campaigns and that the one dollar tax checkoff for presidential campaign financing—a form of public subsidy—is already in effect. Although we encourage additional study of the pro's and con's of some degree of public financial support, we are presently convinced that a system based on private contributions is preferable.

NO CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE THIS YEAR

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I voted against Monday's proposal to provide for

an immediate pay raise for Congressmen and top-ranking members of the executive branch for several important reasons. Most important is the fact that this country is experiencing one of its worst periods of inflation.

Food prices are rising at astronomical rates. The cost of living in general is going up rapidly. Underlying this upward spiral in prices is an ever-increasing rate of wages paid workers who are themselves caught in an inflationary spiral. It is imperative that this Congress set an example for all other wage earners to hold the line on their salaries.

Americans are already heavily burdened with the difficulty of enduring the economic crunch. To add an additional burden at this time would be a mistake in judgment.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing we have learned about the taxpayer is that he is fair. He is willing to assume a new burden if he is assured of the equity of such impositions. While the President is seeking to hold the line with a 5.5-percent wage increase limitation for the workers of America, it would be grossly unfair to go far beyond that for some 5,000 Federal employees among whom are Congressmen and Senators.

Clearly, by all equanimity some pay increase will be necessary in future. The inflation of the last 4 years has ravaged the last increase granted Congressmen. Many of us send our children to college, face high transportation, and living costs commuting back and forth to our district and have many expenses peculiar to the office. Congressmen, as public servants, should receive a pay raise every time all other Federal employees receive a salary increase.

However, this year is not the year to set any pay raises for Congressmen. We must give the supreme example to all other workers. Only if wage earners curtail demands for higher wage settlements, if management restricts executive salaries and if corporations keep profits to realistic levels, will we have a chance at licking this inflation gripping our country.

I hope the significantly large vote against yesterday's pay raise proposal will effectively doom such legislation until next year. At that time, if inflation is in better control, the economic outlook improving, and the Federal budget closer to being balanced; then, a congressional pay raise should be considered.

TRIDENT IS IMPORTANT

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News recently viewed with alarm the reduction in funds for our new Trident submarine by the Senate in their editorial of July 23. We do not yet know what direction SALT II will take, and further than that we do not know the future intentions of the U.S.S.R. It is exceedingly dangerous to unilaterally re-

duce our potential to properly defend our country until we see whether an era of world peace really lies ahead and more whether or not there will be any reciprocal actions by Soviet Russia. The editorial follows:

SENATORS PLAYING WITH FIRE

The Senate Armed Services subcommittee on research and development, which recently halved the administration's request of \$1.7 billion for the Trident, the third generation nuclear weapon firing submarine, continues to outguess Mr. Nixon on what bargaining chips he'll need to consummate a comprehensive SALT agreement before 1975.

Its latest move is to strike out funds sought for development of a mobile missile launcher. The Pentagon had listed the need of such a launcher because of the danger posed to our force of 1,000 Minuteman missiles. That force is one of our three interdependent strategic weapon arms and includes the original Minuteman rocket and the Minuteman 3, which is a Minuteman armed with three independently targetable warheads (or MIRV's).

The danger is posed by the mammoth SS9 missile which the Russians can arm with a 25-megaton warhead, by far the most destructive weapon in existence. So far the Russians have not mastered the art of MIRVing the SS9. If they do, they could MIRV their SS9's and target them on our Minuteman force based in hardened silos around the country. Our force could probably be wiped out.

So, Mr. Nixon has four possible options open to him: dismantle all or part of the Minuteman force; defend the force with ABM's, an action which currently is barred by last year's interim SALT pact; superharden the silos by sinking them in layers of natural hard rock which would make them less vulnerable to attack; or put the Minutemen on mobile launchers, also to make them less vulnerable.

The first option would demand some reciprocity from Moscow which is not likely to be forthcoming easily. We could compensate by placing more reliance on newer submarines and the new B1 bomber. But both are not yet out of the development stage and probably could not be deployed much before 1980. If the silos are superhardened, the Russians could counter by improving the accuracy of their SS9's.

So the mobile launcher is an essential option at this stage of SALT negotiating. Yet a subcommittee which has never experienced bargaining with the Russians thinks it has the responsibility of striking bargaining chips from Mr. Nixon's hands. That is a sure-fire prescription for SALT disaster.

SMEAR THE PRESIDENT-COMMITTEE GOAL—THE PRESS FOLLOWS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, "The Show-down," is the title of the cover story in this week's Newsweek magazine. You and I both know that this magazine is published by the Washington Post Co. which is "hell-bent" on destroying the President. In fact, they are trying so hard that one would get the impression that they are an adjunct to the Senate Watergate Committee.

In this week's feature story there are

10 instances where quotes are attributed to such people as "one midwestern Republican Senator," or a "GOP conservative on the Hill," and this one is good, "one somewhat hyperbolic party pro"—and they go on and on.

In the article the author or authors say that—

His (Nixon's) defiance set in motion an unprecedented test of powers . . .

We can look at this from the President's eyes and say that the committee, not the President, initiated this so-called test. I will comment more on that one shortly.

Reading along, one finds that—

Ehrlichman categorically denied any wrongdoing in Watergate, no matter what John Dean and miscellaneous other ex-colleagues said about him.

Now, for some reason, and I cannot understand why, the press and committee have set Dean on a pedestal and, if the testimony of others does not jibe with what he had to say, it is open to question and, as Senator INOUYE said, "He's a liar." John Dean, I am convinced, is out to save John Dean and no amount of apology on his behalf is going to erase that fact.

Continuing their attack on Ehrlichman, Newsweek says he "won few friends in the hearing room, and neither did his blanket protestations of innocence." As I have already mentioned, INOUYE called him a liar. Newsweek, however, says, "He was not alone on the committee." Who were the friends Mr. Ehrlichman did not win? In a later story, we find that the audience, highly emotional at times, and hardly ever gavelled down by Chairman ERVIN, was composed of "Bonanza's" Lorne Greene, well-known contributor to liberal causes, and John and Yoko Lennon—need I say anything about these two?

I could go on and on, but I will not. The reporting is questionable, contrived, fabricated, slanted, and wholly irresponsible.

William S. White has made some comments for the Republican congressional committee newsletter and I recommend them to my colleagues. Mr. White offers another viewpoint about what Newsweek calls an unprecedented test of powers.

HAVE RESPECT, SUPPORT

(By William S. White)

President Nixon deserves the respect and support of the country for his refusal to appear before the Senate Watergate committee or to allow it to wade through the confidential files and tapes of the White House.

Whether he will, in fact, receive that respect and support from the public no one can possibly say at this point. One significant thing, however, is plain already. This is that whatever the people may think of the President's action, the Senate itself is both favorably impressed—in spite of itself, in the case of some members—and deeply thankful that he has done just what he has done.

For it is perfectly to clear, to borrow a favorite Nixonian expression, that under the Constitution the Senate has no right whatever to seek to put the President of the United States in its witness chair and no right whatever to dig into his White House files, whatever might be its motive.

Moreover, Senators—not excluding those who are reaching for Mr. Nixon's vitals in

the Watergate scandals—know all this very well. In the hysterical atmosphere of the moment, they had felt under public pressure to "get tough" with the President and even to seek to subpoena him to appear before the Ervin investigating committee. They had been afraid that if they did not "get tough" enough they would themselves be accused of "cover-up"....

Accordingly, nobody could be more relieved than they are that the President has told them flatly that he isn't coming up to testify and that his confidential papers and tapes will stay where they are—in the White House.

For among the unthinking it will be the President who will take the heat for refusing to bow to what would have been an act of usurpation by the Senate.

Senators, in short, will remain pure and fearlessly in search of the truth. The President will be the bad guy; it will be only another "Nixon cover-up."

To have submitted, Mr. Nixon would have betrayed the institution of the Presidency, not to mention a long line of his predecessors who themselves had refused to bow to unjustified Congressional searches and seizures. Worse yet, he would have set a precedent of infinite danger to constitutional government....

Let any President allow any committee on Capitol Hill to put him under cross examination or to amble through his private files and the Presidency becomes a mere adjunct of Congress. (How would Senators like to have their own confidential files thrown open to the President?)

Those who criticize Mr. Nixon today are lamentably shortsighted. What is at issue here, Watergate or no Watergate, is the integrity of constitutional government, as Mr. Nixon said in his letter of refusal to the Ervin committee....

Indeed, the President's statement is in every sense a strong and worthy one—standing in sharp contrast, as most regrettably it does, to other and far less forthright communications from the White House concerning the Watergate tragedy.

For this statement Mr. Nixon is entitled to the Nation's thanks, no matter who did what to whom in the Watergate. And in these days when he is so beset by so great and so endless a flood of accusation and innuendo it is a pleasure to be able honestly to say that in politely telling the Senate to go to hell—on this one point—he has well served the Presidency of the United States.

FRANKLIN, IND., DAILY JOURNAL
ON BUSING

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. BRAY. Speaker, a recent Federal court ruling concerning school desegregation in Indianapolis has been a source of concern to many in the area.

The following article by Mr. Al Stilley, of the Franklin, Ind., Daily Journal, July 30, 1973, describes the implications contained in the ruling. I was most impressed by Mr. Stilley's concluding sentence:

It is hoped that a high court may rule that such social-educational experimentation is beyond the inherent powers of the Federal judicial system.

The article follows:

INTERIM

(By Al Stilley)

"I've never had to live with anything like this."

That comment was made by Greenwood Superintendent Dr. Earl Blemker within moments of reviewing Judge S. Hugh Dillin's historic and controversial desegregation ruling last week.

It should be pointed out that Dr. Blemker's comment, made as the head of a 3,300-pupil school system, is shared by other administrators from schools outside the Indianapolis Public School system to operate in Indianapolis by acts of "omission" and his subsequent inclusion of suburban schools as a solution to the desegregation dilemma should come as no surprise.

In his original finding of guilt against IPS, Judge Dillin in 1971 made several statements and brought out several acts of the General Assembly that resulted in a finding of guilt.

In regard to state responsibility in education, Judge Dillin stated, "Perhaps one of the greatest public misunderstandings as to the operation of the public schools of the State of Indiana is that the responsibility for the conduct of such schools is purely local.... The fact remains that the ultimate responsibility for the public schools is placed squarely upon the State."

Judge Dillin also referred to a 1949 state law in which it became "the public policy of the state to provide, furnish and make available equal, non-segregated, non-discriminatory educational opportunities and facilities for all—regardless of race, creed, national origin, color or sex."

However, 12 years later, the General Assembly, permitted the establishment of Uni-Gov in central Indiana, and according to Judge Dillin: "For the first time, it became possible for a "school city" of Indianapolis, alone among the major school cities of the state, to have jurisdiction over a lesser territorial area than the corresponding civil city." He further suggested that the General Assembly's action in 1961 "may well have been to retard desegregation and promote segregation."

Last week, the court, through Judge Dillin's ruling, referred to those acts as acts of "omission tending to inhibit desegregation."

Based upon the aforementioned comments about state law and past acts of the General Assembly, it can reasonably be assumed that inequities in the boundaries of Uni-Gov and the Indianapolis Public School system provided a catalyst, however indirect, to the dilemma facing school systems outside the boundaries of Uni-Gov.

In Judge Dillin's latest decision, there was no finding of guilt of operating a segregated school system against those systems outside the boundaries of IPS. But yet, the suburban school systems were included in Judge Dillin's interim plan to desegregate IPS.

Why? The answer is contained in Judge Dillin's original 1971 ruling when he referred to "the ongoing flight to the suburbs by the white population of the school city (IPS)." It is the "ongoing flight to the suburbs" that Judge Dillin firmly believes will be stopped by the inclusion of suburban school systems. Therefore, he ruled that "the only feasible desegregation plan involves the crossing of the boundary lines between IPS and adjacent or nearby school districts for the limited purpose of providing an effective desegregation plan."

So it is that the court has ordered a further erosion of "home rule."

It must be pointed out that the practice of determining a finding against a segregated school system in the North is not as easily defined on the surface as it was more than a decade ago when the South's practice of operating "separate, but equal" schools for

white pupils and minority pupils was a blatant violation of an individual's right to attend the school in his or her neighborhood. However, it was equally wrong to bus white pupils past all-black schools for segregated purposes in 1950 as it is in 1973 to bus black pupils past neighborhood schools for the purposes of desegregation.

In the aftermath of Judge Dillin's "interim plan" for desegregation, the rights of an estimated 5,700 IPS pupils seemingly will be violated because they will not be permitted to attend the school in their neighborhood and enjoy the eligibility of participation in all school functions in their neighborhood.

There was no evidence submitted by the U.S. Justice Department, which originally brought suit against IPS for failure to desegregate its schools, that any other school system outside IPS be involved in the solution to desegregating schools in the Indianapolis system. In light of references to Uni-Gov and IPS boundaries, it is perplexing to suburban areas why a court order was not made to align the boundaries of IPS with Uni-Gov.

To be sure, the eight suburban school systems outside Marion county are in a struggle for their very right to exist as a truly neighborhood school system.

The Greenwood school corporation's appeal of Judge Dillin's decision and request for a stay to prevent the interim (one-way) busing plan from going into effect this fall are necessary and proper steps to be taken.

Greenwood's civil city tax base and assessments are linked with Johnson county. It is deplorable that Greenwood schools and its citizens are being ordered to provide solutions to problems facing the Indianapolis Public School system.

The forced one-way busing of IPS students into the suburbs will obviously be costly and confusing. It will be an unnecessary drain on the talents and abilities of school administrators.

The fact remains that the Greenwood School Corporation has never refused admission to any pupils living within its boundaries—regardless of race.

But yet, the Greenwood Community School Corporation and other suburban schools near Indianapolis have been ordered by a judicial branch to participate in a social-educational experiment.

It is hoped that a higher court may rule that such social-educational experimentation is beyond the inherent powers of the Federal judicial system.

MORE TALK OF KENT STATE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are many of us in this body who feel that the Justice Department was less than zealous in its pursuit of the truth regarding the incident 3 years ago at Kent State University, when Ohio National Guardsmen shot and killed four students and wounded a dozen more.

Former Attorney General Mitchell admitted that the action taken by the guardsmen was without warrant and unjustified, yet refused to respond to 20 Members of Congress who asked that he convene a Federal grand jury to investigate the killings.

In the light of current events, the

stench of political expediency permeates John Mitchell's personal finding.

While the Justice Department titillates us with glimmers that it might reopen the Kent case, I believe the only hope of candor concerning Kent is for a committee of the Congress to conduct its own investigation of the Justice Department's handling of the matter.

Douglas Pike, writing in an issue of the Boston Globe, recently offered his thoughts on the Kent State case.

I include his article in the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues:

WATERGATE AND KENT-STATE: TWO FACES OF JUSTICE

(By Douglas A. Pike)

The wound that is Watergate will heal in time, and the body politic may eventually be sounder for the whole operation. The cutting edge of truth has reached a threshold in probing the murky remains of criminals and accomplices where the force of events will carry it onward.

The stench is thick, the sickness deep, but the system of justice has the momentum. It will be a field day for law and order, and a bad day for some of its loud proponents.

The venom at a college town in Ohio three years ago received a different treatment. The aftermath of that sunny May 4 at Kent State demanded much in time, less in truth. It left a festering wound that should be examined in the light of Watergate, even though the time for justice at Kent may have passed. The politicized justice that wrapped up the tragedy with glib homilies and regrets may provide a lesson for us now.

The Kent crimes were easy prey to obfuscation. In 1970 the nation was indignant over the growing student strike against the President's invasion in Cambodia. There had been violence the weekend before Monday's campus rally. Protestors hurled rocks and obscenities after the National Guard broke up the Monday rally. The besieged Guardsmen were unlike the sneaky Watergate gang, and their victims were "campus bums," not defenseless Democrats.

Yet the search for truth began hopefully. The FBI investigation rejected Guard claims of sniper fire, and placed all but two of the protesters down a slope, nearly the length of a football field away when the killing began. The Scranton Commission labeled the deaths "unnecessary, unwarranted and inexcusable." But the reality of public opinion asserted itself with the state grand jury's indictment of one professor and 24 students and outsiders.

That reality finally closed in on the search for truth in 1971. Ohio's failure to act against the National Guard had left a possible conspiracy as one of the few grounds for Federal action. Then Attorney General John Mitchell announced on August 13, 1971, that there would be no Federal grand jury. Amid words of sympathy to the parents, Mitchell said "there is no credible evidence of a conspiracy between National Guardsmen to shoot students on the campus." He had found no conspiracy.

Against the bureaucratic inaction of responsible persons, one man has stood tall for justice. An insurance agent in New York, Peter Davies, had no connection with those who fell at Kent. He immersed himself in thousands of hours of research on the killings, and submitted a 227-page "Appeal for Justice" to the government two months before Mitchell's decision to drop the case.

The report showed contradictions in statements to the FBI and in testimony before the state grand jury and the Scranton Commission. Davies charged a conspiracy among eight to 10 National Guard members to shoot certain demonstrators, followed by a con-

spiracy of silence to cover up the facts. He argued that a Federal grand jury's power to grant immunity from prosecution would produce someone willing to reveal the truth.

Davies still hopes to force out the facts. He has carried on, undaunted by the Grand Jury's whitewash or Mitchell's eyewash. A National Guard member has sued him for \$3 million because of his charges, yet Davies will publish a book this month based on his research. His fragile hope lies in the possibility of a congressional investigation.

The memory of May 4 has faded for most Americans, but Davies is prodded on by the spectre of unnecessary, unwarranted and inexcusable death three years ago today. Jeff Miller lay dead 270 feet from the Guardsmen, shot through the mouth. Allison Krause, Bill Schroeder and Sandy Scheuer lay dying, even farther away. Dean Kehler fell badly hurt at 300 feet, shot in the back.

One year ago in the Daily Kent Stater, Peter Davies reflected on the failure of justice at Kent. On the third anniversary of those deaths, his words can be directed to the present quagmire. "Our laws and judiciary are the backbone of this free society. Break it for the sake of political expedience and institutional imagery and our society will be as crippled as young Dean Kehler is for the rest of his life."

Douglas Pike is a San Francisco-based writer.

RIISING FOOD PRICES

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, during this period of rising food prices, I think we are often tempted to search for a culprit. We assume that someone must be to blame for these soaring prices. That someone is certainly not the small farmer.

As evidence I offer a recent article from the Detroit Sunday News discussing the experience of a young couple in my district who are striving to earn a living from dairy farming. More than 3 years ago, Mr. and Mrs. Ron Beatty of Lapeer County, Mich., abandoned the confinement of the city and decided to gamble on "the good country life." This experience has taught them that dairy farming is a demanding enterprise in which expenses can easily outstrip income.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the comments of the Beatty family are not unusual among Michigan dairy farmers, and for this reason I commend this article to my colleagues:

LAPEER DAIRY FARMER LOSES \$80,000 GAMBLING ON THE "GOOD COUNTRY LIFE"

(By Doug Bradford)

Ron Beatty, a farmer, calls himself a rural gambler.

He has run a \$40,000 debt to \$80,000 in three years, and at the rate he's going is afraid he'll be out of business in six months.

The story of how Beatty, 39, took his pretty wife, Joan, 30, from suburban Warren to the Lapeer County countryside is the old one of dreams versus reality.

Unfortunately, as Beatty will tell you, it's tough to make a buck down on the farm—a premise substantiated by the State Agricultural Department's marketing division.

The average farm income is \$3,392, said Forrest Strand, the division's acting director. "That's just not enough," he added. "A

tractor alone costs \$10,000, and you need a lot more equipment than that."

He's not telling Beatty anything. Buying equipment "with the help of my friendly banker" is one of the ways he acquired that sizable debt.

"If I wanted to buy a combine it would cost \$35,000, about the price of a new house in the suburbs," Beatty said.

Beatty, a Royal Oak fireman, and his wife, a hairdresser decided to leave the confinement of the sprawling metropolis 3½ years ago for life of open air, sunshine, and, hopefully, their fortune.

Today, they said, they are glad Beatty continued working for the fire department and she one day a week at the beauty parlor. They don't think they would have made it as far as they have, otherwise.

Their 96-acre spread on a dirt road a few miles east of North Branch had stood empty for about five years, and they applied at "about a dozen" lending institutions before they could buy it.

One of the reasons the Beattys took a chance on a business they knew little about was because few people are going into farming, especially among the younger generation.

Strand said most of the state's farmers are 45 or over, with the highest percentage in the 55-64 bracket. Young people, he said, are finding more money and considerably less responsibility today in factories and construction work.

The Beattys have tried hard since becoming dairy farmers. They bought dairy cows at \$525 each, gradually building their herd to 48.

They expect to gross about \$40,000 this year with that many—and still lose money.

In fact, Beatty said if he hadn't been able to depreciate his holdings at income tax time he wouldn't have shown any profit on dairy farming. His losses, not figuring the depreciation, were \$9,000 the first year and \$6,000 the second, he said.

The Beattys say there are reasons for this aside from their heavy payments on the property, equipment and cows.

There are other kinds of overhead which may vary with the season and the economy. Perhaps most significant recently has been the drastic price increase in soybeans, a food high in protein and much desired for increasing the milk yield in dairy cows.

"I paid about \$105 a ton for soybeans last fall, and now I'm paying \$320 and have paid as high as \$380," Beatty said.

"When I switched to a lower-priced feed with less protein my daily milk yield dropped 700 pounds. That cost me \$60 a day."

Some cows, Beatty explained, just will not produce as much milk with a protein-lowered diet. So he had to switch back to soybeans.

Beatty sells his milk at about 13½ cents a quart, but the feed, he said, costs him about 9½ cents for every one of those quarts.

Both he and Thomas Thorburn, Lapeer County agricultural agent, claim Beatty can't make any money on the four-cent difference.

There is too much overhead, including medicine, veterinarian's fees, electricity and so on.

One bad day at the farm, Beatty said, one of his \$525 cows calved, but both animals died. He had a flat tire on his tractor, blew a motor on his truck and a hired hand flipped over a new hay wagon in a bit of reckless maneuvering.

"How much can you take?" he asked. "I went into the house for three or four belts out of the bottle and went to sleep."

Beatty points out that he has no union to represent him when things go wrong and gets no overtime for the 19-hour day he often puts in on his seven-day-a-week job.

"There's no paid vacation, either," he said. "When the cows are ready to be milked you better be there to milk them . . . and they don't understand daylight saving time either,

so you can't milk them an hour earlier than they're used to . . . they're temperamental."

But his biggest gripe is that he believes he and other farmers do not receive enough money for the investment and gamble they take.

Mrs. Beatty, the first woman delegate to the Michigan Milk Producers Association, said this is the complaint aired most often at the association's monthly meetings in Detroit.

In this connection, farmers also complain that consumers, unhappy with rising food costs, do not understand or appreciate the amount of work for a low financial return in farming.

"We used to live in the city, and we used to complain about food prices, too," Mrs. Beatty said. "But no more—now we know what is involved."

While farmers like the Beattys chase runaway cows, try to save the delicate lives of calves—which have a high mortality rate—and pull milk trucks down icy roads with farm tractors so the milk can get to market, the consumers, they say, are busy with other things.

The farmers say too many consumers who complain about rising food prices think nothing of buying snowmobiles or other luxury items, including convenience foods it took farmers hours to produce but which may be prepared in a few minutes.

Mrs. Becky Tompkins, of the Michigan Agricultural Commission, charged that American consumers have been "spoiled" by low food prices in the past.

"They pay outrageous prices for luxuries but complain about food prices which are lower than in any other country," she said.

Beatty said that if he could have a luxury it would be a magnet finder for the neck of one of his better cows. The magnet triggers an electronic system at the feeder which provides more protein for a good milk cow, leaving less productive critters with less nourishment in their meal.

"But I'm afraid I will have to spend \$25,000 for a manure liquifier if the ecology people get a state law requiring farms to have them," he declared. "Can you imagine \$25,000 for that?"

Problems posed by people such as the Beattys are helping decrease the number of farms and farm acreage in Michigan, Strand said.

In 1910, Michigan had 206,960 farms on 18,940,614 acres. The acreage increased to 19,032,961 the following year, but the number of farms decreased about 10,000.

Strand said that, according to the latest figures, a steady decline that began in the early 1940's during World War II put the number of farms in 1971 at 85,000 on 13 million acres.

Farms that prosper usually have at least 45 acres, Strand said. But although the marginal farmer has all but faded from the scene many farmers work at other occupations, as does Beatty.

A large dairy farm today—bigger than that of Beatty who started small—is a \$250,000 investment.

"You don't find too many people with that kind of money to invest in something as risky as farming," Strand said.

Why, then, do people go into farming? Well, there is the dream of having the good life away from it all, and of someday finally making a success.

The Beattys' for example, say that if milk prices go up and feed prices go down in the next six months their chances of winning the gamble will be much better.

"But you better like this business because there isn't much else, and everyone in the family works at it," Mrs. Beatty said. She even has taken a course on how to milk cows—and likes it.

"And on top of everything else," Beatty added, grinning, "we have four daughters.

We don't even have any sons coming along to help with the heavy work."

MARINE CORPS LEAGUE'S FIRST 50 YEARS

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, the Marine Corps League will hold its 50th Anniversary National Convention in Miami Beach. This most worthy organization has an enviable history and I would like to take this opportunity to insert into the RECORD excerpts from that distinguished 50-year history for my colleagues to share.

The excerpts follow:

THE MARINE CORPS LEAGUE: A HISTORY OF THE FIRST 50 YEARS, 1923-73

(By Richard J. O'Brien)

"THE MARINE CORPS LEAGUE"

"The Marine Corps League is an alumni association of the United States Marine Corps. Its membership is open to men who have served before, during, and since the World War. Thus it is in a position to grow progressively stronger each year, because more and more persons will become eligible for membership. It is asserted by its members that the potential membership of the league now is approximately 100,000, and that its actual membership is spread throughout the country."

Congressman Arthur D. Healy of Massachusetts used the above words in 1937 in support of his successful bill which incorporated the Marine Corps League. President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed it on August 4th of that year, making the Marine Corps League one of the very few veterans organizations chartered by the U.S. Congress.

The enactment of this bill followed by fourteen years the founding of the Marine Corps League at the Hotel Pennsylvania in New York City on June 6th, 1923, a date especially chosen, as it was the fifth anniversary of the U.S. Marine counterattack in Belleau Wood. Thus, from the very first the League sought to commemorate events of special interest to Marines.

The forming of the League took place during an All-Marine Caucus called by Sidney W. Brewster of New York a retired Marine major, who was Commandant of the Marine Corps Veterans Association (MCVA), forerunner of the League. The MCVA itself was formed only eight months before on the 147th birthdate of the Corps, November 10th, 1922, in the Hotel McAlpin, New York City. It was composed of individual groups of Marines who had banded together after the First World War to perpetuate the Marine Corps Spirit in their own communities. In their ranks were Marine veterans of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the First World War, as well as several expeditions in between.

THE FIRST DECADE, 1923-33

There was much debate at the All-Marine Caucus about the name of the group to emerge from the reorganization of the Marine Corps Veterans Association. The more than 150 delegates representing every section of the Nation were in agreement that this, the first national Marine Organization, would embrace in-service Marines as members as well as civilian Marines. Since, at that time, active duty Marines were not officially considered "veterans" (even though many had fought in countless campaigns all over the

globe), the group voted to change its name, and the MARINE CORPS LEAGUE was born.

While all the delegates who attended are co-founders of the League, one of their ranks is considered the Father of the Marine Corps League, and that is John A. Lejeune, the Major General Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, and first National Commandant of the League.

"Johnny" Lejeune gave to the League three mottos: *Semper Fidelis* (Always Faithful); Once a Marine—Always a Marine; and "All for One and One for All." This latter caused him to mobilize the recruiters on behalf of the League, and the League on behalf of the recruiters and the Reserves. His strong backing and encouragement enabled the League to get a good start. Many of his officers at Marine Headquarters doubled in brass in the League, including Major J. C. Fegan as our National Adjutant, and Sergeant A. E. Beeg as Paymaster. Lejeune was elected to six consecutive one-year terms as National Commandant.

National Conventions were held in the fall each year of this first decade from New York to Chicago to Dallas, and cities in between.

Of major importance was the League's involvement with the Belleau Wood Memorial Association (BWMA) in the efforts to preserve that Marine Corps battlefield in France. Through considerable effort the League was able to finance the operation of the Wood for a two year period. The cost was becoming too heavy a drain on the fledgling League and too great a burden on the BWMA. At last the battlefield was turned over to the American Battle Monuments Commission. The Commission maintains Belleau Wood to this date as an historic park.

Lejeune firmly believed that the Marine Corps Commandant should be Commandant of the League. So, when he retired from active service, he stepped down as League Commandant as well, recommending Major General Wendell C. Neville, his successor as Commandant of the Corps, to head the League. In response, on April 3rd, 1929, the National Staff of the League elected Neville, a holder of the Medal of Honor, as National Commandant.

Neville, while accepting the post, believed the League should be civilianized. He asked W. Karl Latons of Massachusetts, the senior-most Vice Commandant, to run the League in his stead. This Latons did, and he was subsequently elected as the first civilian commandant at the 1929 convention in Cincinnati. Among his accomplishments was to move the League headquarters to downtown Washington from Marine Corps Headquarters. Latons' major contribution as Commandant was the conversion of the League to a civilian business-like basis for the benefit of all.

By its policy the League is "non-political, non-partisan, and non-sectarian." But the League has always reserved the right to engage in political and legislative issues which effected the welfare of the U.S. Marine Corps, the League itself, and of its constituent or subsidiary organizations, and the rights, privileges and benefits which were based on military service of any members thereof.

The League used its legislative weight to back legislation favorable to Marines and other veterans, and to oppose that which was not.

THE SECOND DECADE, 1934-43

The membership strength of the League improved every year, rising to 17,143 by the end of the second decade.

Jerome D. Cohen of Massachusetts, National Junior Vice Commandant in 1937, was the force behind the movement for federal incorporation of the Marine Corps League. Working through Senator David I. Walsh and Congressman Healy, both of Massachusetts, he was successful in securing passage of this significant bill on August 4th, 1937.

Thus, a new era began, and the Marine Corps League, under National Commandant Maurice A. Ilch, gained greatly in national stature. (Before he was to pass away in 1972, Ilch would be accorded the title of "Grand Old Man of the Marine Corps League" because of his great spirit and many faithful years of prior and subsequent national service).

Although several detachments of the League had auxiliaries for years it was not until the 14th National Convention in Akron in 1937 that the Marine Corps League Auxiliary was chartered as a national subsidiary organization. The first National President was Marian L. Harper of New Hampshire.

In 1942 League Commandant Chris Cunningham and National Adjutant-Paymaster Steve Brown started publication of a monthly tabloid, the *Marine Corps League Bulletin*. It quickly won the approval of the membership and before long had a press run of 45,000 with some editions being 32 pages. From 1924-1940, League news had been carried in the pages of *Leatherneck Magazine*. But from 1942 on, the League published its own paper or magazine, with the banner years being 1942-50 under Cunningham and Brown.

In 1943, under the leadership of Thomas Wood of Ohio and Alexander F. Ormsby of New Jersey, the League spearheaded a drive for proper post-war plans for the benefit of veterans in the area of Rehabilitation. This embraced the setting up of clearing houses in Cincinnati and other cities by business houses and industrial leaders. Veterans were given vocational guidance and efforts were made to place them in the type of work for which they were best fitted. The services of medical specialists were enlisted for those suffering from rare diseases and arrangements were made to secure treatment for them at nominal cost, far below regular fees.

THE THIRD DECADE, 1944-53

The League achieved its membership high shortly after World War II when 27,664 were carried on the rolls under League Commandant Thomas Sweeney of Illinois.

Under Commandant Alan Stevenson of New York in 1945 the Marine Corps League was accorded the privilege of representing Marines before the Veterans Administration (VA) in presenting claims and obtaining veterans rights. Florence E. O'Leary of Ohio became the first Service Officer.

The following year the Internal Revenue Service exempted the Marine Corps League from income tax payments. The Service also declared that its Auxiliary units would be deductible income tax items.

With the end of World War II America turned its focus on its returning disabled veterans. League and Auxiliary members and representatives of other groups visited them in VA hospitals, volunteering their free-time in behalf of the sick and wounded. To coordinate the efforts of these volunteers, the Veterans Administration Voluntary Service (VAVS) program was created. The League and Auxiliary supported the VAVS program from the beginning, and continue to do so today. 27 years later, as a program that literally goes to the heart of the Marine Corps League.

In 1944, a Marine Corps recuperation center in Oregon came to the attention of the League when Leaguers from Portland tried to obtain recreational equipment for returning veterans of the Pacific campaigns. An almost spontaneous League effort to assist the Marine Barracks, Klamath Falls, resulted. League and Auxiliary detachments across the country sent the needed equipment, and funds for other recreational purposes. L.L. Pittinger of Oregon became a full-time League Service Officer there. The concerted effort remained through the close of the Barracks two years later.

Following World War II the Marine Corps

League adopted a project for the erection of the heroic-sized bronze statue of the flag raising on Iwo Jima by Felix DeWeldon in the Nation's Capitol. Congress approved of the project, the Department of the Interior provided the land, the Fine Arts Commission approved the design, and the U.S. Marine Corps favored the project all the way. All that was needed was for the League to come up with the anticipated cost of \$250,000. This proved to be a gargantuan fund-raising task for which the League was not organized. National Liaison Officer, Colonel Jean W. Moreau, USMC (Ret.), then formed an independent organization, the Marine Corps War Memorial Foundation, Inc., which raised the money from regular Marine Corps units, Marine Corps Reserve (inactive), and other sources. League and Auxiliary contributions exceeded \$7,000. Final costs were placed at nearly one million dollars. When the monument, erected to the memory of our comrades who have fallen on all the fields of battle in Marine Corps history, was dedicated on November 10th 1954, National Commandant George K. Shangochian of Massachusetts and other distinguished Leaguers were in attendance. In 1950, the outbreak of the Korean War and the resultant mobilization of the Marine Corps Reserve cut a wide swath through the ranks of the 30% of the membership was called up. Whole detachments were mothballed while its members went off to war. Every issue of the League *Bulletin* carried names of Leaguers killed in action. Some of these Marines held office on the department level.

Throughout this decade the League continued to back legislation of importance to the Corps. It fought unification and the abolishment of transfer of the U.S. Marine Corps to the Army. In the battle to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps, a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Honorable Mike Mansfield of Montana and Brigadier General James P. S. Devereux, USMC (Ret.), the hero of Wake Island, testified in their individual capacities as representatives of the Marine Corps League, rather than as members of Congress, which they were. Their testimony, and thousands of letters to congressmen from Leaguers, helped to turn the tide of victory.

In an effort to combat Communism, the League conducted nationwide Americanism drives and engaged in educational work through the medium of speakers in the organization.

THE FOURTH DECADE, 1954-63

In order that the League might be suitably represented at ceremonies in holidays and other important occasions, two area Marines, John P. Lester of the District of Columbia and Raymond B. Butts of Virginia, formed the League's National Guard of Honor. Appropriately uniformed, the Guard appeared numerous times throughout the decade at parades, funerals, and other significant occasions at the call of the national Commandant where the National Colors were presented.

One of the League's key programs developed during this period. The Marine Corps League Foundation Fund, conceived and led by Herbert Rose and Claude H. Downing of Florida, was created to assist certain qualified persons in acquiring an education above or equivalent of the scholastic high school level. First presented at the 33rd National Convention in Miami in 1956, the Foundation Fund was approved the following year at the convention in San Jose, California. Through the present time all funds received by the Foundation are still intact.

Out of a desire to recognize its own, the League, in 1959, instituted the National Marine of the Year Award. The first recipient was I. D. Hale of Wisconsin, for his outstanding efforts in League and veterans affairs. There were several subsequent years

where no award was made as none were found qualified for such a high honor.

This decade commenced with the publication of a Marine Corps Order encouraging close cooperation with the League by Marine Corps officials. The freshening and strengthening of relations between the Corps under General Wallace M. Greene, Jr., and the League under Raymond B. Butts, was a felicitous beginning for the coming years.

With the advent of the Vietnam war the League threw its support behind the Civic Action Fund for Vietnam, sponsored by the Marine Corps Reserve. Throughout the period of active Marine Corps involvement in Southeast Asia, the League and Auxiliary donated untold thousands of dollars to the Civic Action Fund for General Lew Walt's use in waging his important "other war" in Vietnam.

On a note of pride, and "to perpetuate patriotism and valor," the League and Auxiliary teamed up in 1965 to construct entrance gates to the grounds of the famous Freedoms Foundation in Valley Forge, Pennsylvania. National Commandant Burton P. Daugherty of Michigan and National President Helen Robinson of New York presided at the ceremonies which were attended by high-ranking civilian and military officials. The dedication coincided with the League's 42nd National Convention in nearby Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

The fifth decade saw the Marine Corps League adopt its two great Youth programs, Young Marines, and Youth Physical Fitness.

Originating as an idea of the Brass City Memorial concept grew and was formally established as a League-wide program by resolution of the 41st National Convention meeting in Wichita in 1964. Commandant Daugherty signed the National Charter at Ansonia, Connecticut on October 17th, 1965. The first director of Young Marines was Steve Zuraw of Connecticut. This action program for youths 8-17 emphasizes eight points basic to the development of Young Marines: citizenship; leadership; physical fitness; school; home and outside activities; personal habits; character; and drill. Its motto is "Our Youth is the Future." By decades end over 5,000 Young Marines were enrolled in 65 detachments located in 21 states.

Youth Physical Fitness, the second of the League's two ever-expanding youth programs, was adopted by the League at the 1967 Mid-Year Staff Meeting in Arlington, Virginia. The program had been a great success in Ohio, where in 1965, it earned a Gold Medal from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge "for outstanding contribution to the youth of junior and senior high school age through its physical fitness program."

Walter A. Churchill of Ohio, the Father of the Youth Physical Fitness Program of the Marine Corps League, conceived the program, largely financed it through its developmental stages, and serves today as its National Chairman. The program is currently operating in 20 states with a potential of five million or more youths participating. The goal of 20 million youths participating by 1975, the 200th birthdate of the U.S. Marine Corps, has been established.

To help finance both the Young Marines and the Youth Physical Fitness programs, Churchill, a Past National Commandant, developed the United States Marines' Youth Foundation in 1968. This carefully organized Foundation provides support for appropriate youth activities sponsored by Marine Corps-oriented organizations. It has helped enable the League's youth programs to develop without undue concern for funding and helped ensure their success.

At the 1971 Mid-Year Staff Meeting the League's Board of Trustees voted to support Marine Corps' desires that there be created a United States Orienteering Federation (USOF). This was reaffirmed at the 1971 National Convention in San Antonio. The Ma-

rine Corps had adopted orienteering, a world sport combining cross-country running and land navigation, as a military sport. Under the League's umbrella an organizational meeting was held at League Headquarters on August 1st, 1971, at which a complete set of By-Laws for the USOF was approved. The USOF, which embraces civilian and military orienteering clubs and individuals, was later incorporated under the laws of Virginia, and was accepted into the International Orienteering Federation (IOF). The President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports has since recognized orienteering and approved it for participation in the Presidential Awards Program, a significant step.

Two long-time Leaguers from Ohio, Philip A. Schloss and John L. Kleinhans, were elected USOF President and Secretary/Treasurer respectively. The USOF, spawned and still assisted by the Marine Corps League, already has had a tremendous impact on orienteering in America. Its influence is expected to grow with the passage of time.

Throughout this period the League's voice was raised in concern over such issues as drug abuse, possible amnesty to draft dodgers, our POWs/MIAs, and the planned reduction in the number of beds in our VA hospitals. On the local level the Golden Triangle Detachment of Texas commenced its successful HALT Program. (Hire a Leatherneck Today) as one example of Leaguers helping in the important area of jobs for veterans.

As this goes to press National Commandant Gilbert E. Gray of New York is preparing to go to Belleau Wood, France, with a veteran of that battle and other Leaguers to commemorate the 50th birthday of our beloved Marine Corps League. U.S. Marines and French and German officials have been invited to meet there in friendship, and to help commemorate the golden occasion with planting a tree, conducting respect for the past, and hope for the future.

WATERGATE'S HANGING JUDGES

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, it came as shock to me yesterday morning while perusing the Washington Post, to find, completely hidden from anyone with less than 20-20 vision, an article about someone who actually wants to help President.

Although it is not exactly equal space, I was so overcome by the courage of our great local paper to print the article, I felt I must share it with my colleagues and enshrine it for posterity in the RECORD.

My hat is off too, to Rabbi Baruch Korff, who is not afraid to stand tall and be heard.

The article follows:

RABBI HEADS PRO-NIXON CAMPAIGN

NEW YORK, July 30.—A citizens' committee headed by a Massachusetts rabbi has started a campaign against the "vigilante atmosphere" of the Senate Watergate committee, charging most of its members are "hanging judges" trying to destroy President Nixon.

The committee took out a \$5,772 advertisement in Sunday's New York Times headed "An Appeal For Fairness."

Rabbi Baruch Korff, 59, of Rehoboth, Mass., who gained fame in the 1940s for his work in the rescue of Jews from Nazi Germany, is the temporary chairman of the group.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES AND MILTON PREVES

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this past June 14 I joined with a majority of the Members of this body in voting to authorize \$145 million for the extension of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act. In view of the need to curtail Government spending this was not an easy decision to make. Knowing the importance of the arts and humanities to American culture, however caused me to support and encourage artistic and humanistic endeavors.

These programs have been highly successful in the past. For example I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the many musical accomplishments and achievements of Mr. Milton Preves of Glenview, Ill., a member of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra since 1934 and musical director of the North Side Symphony since 1948.

Mr. Preves is principal violinist of the Chicago Symphony, professor of viola at DePaul University in Chicago, and a member of the Chicago Symphony String Quartet.

Despite these many pressing responsibilities and obligations, Mr. Preves has spent the last 25 years involving himself in a host of community and neighborhood musical activities.

Mr. Preves has been director of the North Side Symphony since November 21, 1948, the day he conducted his first concert with that orchestra at the Loyola Community Theatre. It is the oldest non-professional orchestra in the Chicago area, dating from April 30, 1941, when it presented its first concert in Chicago's Eugene Field School.

Members of the North Side Symphony are from the north and south sides of Chicago, the city's northern suburbs, and from as far away as Michigan City, Ind. It is a fitting tribute to Mr. Preves that several of these musicians have gone on to become members of the Chicago Symphony and to perform beside their former mentor.

During its 32 years of performance, the symphony has performed nearly every classic symphony. In the last 2 years alone, its musicians have played the Chausson Symphony in B Flat Major, the Schumann Symphony No. 1, and the Shostakovich Symphony No. 5. In other years, violinist Mischa Mischakoff has performed with the orchestra, and Samuel Thaviu, violinist, and Joseph Schiachitano, cellist performed the Concerto in A Minor by Brahms.

This season the North Side Symphony has given nine concerts. In addition to its regular performances in high school auditoriums on the north side of Chicago, the symphony has also participated in classical choral concerts in Austin, Elk Grove Village, Westchester, and Glenbrook South High School. I think my colleagues will agree that this is an outstanding record in view of the fact

that most community orchestras perform only 3 or 4 times a season.

After a recent tour of the east coast with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Mr. Preves was immediately faced with preparing the North Side Symphony's final concert of the season. This was held on June 3 in Chicago's Orchestra Hall and featured soloist Mitchell Andrews, who performed the Tchaikovsky Piano Concerto No. 1.

The Overture to "An Italian in Algiers" by Rossini and the Sibelius Symphony No. 1 in E Minor also were played. I know from those that attended that this was an outstanding performance to mark the end of the Symphony's winter season.

I might also note that Mr. Preves has conducted musical performances of the Civic Symphony of Oak Park-River Forest, the Wheaton Summer Orchestra, and the Gary Symphony.

Mr. Preves is to be especially commended for his encouragement and special emphasis on the training of youth soloists. Each year, the winners of a youth competition are the soloists for the North Side Symphony the following year. Mr. Preves has perceived wisely that young artists need performing opportunities and that the neighborhood community orchestra is an excellent place to give them such opportunities. Violinist Elaine Skorodin and Jeffrey Siegel are two young artists who have won the competition in the past and then successfully pursued musical careers. Mr. Siegel has won international awards and is now an artist in residence at the National College of Education in Evanston, Ill.

During his long and distinguished musical career, Mr. Preves has received many awards, including the 1973 Library of Congress Achievement Recognition Award, the 1969 Hadassah Myrtle Wreath Achievement Award, the 1968 Steinway Award for contributions to the musical life of Chicago and the American String Teachers Citation for Excellence.

I feel sure that all my colleagues join with me in commending and congratulating Milton Preves on his numerous accomplishments and his outstanding work with the North Side Symphony Orchestra. His enthusiasm and dedication to his profession are indeed an example for us all.

A POLITICAL POSSE RUNNING THE AMERICAN INQUISITION

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time there is expressed in the media a concern as to how we in this country are viewed and evaluated by people living in other parts of the world and this concern has been voiced a number of times since the Senate committee began its hearing into Watergate and related matters.

In that regard I noticed a column by Mr. Bernard Levin appearing in the June 21, 1973, edition of the London Times which gives the viewpoint of a

foreign observer with respect to the style and performance of the Senate Committee. I insert the text of the column in the RECORD at this point:

A POLITICAL POSSE RUNNING THE AMERICAN INQUISITION

(By Bernard Levin)

I have just come back from ten days or so in America, where I watched a good deal of the Senate inquiry into the Watergate affair; the proceedings are being carried live and in full on television, with generous repetition in the evenings. I do not know what sort of viewing figures the business is getting, but it must certainly run into millions, perhaps tens or scores of millions. And it is just about the most scandalous violation of every standard of justice to take place in a free society since the Southern gentry abandoned lynching as their favourite outdoor sport.

Mencken called the United States Senate (and in a piece commiserating with Presidents on some of the burdens of their office, at that) "the windiest and most tedious group of men in Christendom", and it does not seem to have changed much, except for the worse, since his day. To start with, the conduct of the Chairman, Senator Sam Ervin, is so deplorable that the lack of any serious protest against his behaviour is in itself a measure of the loss of nerve on the part of so many distinguished Americans, in the press, the academic world and politics itself, who would once, in similar circumstances, have been campaigning vigorously to bring him to heel. (As far as I know, nobody has even bothered to draw pointed attention—or unpointed attention, for that matter—to the fact that Ervin is up for re-election next year.)

Senator Ervin, in his chairmanship of the committee, has clearly determined on two things. First is that he is going to play the role of simple ol' Sam Ervin from Dogpatch, North Carolina, first cousin to Mammy Yokum and dispenser of the same brand of homespun wisdom that grows 'way down among the grassroots. He does not (at least he didn't while I was watching) actually chew tobacco and spit the juice into a brass spittoon, snap his gulluses or use a flyswatter, but the mugging and grimacing, the posturing and posing and hamming, which would get the sixteenth spear-carrier from the left flung out of Barclays Bank Musical and Dramatic Society even if his father was the chairman, indicate, as clearly as if he had a sign up admitting as much, that he is having a whale of a time in his first experience of nationwide limelight, and that he not only knows when the cameras are on him, but exactly when they start to move in for a close-up.

One of the sadder phenomena of this business is the way in which the liberal establishment of America, in its insatiable greed for President Nixon's destruction, has tried to suggest that Ervin is a kind of reincarnation of Clarence Darrow, which would be all very well if it were not for his record of implacable opposition to civil rights legislation, and, incidentally, his no less consistent record of support for the American involvement in Vietnam. (But the American liberal—or, more correctly, pseudo-liberal—establishment does not mind how muddy is the stick with which it beats its devil-figures; Senator William Fulbright, whose record on civil-rights legislation is hardly less lamentable than Ervin's, and who topped even this sorry aspect of his career when he sneered that it couldn't possibly matter to a Vietnamese peasant whether he lived under a Communist or a non-Communist Government, was the great hero of the sloppier American left, whose concern with Negroes and Vietnamese alike was in many cases a good deal less than their enjoyment of the

nice, warm feeling their opposition to the Vietnam war gave them.)

Worse, however, than Senator Ervin's yokum-hokum is the way in which he was clearly decided that some of those appearing before him under suspicion of various malpractices are heroes, and some villains. Mr. Maurice Stans, for instance, was a villain; his interrogation (and most of the rest of the committee seem to take their cue from Ervin, or at least to realize the advantage of getting their own bread in any political gravy that might be going) was relentless, entirely hostile and plainly based on an assumption that Stans was guilty of everything of which he was accused and a good deal more besides. The odious Mr. Jeb Stuart Magruder, however, who followed Mr. Stans before the committee, was a hero; Ervin and others—especially the ridiculous and maudlin Lowell Weicker, who looked several times as though he was going to cry at his own benignity—fell over themselves to congratulate Magruder on being a fine, upstanding young man with a splendid future in front of him despite this setback.

The technique, of course, was exactly the one used by Senator Joseph McCarthy. Those who stood up to him, denied his accusations and refused to implicate anybody else, were torn to pieces; those who agreed with everything he said and hastened to add the names of others were given an easy passage and congratulated at the end of their session. So it was with Stans and Magruder. The former admitted nothing and pointed the finger at nobody; the latter readily agreed on his own complicity in crime, and sprinkled handfuls of names, about with cheerful abandon. Their respective treatment at the hands of Ervin and his posse was eloquent testimony to the fact that the lesson taught by McCarthy had been learnt.

But there is a wider, and more important, aspect of this scandal that needs examination, though before turning to it I cannot resist one digression, in the direction of yet another member of the Ervin committee. I nearly fell out of my chair when the wizened face of Senator Herman Talmadge came up on the screen. For this Talmadge is no stranger to constitutional irregularity. Apart from being one of the worst opponents of Negro rights in Congress, he was once guilty of an action from which Huey Long himself might have flinched. Herman Talmadge's father, Eugene, was Governor of Georgia (and also used to campaign for white supremacy and against Negro advancement); after one re-election of the post, however, in 1947, he died before being inaugurated. The state constitution provided for the lieutenant governor (that is, the deputy) to succeed, in such circumstances, to the unexpired term. Talmadge Junior, however, backed by his tame state legislature, demanded the governorship for himself and seized the state capitol and posted armed guards to keep the rightful governor out. And now here he was, quoting Woodrow Wilson and plainly determined to put down sin; it was like the town harlot reporting the clergyman's son to the police for kissing his girl goodnight in the church doorway.

Such grotesqueries make the whole business nastier; but they are not in themselves the cause of the distaste and concern that must be felt by any viewer of the Senate proceedings who retains some sense of proportion. What is really wrong with this inquisition is that it appears to be a judicial process but is in fact a political one. There seem to be no rules of evidence; certainly hearsay and even "opinion" evidence is freely admitted and even encouraged. No opportunity for confrontation of accused and accuser is permitted; no cross-examination of accusers by counsel for the accused takes place; nobody is there to see legal fair play. Men are having their reputations destroyed in full view of millions; worse, men who may

shortly have to face a criminal trial are having their cases literally prejudged, without any of the safeguards of true legal proceedings. Backed up by a press now overwhelmingly determined to find President Nixon guilty of every accusation flung at him, the senators of the committee are conducting a tainted trial the nature of which would still be indefensible even if the motives of every one of them were beyond reproach.

President Nixon may be the greatest scoundrel unchanged; or wholly innocent of any kind of complicity in the Watergate activities; or anything in between. The same goes for all these whose names are being exchanged like trading-stamps. It is very important indeed that the truth should be determined in every case, and that full justice should be done to the innocent and to the guilty. But the method of Senatorial inquisition, certainly as it is actually being conducted by the Ervin pack and almost certainly however it was conducted, is unable to determine the question of guilt or innocence in respect of any individual, or even the question of what actually happened. What it will quite certainly do, however, is to ruin a number of men, some of whom will not deserve ruin, and none of whom will deserve ruin before such a forum and in such a manner. "My conscience", Senator Ervin has said, "will not permit me to follow after a great multitude to do what I conceive to be evil." But at the moment, the great multitude is following him and in a very disturbing direction too.

TRIBUTE TO TED MOSIER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, those individuals who contribute their time, their ideas, and their spirit to improve conditions for their fellow man are rarely recognized for their outstanding deeds, except by those with whom they closely work, and those who are direct beneficiaries of their services.

The Paramount, Calif., Rotary Club has corrected this oversight by establishing a Man of the Year award honoring that person who has contributed the most to the community in the past year. And the person selected to receive this coveted award for this year is the Honorable Ted Mosier—a gentleman who has earned a well-deserved reputation of respect and admiration by giving unselfishly of his time and efforts for 35 years to better the quality of life of his fellow citizens of Paramount.

In addition to his successful business, Ted has dedicated himself to public service and is currently in his sixth year as a city councilman. Since 1969, he has served as either mayor or vice mayor and he is credited with bringing a progressive, businesslike manner to the administration of his fine city. It was due largely to his efforts that the 150-bed Paramount General Hospital came into being and began serving the people in November 1972.

In addition to this outstanding achievement, Ted Mosier was the moving force behind the establishment of the community education program—an innovative program which encourages

teachers to instruct anyone free of charge in the evenings. He is presently the chairman of this program.

An active community leader, he is a charter member of both the Elks and the Lions Clubs. He is the past exalted ruler of the Elks and is the past president of the Lions. In addition, he serves as a trustee of the United Methodist Church. Ted Mosier is also chairman of the district board of directors of United Way, on the board of directors of the Paramount Boys Club, and an active participant in the Boy Scouts.

In addition to leading such an active and successful public life, Ted has been a devoted family man. His gracious wife Mary—an accomplished artist and dedicated civic worker—has been a guiding light over the years. They are the proud parents of a daughter, Pam, who is a junior at Utah State and hopes to study law.

Mr. Speaker, citizens like Mr. Mosier are the greatest assets a community can have. They provide the vitality and idealism that make a city thrive. I am proud and privileged to take the time to honor the many contributions Ted Mosier has made to the city of Paramount.

spelled out this week in two remarkable documents, both largely overlooked in the hubbub over Watergate. The first, appropriately enough, was a damning report made public in South Vietnam by the retiring Canadian truce supervising team.

The Canadian report was obtained exclusively by Thomas W. Lippman, a correspondent of the Washington Post, after it had been submitted formally to the four-nation commission which includes Indonesia. A Canadian officer gave a copy of the document to the reporter with the comment that otherwise it "would never see the light of day" thanks to the Communist Polish and Hungarian members.

The strongly worded summation report accuses North Vietnam of "massive" and "unrelenting" infiltration of troops into the Mekong Delta of South Vietnam ever since the January cease-fire specifically outlawed such activities.

Based on the testimony of numerous captured North Vietnamese soldiers, the Canadian report said that the infiltrators who are continuing to pour into the South have been uninformed about the Paris accords, the various peace-keeping forces, and even about the departure of United States forces.

Moving in seemingly endless groups of 500 each down the Ho Chi Minh Trail system, the captured infiltrators were quoted as saying their common practice is to change from North Vietnamese to Vietcong uniforms before crossing over the border from Cambodia.

This point in the Canadian report contains the first detailed documentation of how Hanoi continues to back up its most notorious lie—that it does not and never has had any of its military forces in South Vietnam.

The report makes it abundantly obvious that the infiltrators and the huge amounts of military hardware they are bringing with them are under control of North Vietnamese officers, not the Vietcong. The latter, for all practical purposes, emerges in the report as a negligible factor.

Here are the summary paragraphs of the officially suppressed Canadian report:

"North Vietnam, without being deterred one scintilla by the Paris agreements, has been infiltrating massive armed troop units into Cambodia and South Vietnam in order to conduct military operations against the Republic of Vietnam.

"It can also be concluded that there never has been the slightest indication following the cease-fire that North Vietnam has modified its infiltration policy."

In view of the above, it is small wonder that Saigon reported a total of 98 Communist truce violations during just one 24-hour period this week.

The wonder is there weren't a lot more. The apparent truth is there are bound to be more, lots more, and very likely an eventual renewal of all-out Communist assault. Such is the conclusion to be drawn from a second remarkable document also all but buried by the Watergate news this week.

It consists of an analytical dispatch from London to the Christian Science Monitor by Dr. P. J. Honey. He is universally acknowledged as Britain's foremost expert on Vietnam and is a lecturer in Vietnamese studies at London University.

Dr. Honey contends, as I always have contended that the reason Hanoi signed the Paris truce was to get relief from the terrible destruction of our December bombing attacks—and to get a desperately-needed breather to gather strength for future takeover of the South without U.S. interference.

Here are a few of Dr. Honey's revealing observations, offered here with the wish that space permitted more:

"The evidence strongly suggests that North Vietnam's leaders view the cease fire as merely one more step along their long revolutionary road.

"Within the first 60 days of the cease-

fire, North Vietnam infiltrated at least 40,000 of its own soldiers into the South. Of the North Vietnamese war prisoners released by the Saigon authorities, 25,000 unwounded ones were integrated into communist military units in the South.

"In Military Region 1, which adjoins the frontier with North Vietnam, thousands of Soviet surface-to-air missiles have been installed in newly seized territory, rendering it immune from air attack.

"In South Vietnam, close to the border with Laos, North Vietnamese are building all-weather roads which, when completed, will replace the present Ho Chi Minh Trail, and many thousands of Northern civilians are arriving to settle in the recently captured Communist areas.

"All these continuing operations have an air of permanence about them."

The expression "air of permanence" is typical British understatement.

What the good doctor means, of course, is that everything about the operation indicates that the Communists are there to stay.

All this is pretty discouraging, and the sort of informative news which might drive even those sick of Watergate back to the tube. All the same it should not be overlooked, and future events will guarantee that history will not overlook it.

It seems to me, at this late date, that Americans from the White House on down are going to have to accept the fact that the woes of southeast Asia are beyond our control—that we have done all we can to stop aggression in the area.

If the South Vietnamese henceforth cannot defend themselves after all the training and equipment we have given them, then that is simply going to be too bad. You can't instill a will to fight for freedom if it doesn't at least exist in embryo.

We seem to have made a noble but disastrous error in judgment. We are going to have to face it, accept it, and make sure we don't do it again.

Canada made the same kind of error in thinking it could act effectively as an impartial arbiter in a dog fight.

It is withdrawing this weekend with its honor intact. Canada's successor—if one can be found—will have the gravest difficulty in matching the Canadians' integrity and forthrightness in recording history.

WILLIAM L. WHITE

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Kansas and the Nation have lost a distinguished journalist and citizen. William L. White, editor of the famed Emporia Gazette and son of the noted William White, passed away last week. Mrs. Shriver and I join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. White and the family on their great loss.

Mr. White's contributions to journalism extended beyond his beloved community of Emporia. He was a successful author, columnist, and war correspondent.

It was my privilege to represent Emporia during my first years in the Congress, and to get to know Bill White. I valued his friendship and his counsel. He will be sorely missed.

Under the leave to extend my remarks

IS NORTH VIETNAM OBSERVING THE CEASE-FIRE?

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the following editorial to the attention of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives. It is the clearest statement I have seen about the total lack of any intent by North Vietnam to abide by the cease-fire agreement:

THE OTHER NEWS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

SAN SIMEON.—As anticipated and analyzed in this column two weeks ago, the flood of Watergate testimony has reached a point which may well so alter its course as to render it rather an inconclusive experience in rhetoric. I refer of course to the imminent and historic legal showdown on the relative powers of Congress vs. the President of the United States.

The constitutional collision, naturally, is far and away the top news of the week. But since the issues involved already have been discussed here at length, today's late headlines should more than cover the subject. Besides, it's a cinch you've gotten more—in fact you haven't been able to get much else—on TV.

What is on my mind as a timely alternative topic is the fact that this weekend is the last for Canada's membership in the four-nation commission assigned to police the Vietnam truce agreements. Canada is pulling out because of the impossibility of policing a truce which is non-existent.

The pullout is a historic milestone in its own right, though it could have come as no surprise to readers of this report. It has been my conviction right along that the cease-fire pacts—both of them—would never work because Hanoi's goal of ultimate conquest remains unchanged.

Just how unchanged that goal is was

in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Hutchinson, Kans., News and the Wichita, Kans., Eagle which eloquently eulogize this respected newspaperman:

WILLIAM L. WHITE

William Lindsay White, one of Kansas' most accomplished and versatile newspapermen, has died at his home in Emporia. During his 73 years, Mr. White was notable for many achievements, but the one in which he seemed to take greatest pride was his continued editorship of The Emporia Gazette, the newspaper his father, William Allen White, made internationally known.

It often has been observed that sons of great fathers rarely come to much. Mr. White was an exception to the rule. By the time he was 14 he was a reporter under his father's tutelage. Once his education was completed at Harvard in 1924, he began his career in earnest.

Most of his first 35 years was spent on The Gazette, and during that time he managed to work in one term in the Kansas Legislature, and was otherwise active in politics. In 1931 he was married to Katherine Klinkenberg, a Kansas girl then on the staff of Time Magazine.

For a time he worked for the Washington Post and Fortune Magazine. At the beginning of World War II he headed for Europe as correspondent for 40 daily newspapers and the Columbia Broadcasting System, where he distinguished himself as an alert and perceptive reporter and analyst. In 1939 he was cited by the National Headliners Club for the best European broadcast of the year. The following year he switched his allegiance to the North American Newspaper Alliance and started his long association with Reader's Digest as a roving and contributing editor.

He wrote a number of books, the best known of which was "They Were Expendable," which later became a movie. He and his wife traveled extensively, and maintained homes both in New York and in Emporia, but wherever he might be, he retained firm direction of the Gazette's policy, and wrote frequent editorials, articles and columns for it until a few months before his death.

In addition to his professional skills, he was a gifted conversationalist, a bon vivant, and a steadfast friend. Emporia and the nation are diminished by his death.

WILLIAM LINDSAY WHITE

Who's Who bills him this way:

"White, William Lindsay, newspaperman." The only improvement Bill might have made on that would be to add one word: "Newspaperman, Kansas."

There is much more, of course. His biographical details go into such achievements as his wartime CBS broadcasts, notably his coverage of Russia's march into Finland and his Christmas report from the Mannerheim Line. Into his many fine books, his work as a Reader's Digest editor and as a Fortune magazine writer, and his dabbling into Republican politics—including a stint in the Kansas legislature.

However, "newspaperman" is the title he preferred, and the distinction that will be given him by his friends, most of whom are newspapermen and women too.

He wandered far. He explored life in Vietnam's jungles, London's bombed houses, Italian villages. He kept a handsome Manhattan apartment and enjoyed the pleasures of such places as the Century Club, the Coffee House, and a half-dozen press clubs. He played with movies and even some television.

But through it all, he remained a Kansas newspaperman.

As his father, "Young Bill" White really

never left Emporia. Wherever he roamed, his writing came back to The Gazette. Wherever he was, his staff searched him out for decisions, or waited for his return for guidance in the newspaper's operation.

And that was the pattern through even the tough, final years when cancer gripped him. His thoughts centered, as always, on The Gazette. It must have been considerable satisfaction to him and his loyal wife, Katherine, that their daughter Barbara and her husband, Paul David Walker, decided that The Gazette and Kansas were to be their prime interests too.

The nation, and much of the world, will remember Bill White for his World War 2 exploits, for such writing as "They Were Expendable," "Queens Die Proudly," and "Journey for Margaret."

But Kansans will remember him, fondly and proudly, as a native son who embraced Kansas with the affection of a father for an errant son, who both scolded and loved us, and who dug deep roots into the Kansas soil.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY A. WHALEN

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense of personal loss that I pay tribute to a great friend, dedicated public servant, and American patriot, Henry A. Whalen.

Henry Whalen was a man whose entire life was spent fighting for those ideals which he felt were right. During his 56 years on God's Earth, he had an immense influence on many aspects of community and civic life.

Henry Whalen's accomplishments and contributions, however, were not limited to the Bronx. Between the years of 1941-45, while serving in the U.S. Army, Harry Whalen compiled one of the most impressive military records of recent times. Some of his citations and awards include, the European, African, and Middle Eastern Campaigns Medal with eight citations—including one Silver Service Star and three Bronze Service Stars representing distinguished contributions to eight separate campaigns in the war. He was also presented a special Bronze Arrowhead award for his efforts in the famous invasion of North Africa of November 8, 1942. In addition, he was awarded the prestigious Purple Heart, the Good Conduct Medal, and the Distinguished Unit Emblem.

Even after this most laudatory of service records, Harry Whalen remained a friend to the serviceman and the veteran by becoming active in all veterans organizations in the Bronx and serving as commander of the United War Veterans of the Bronx from 1967-69. Further, Harry Whalen was instrumental in the organizing of several public tributes to the serviceman and veteran. Of particular pride to him was his assistance to Kathy Connelly Begley, another deceased American patriot, in the organization of the successful "Support our Serviceman" parade which was held on November 15, 1969. In addition, Harry Whalen organized another famous patriotic parade,

the "Support the Boys in Vietnam" march of October 22, 1967.

Henry Whalen's goal in recent years was the establishment of a new veterans' hospital to serve the thousands of veterans living in the New York area. He spent countless hours in Washington and New York trying to make this facility a reality. It seemed tragically ironic that as he lay on his deathbed several weeks ago, he was informed that Congress had finally appropriated the necessary funds for the construction of the new facility. As a tribute to his tireless efforts, I plan to introduce legislation to name this facility in honor of Henry Whalen.

His efforts on behalf of veterans did not go unnoticed. In 1963, he received an award from Governor Rockefeller and the State legislature for conspicuous service. In 1965, he received a plaque from the Catholic War Veterans for unselfish service and loyalty. In 1969 he was a recipient of a Certificate of Merit from the Henrick Hudson Post No. 3300 of the Bronx. Finally, in 1972 he was accorded the distinguished Certificate of Appreciation from Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York.

Harry Whalen was intensely involved in community life in the Bronx he loved so much. An example of his involvement was in 1970, a disastrous fire occurred in his home in the Norwood section of the Bronx. As a result of this fire, four families were rendered homeless. In response to his neighbors' plight, he started a fund which provided these destitute families with financial assistance to reestablish themselves in new homes. Harry Whalen went one step further, he realized from this experience the community needed a civic organization to deal with any similar situations in the future. The end result was the formation of the Norwood Civic Association in September of 1970. This organization accomplished much in the development of a new spirit of friendliness and cooperation among the residents of the area.

Henry Whalen was a deeply religious man and was especially active in the parish affairs of St. Brendan's Roman Catholic Church as exemplified by his serving two terms as chairman of the parish council.

Henry Whalen's life was also a story of great personal courage. In 1967 Henry had his first pacemaker implanted by Dr. Arthur Gaynor, of Montefiore Hospital, who was not only his cardiologist but a great friend as well. By 1972 he had received four pacemaker replacements. With each replacement, he was reordered to slow his pace down, yet Henry Whalen did not know how to lead the type of life his doctors wanted him to.

In May 1973 he was given the choice of open heart surgery for survival. Although advised by his doctors that it was an extremely risky operation, Henry decided, as he had done throughout his life, to take the risk. He died on Friday, July 13, 1973.

Yet despite all his accomplishments and contributions to the welfare of his fellow man, Henry Whalen will best be remembered as a loyal friend and devoted husband and father. I had the distinct honor of calling Henry Whalen a friend,

and a friend he was. He was the type of person you could call at any time, and he would always be more than willing to lend a hand or offer a solution to a problem.

I believe that Henry Whalen's loss will be shared by thousands, but the one who will feel it the deepest will be the people he was the closest to: his family. Henry Whalen was above all a family man. As a loving father and dedicated husband, he provided his loved ones with countless years of enjoyment. I especially wish to extend my heartfelt condolences to the Whalen family, to his wonderful wife, Anne Cotter Whalen, and his three lovely daughters Eileen Lennon, Kathleen Armstrong, and Nancy as well as his six grandchildren.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include with my remarks in the RECORD, an editorial tribute to this great man, Henry A. Whalen that appeared in the Bronx Journal News.

BEYOND THE CALL OF DUTY

The death of Henry A. Whalen last Thursday on the operating table at Montefiore Hospital came as a not unexpected shock to the thousands of Bronxites who had worked with him at one time or another.

Henry Whalen went off to war in the 1940's to fight for his country. He never stopped fighting until last Thursday when his Maker decided to end the battle for him. Henry Whalen was a volunteer in the service of his country whether in uniform, or out of it. And, most assuredly, he died for it.

Civic leader, veterans leader, religious leader . . . these were some of the many titles he had carried. He could have sat back like many and enjoyed life taking it easy. But Henry Whalen had convictions, a dream of a better America and a better Bronx, and he was willing to die for them.

Willing to die for his ideals were not idle words for Henry Whalen. For many years his life was sustained by an electronic heart pacemaker. His doctors told him to take life easy . . . rest. And he always promised he would follow these orders.

But, there was always a battle to be fought, some civic improvement which needed action right away, a trip to Washington to fight for a new Kingsbridge Veterans Hospital or a battle with city officials to win improvements for his home community of Norwood, or a meeting of the St. Brendan Parish Council to find new means to finance the local parochial school system.

Three years ago Henry Whalen had a new pacemaker implanted to keep his heart going. Three years ago he finally spurred Norwood residents to get off their rumps and get a civic organization going. Three years ago the battle for a new Kingsbridge Veterans Hospital was nearing its climax. Henry Whalen kept fighting. He burned out the pacemaker.

His doctors warned of dire consequences. But Henry Whalen couldn't sit back while battles for just causes needed his efforts. And the new pacemaker started burning out.

Henry Whalen died that others might enjoy a better life. He will be sorely missed. There are so few people willing to assume the burdens he did to help his fellow man.

In his last weeks in the hospital news reached him that Congress had appropriated funds to build the new wing at the Kingsbridge veterans facility. It would be appropriate and fitting that the new facility be named the Henry A. Whalen Pavillion in honor of a real Bronx hero who died that others might live a little better.

MORE NONQUALITY EDUCATION

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, education in this day and age is a far cry from what it was when we were young. It used to be that we at least tried to learn from the great lessons of history, and from the great thinkers and writers of the Western, Judaic-Christian tradition. Now many educationists are attempting to, and are, discarding this tradition to utilize instead the students themselves and such local resources as married couples, engaged couples, widows, bachelors, and divorcees as instruments of learning. In education, tradition is now ignored, it is the educational moment that matters. Everything is geared toward the present with no regard for the lessons of the past and its portent of the future.

In an article in the February 1972 issue of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Tribune, Mr. Malcolm Lawrence exposed the absurdities of this approach to education. I believe that all Members of the House who are concerned with the teaching of the young will find what Mr. Lawrence has to say both interesting and alarming.

The article follows:

MORE NONQUALITY EDUCATION

(By Malcolm Lawrence)

If your 16 year-old son or daughter comes running home one afternoon and shouts, "Hey, Ma! I just learned all the characteristics of a successful honeymoon," it may well be that he or she is enrolled in a new course called "Relationships" being offered to 11th and 12th grade students in the Montgomery County Public Schools system.

When you consider the sad state of the academic achievements of our schools and the increasing financial demands being made on the taxpayers (\$177 million for the coming year), you would think the management in Rockville would be concentrating more on improving the quality of education and less on encouraging introspection, narcissism, and a premature curiosity about socio-sexual dynamics. But not so.

Instruction in so-called Human Development is being thrown at our kids from every angle. It's all part of the behavioral scientists' pre-programming and conditioning to change the attitudes and behavior of our children. The basic aim of the planners is to have the schools take over the "total child." The techniques are geared to the alienation of the child from the home and the destruction of the socially acceptable concepts of the family unit. From last September through January, hundreds of hours of instruction were given at all levels in the County schools on sensory awareness; group dynamics; feeling, touching, and smelling games; nonverbal communications; and films and discussions on the emotions of love, anger, and fear—all at the expense of much-needed instruction in reading, grammar, composition, history, and arithmetic. Incidentally, the new gimmick concept to watch for is "self-actualization."

I have just gone through the 126 pages of the new curriculum for "Relationships" and have concluded that there is absolutely no justification whatsoever for the incorporation of such nonsense and drivel in our

school system. My objections are based not only on the material proposed for the course, but on the latitude afforded the teachers most of whom I am sure are ill-equipped to teach such sensitive and open-ended material. Therefore, to prepare the teachers to instruct in this behavioral-changing curriculum, the taxpayers of Montgomery County are going to pay millions of dollars are "in-service training" so that our children's minds can be properly warped.

How does this kind of course find its way into our schools? Who approves it?

The Board of Education, which is supposed to vote on all curriculum? It's my guess that most of the Board members have never even seen a reference to "Relationships," much less approve it.

Large chunks of the material for the new course were lifted directly from that celebrated elective HOME ECONOMICS No. 245, including the worthless sex films some of which I reviewed in my January 28, column (Phoebe, Merry-Go-Round, The Game, etc.). It can be fully expected that whatever the Curriculum Department of the Montgomery County Public Schools system chooses to name its courses, the same undesirable subject matter will continue to crop up again and again. Unless, that is, something is done to call a halt to the free reign in Rockville.

Because so few parents have the opportunity to examine the actual materials being used to instruct the students, I shall devote the remainder of my column to quoting—without comment—selected portions of the so-called "learning experiences" from the "Relationships" curriculum. Such "experiences" along with the films make up the bulk of the course. As you look over the following topics, keep in mind the question, "Is this the type and quality of education we need and desire in Montgomery County?"

Write paper, "Who am I?"

Write a report on "How I Feel About Myself." Sharing with the class or teacher would be the individual's decision.

Have the class write a group poem or song on self concept.

Discuss clairvoyance, apports levitation, psychokinesis and telepathy. Relate stories of such phenomena. Collect newspaper accounts of these. Discuss Jean Dixon and gather articles on her predictions.

For two weeks the student keeps a record of his emotions and his response. Evaluate the emotion, response, and adjustment behavior.

Discuss the problem of young people who are too dependent upon their parents and always let their parents make all their decisions for them.

Listen to lyrics from popular love songs. Discuss. Is this a true view of love? What is the popular view of love? Where do we first learn about love?

Role-play situation such as the following: A boy with several years of schooling ahead of him is confronted by a girl he has been dating. She tells him that he is the father of her expected child, and she demands that he marry her. If neither professes to love the other, what should they do?

Complete this open-ended sentence: The greatest source of conflict with my family is _____.

Ask students to choose a problem in which they have the most family conflict. Experiment for one week trying to improve communication with family members in the particular area. Those who wish to may report progress to the class or teacher.

Watch TV shows involving family conflict and the generation gap.

Play game "generation gap."

Discuss family privacy—does a parent have the right to read a diary or look through a teenager's room for evidence of drugs? An 8 year-old's room?

Discuss: What limitations should parents set on dating, practices such as going steady, time and money, choice of dates, and behavior?

React to the statement: "God made things to be used and people to be loved." (Resource: Why Wait Till Marriage by Duvall.)

Plan a panel on dating and present it to junior high home economics class. Discuss the problems of early dating.

Invite an engaged man and an engaged woman to speak about the engagement and tell, "What the engagement period means to me."

Interview married couples and ask them about their engagement period and the tasks accomplished. Discuss how one could tell whether or not the engagement period was long enough.

Complete: The purpose of engagement is—

Brainstorm (discuss freely): The characteristics of a successful honeymoon.

Divide into groups and identify situations in early marriage that require initial adjustment—role expectations, sexual relationships, and birth control.

Review ways the role expectations for men and women have changed.

Collect cartoons and prepare a bulletin board showing the popular understanding of in-law relationships.

Discuss what can happen when too much "togetherness" exists in early marriage.

Ask a bachelor, career girl, widow, divorcee, etc. to discuss the pleasures and pains of the single life.

Assemble a bulletin board on the societal forces that encourage and pressure individuals into marriage.

Research and define terms used in studying the following family organizations: nuclear family, extended family, family of orientation, family of procreation, clan, monogamy, polygamy, and trial marriage.

Form a panel consisting of several of the following: divorced persons (both male and female), a remarried divorcee, a marriage counselor, a psychiatrist, and children from divorced homes. The students will direct questions to the panel.

Divide into research groups. Each group work with one crisis in family living. Consult resource people, read articles, visit agencies, etc. to gain background information. Include the following crisis situations: temporary separation, defective offspring, involuntary childlessness, extended illness, sexual infidelity, desertion, drug addiction, change of income level, alcoholism, old age, divorce, death of a mate, and war.

If this is the sort of thing the taxpayers and voters want, this is what they are going to get.

ENERGY SCIENCE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1973

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced, with my colleague from Ohio, Mr. VANIK, the Energy Science Development Act of 1973. I include this bill in the RECORD in full for the benefit of my colleagues who have demonstrated concern about the current energy situation.

H.R. —

A bill to provide for a coherent rational program of energy research and development, to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Energy Science Development Act".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) the lack of coherent planning among the various agencies engaged in energy policy formulation has accentuated shortages in petroleum supplies and electrical energy;

(2) a comprehensive national energy policy, encompassing energy research and development, and the efficient use of the Nation's energy resources, is essential to the improving of the general welfare of the Nation; and

(3) it is a primary responsibility of the Federal Government to provide essential leadership in advancing a program of efficient development, supply, utilization, and conservation of energy resources.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 3. In order to provide an adequate energy base to support the Nation's existing and future social goals and aspirations, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to establish and maintain a national program of research and development in energy technologies and energy conservation adequate to—

(1) eliminate the Nation's excessive dependence on fossil fuels and to insure adequate, reliable, economical, and environmentally acceptable energy systems to support the essential needs of modern society;

(2) discover the most attractive short-term solutions to immediate problems of the energy system which are having serious impacts upon society;

(3) develop the technology and information base necessary to support development of the widest possible range of options available for future energy policy decisions by aggressively pursuing research and development programs in a wide variety of energy technologies; and

(4) establish within the Federal Government central responsibility and institutional capability for maintaining continuing assessment, overview, and direction of the energy research and development activities of the Federal Government, private industry, and nonprofit organizations pending the reorganization of the Federal energy agencies to attain and support the objectives of a national energy policy.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Energy Research and Development Commission, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission".

(b) (1) The Commission shall consist of five members appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) No individual shall be selected to serve on the Commission if such individual has, within the two years preceding such selection, been affiliated with or has held any direct or indirect pecuniary interest in any electrical power, natural gas, petroleum, or other energy production or distribution industry.

(3) Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the Commission shall be selected from among those individuals who have experience and competence regarding the environment and its protection, consumer protection, and energy-related research and development.

(4) Not more than three members appointed under this subsection shall be of the same political party.

(c) (1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), members shall be appointed for terms of five years.

(2) Of the members first appointed—

(A) one shall be appointed for a term of one year;

(B) one shall be appointed for a term of two years;

(C) one shall be appointed for a term of three years;

(D) one shall be appointed for a term of four years; and

(E) one shall be appointed for a term of five years; as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(3) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the powers of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(4) A member may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office, except that no member shall serve beyond the expiration of the next session of the Congress beginning after the expiration of his term of office.

(d) During the period any individual serves as a member he shall not engage in any other employment, business, or vocation, or have any direct or indirect pecuniary interest in any electrical power, natural gas, petroleum, or other energy production or distribution industry.

(e) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(f) A Chairman shall be selected from among the members by the President. The Commission annually shall elect a Vice Chairman to act in case of the absence or disability of the Chairman, or in case of a vacancy in the office of the Chairman.

(g) The Chairman shall be compensated at the rate provided by level II of the Executive Salary Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. Other members shall be compensated at the rate provided by level III of the Executive Salary Schedule under section 5314 of such title.

(h) The Commission may appoint a Director and such staff personnel as it deems desirable. The Director and staff of the Commission shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(i) The Commission shall have an official seal, of which judicial notice shall be taken.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, the Commission may—

(1) make such expenditures and enter into such contracts as it deems necessary;

(2) promulgate regulations to carry out its functions;

(3) subject to subsection (b), procure the services of experts and consultants to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 (b) of title 5, United States Code;

(4) subject to subsection (b), utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel who may be allowed transportation expenses, including per diem expenses, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals serving without pay;

(5) purchase lands or interests therein;

(6) purchase, rent, or lease office space; and

(7) make grants with respect to any research project established or maintained under section 6(b).

(b) In obtaining the services of individuals under subsection (a) (3) or (a) (4), the Commission shall seek such individuals from all segments of electrical power, natural gas, petroleum, or other energy production or distribution industries, from State and municipal

governmental units, environmentalist groups, consumer groups, institutions of higher education, and Federal executive agencies. Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal executive agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out the purpose of this Act.

(c) The Commission shall, for the purpose of examination and audit, require that any person receiving a grant under subsection (a) (7) shall maintain such records as the Commission shall prescribe, including—

(1) the amount and disposition by such person of funds received under such grant;

(2) the total cost of the project in connection with which such funds were given or used;

(3) the amount and nature of the portion of the cost of the project supplied by any other source; and

(4) any other record which the Commission deems necessary.

(d) The Commission and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any authorized representative thereof, shall have access, for the purpose of examination or audit, to any record of any person receiving a grant under subsection (a) (7) which is maintained pursuant to requirements prescribed by the Commission under subsection (c).

RESEARCH

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall establish a national policy of energy research and development which shall bring to commercial development, as quickly as possible, technology in the project areas in which the Commission will undertake research, as specified in subsection (b).

(b) The Commission shall undertake research, including, but not limited to, research projects to—

(1) develop processes and techniques of energy conservation for use in construction, transportation, and in the manufacture of consumer and capital goods;

(2) decrease the adverse environmental impact and generally improve the processing of electricity generation and transmission, including—

(A) the improvement of thermal efficiencies in generation (including magneto-hydrodynamics), and

(B) the development of technologies for the application of extra-high voltage transmission lines, underground transmission, cryogenic transmission systems, and high voltage direct current transmission lines;

(3) develop clean alternatives in obtaining energy, including—

(A) the gasification and liquefaction of coal,

(B) the development of multiproduct coal refineries,

(C) the effective utilization of shale oil and tar sands, and

(D) the improvement of recovery of petroleum and natural gas;

(4) minimize costs as well as environmental damage in the transportation and storage of energy, including—

(A) pipelines for petroleum and natural gas, and

(B) storage of electricity (including fuel cells), petroleum, natural gas, chemical energy, hydrogen, compressed air and other conventional or undeveloped energy forms; and

(4) develop previously unexploited energy sources; including—

(A) solar energy (including biological conversion),

(B) wind power,

(C) tidal energy;

(D) ocean thermal power; and

(E) ocean current energy.

(c) (1) Any grant made with respect to any research project established or main-

tained under this section shall be made upon the express condition that all information, processes, or patents, resulting from federally assisted research will be available to the general public.

(2) Where a grant recipient holds background patents, trade secrets, or proprietary information which will be employed in and are requisite to the proposed research and development project, the Commission shall enter into an agreement which will provide equitable protection to the participants' rights; except that any such agreement must provide that when the energy research and development project reaches the stage of commercial application all previously developed patents, trade secrets, or proprietary information necessary to commercial application of the energy process or system developed under this section will be made available to any qualified applicant on reasonable license terms which shall take into account that the commercial viability of the total energy process or system was achieved with the assistance of public funds.

PRIORITY OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 7. In evaluating proposed opportunities for particular research and development undertakings pursuant to this Act, the Commission shall assign priority to those undertakings in which—

(1) the urgency of public need for the potential results of the research, development, or demonstration effort is high, and there is little likelihood that similar results would be achieved in a timely manner in the absence of Federal assistance;

(2) the potential opportunities for non-Federal interests to recapture the investment in the undertaking through the normal commercial exploitation of proprietary knowledge appear inadequate to encourage timely results;

(3) the extent of the problems treated and the objectives sought by the undertaking are national or regional in scope as opposed to being of importance to localities or individual industries;

(4) the degree of risk of loss of investment inherent in the research is high, and the availability of risk capital to the non-Federal entities which might otherwise engage in the field of the research is limited; or

(5) the magnitude of the investment appears to exceed the financial capabilities of potential non-Federal participants in the research to support effective efforts.

RESEARCH DATA BASE

(a) Section 3(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (82 Stat. 360; 42 U.S.C. 1862) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (6),

(2) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8), and

(3) by inserting immediately after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

"(7) to administer the Research Data Base, including the compilation and verification of data, as prescribed in section 8 of the Energy Science Development Act; and"

SEC. 8. The National Science Foundation (hereinafter called the "Foundation") shall prepare annually an inventory of mineral fuel deposits in the Nation and shall submit such inventory to the Commission, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the Secretary of the Interior in order to promote coordination among them regarding energy research and policy. The first such inventory shall be completed on or before June 30 of the second calendar year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) Any prospector, mine operator, or well operator who owns or has legal authority, by lease, license, or otherwise, to exploit any substantial deposit (as defined by the Founda-

tion) of any mineral fuel shall file a report annually with the Foundation, at such time and in such form as the Foundation may prescribe, setting forth the following information regarding such deposit—

(1) the type of mineral fuel, the estimated volume of the deposit, and the estimated quality of the unprocessed mineral fuel;

(2) the location of the deposit;

(3) any activity pertaining to the extraction of the deposit; and

(4) the name and address of—

(A) any owner of the deposit; and

(B) the person filing the report.

(d) For the purposes of this section, the term "mineral fuel" means crude petroleum, natural gas, uranium, thorium, or lignite, anthracite, bituminous, or subbituminous coal, or any such other mineral fuel as the Foundation may prescribe.

(e) Any member of the Foundation, or any duly authorized representative of the Foundation, may enter during business hours the site of any substantial deposit of a mineral fuel for the purpose of conducting independent tests to determine the accuracy of the reported quality, volume, and location of the deposit.

(f) Any member of the Foundation, or any duly authorized representative of the Foundation, may inspect or examine any record or document relating to the estimated quality, volume, and location of the deposit.

(g) Any person who willfully fails to file any report required under subsection (c) or files any report under subsection (c) with the knowledge that such report is erroneous in any material respect, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

NEWSLETTER

SEC. 9. (a) Not less than twice each month, the Commission shall publish a newsletter (hereinafter referred to as the "Newsletter"), which shall be made available to all interested persons and include—

(1) abstracts of all approved grants, including a statement on the general nature of the work;

(2) announcements of hearings pursuant to section 10;

(3) notices of grants required under subsection (b); and

(4) summaries of promising developments.

(b) The Board shall give notice by publication in the Federal Register and in the Newsletter at least ninety days before approval of any grant of \$1,000,000 or more, and shall provide an opportunity for any interested party to comment on any such grant prior to approval. No grants may be approved until thirty days after completion of the time allowed for the comment of interested persons.

BUDGET HEARING

SEC. 10. At least once each year the Commission shall conduct a hearing on its proposed budget for the following fiscal year. Notice shall be given by publication in the Federal Register and in the Newsletter at least sixty days prior to its occurrence, the scheduled date, time, and place of such hearing. At least forty-five days before the hearing date, the Commission shall publish in the Newsletter a complete statement of proposed programs in the next fiscal year. All interested parties should be granted an opportunity to testify or submit written statements. A record shall be made of all hearings, and such record shall be available for public inspection. All reasonable and germane inquiries made at the hearing of the Commission, or of the principal investigators where possible, must be fairly responded to on the record. The Commission shall wait at least thirty days after the completion of the hearings to allow for the comment of interested parties before submitting its budget to the President.

DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

SEC. 11. (a) Any information received by the Foundation under section 8(c), 8(e), or 8(f), or by the Commission under section 5(d), may be published or otherwise disclosed, subject to the provisions of section 6(c), the Foundation, or by the Commission, as the case may be, except that no information may be disclosed (except as provided by subsection (b)) if—

(1) such information contains or relates to any trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18, United States Code; or

(2) the Foundation, or the Commission, as the case may be, determines that such disclosure of such information would give an unfair competitive advantage to any person.

(b) The Foundation or the Commission may disclose, subject to the provisions of section 6(c), any information received by it under section 5(d), 8(c), 8(e), or 8(f) to—

(1) other Federal officers or employees concerned with carrying out the purposes of this Act;

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, for the purpose of ascertaining the accuracy of any Federal tax return; and

(3) either House of Congress or a committee thereof.

Any information falling within subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) shall not be published or disclosed by any person receiving such information under this subsection.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 12. The Commission, in carrying out the purpose of this Act, shall coordinate its activities, in order to avoid any duplication in policy planning, with the Departments of the Interior, Commerce, Agriculture, Defense, and Transportation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Science Foundation.

COMMISSION REPORTS

SEC. 13. The Commission shall prepare a comprehensive report, to be submitted to the President who shall transmit such report to the Congress within thirty days after his receipt, regarding the administration of this Act. The first of such reports shall be submitted to the President within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act and each of the succeeding comprehensive reports shall be submitted annually thereafter. Any judgment, conclusion, or finding contained in such report shall include a detailed statement of any underlying assumptions or data used. Such report shall include—

(1) an analysis and evaluation of research and development funded under this Act;

(2) a comprehensive evaluation of areas most in need of future research and development;

(3) an analysis of the impact of new technology on the demand for energy, and the interrelationship of the economy and the environment;

(4) a subreport, to be prepared by the Foundation, containing information regarding the quantity of mineral fuel deposits extracted, together with the amount discovered, during the preceding calendar year, and the estimate of the Commission of the total remaining mineral reserves of the Nation by categories;

(5) a description of the extent of cooperation by the Commission with other agencies and public and private institutions, and recommendations to improve such cooperation; and

(6) recommendations for legislation needed to revise and improve national energy policies, encourage the conservation of energy, or for other purposes relating to the administration of this Act.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 14. Unless otherwise provided by law, the provisions of this Act shall cease to have effect on September 30, 1985.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD'S HIGH INTEREST RATE CREATES ANOTHER CREDIT CRUNCH

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate the credit crunch brought on by the Federal Reserve Board's increased interest rates continues unchecked. Because of high interest rates many areas across the country are suffering from tight money for home loans. In some cases, there are no funds whatever available for housing, in other areas the cost of housing and home financing is so great that nobody but the rich and powerful can obtain any funds. But in either case the result is the same. Homeowners find that decent housing is beyond their reach; housing construction has come to a halt; construction workers find themselves unemployed with the prospect of employment bleak; and many savings institutions created to assure the public of a source of housing funds at a reasonable rate of interest are losing funds to commercial banks.

What brought all this about? The Federal Reserve Board allowed commercial banks to pay unlimited interest on certain classes of deposits. As a result, banks have very aggressively gone out and solicited new funds which otherwise should have stayed in the housing market. Although it is too early to see whether the Federal Reserve Bank has allowed the banks an unfair advantage over other financial institutions in this situation, it is certainly clear that millions of people across the land, both the homeowners and others interested in providing the people with an opportunity for decent housing and a decent standard of living have been gravely injured by these high interest rates.

So that the Members may be informed about the seriousness of this problem, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time copies of correspondence which focus on the issues involved in this now devastating credit crunch:

GIBRALTAR SAVINGS AND

LOAN ASSOCIATION,

Beverly Hills, Calif., July 9, 1973.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency
Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: I wish to register grave concern for the action taken by the several governmental agencies which permitted increases in interest rates on various types of savings accounts. It appears that little concern was given to what the ultimate effect would be on the prospective home buyer. He will now be charged an interest rate that was previously considered to be unconscionable. Mortgage money will become much more expensive than ever before while not providing any more money for the mortgage market.

For example, earlier this year a family that borrowed \$25,000 to purchase a home was generally charged 7½%. On a 30-year term that meant his monthly payments of principal and interest were \$170.00. With the increase in savings rates that same family would now be charged 8½% and their monthly payments increased to \$192.00 (a \$22.00 monthly increase).

We respectfully suggest that the interest rates permitted banks and savings and loans to pay depositors should be adjusted downward as quickly as possible in order to permit us to reduce our mortgage rates.

Sincerely,

HERBERT J. YOUNG.

FIRST FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN OF
MACON COUNTY,

Decatur, Ill., July 10, 1973.

Re Regulation "Q," Interest rates controls on bank deposits.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: It was with shock, utter disbelief, and disgust, that I received the news that the Federal Reserve Board and Federal Home Loan Bank Board were allowing banks, savings and loan associations, and mutual savings banks to increase deposit interest rates. These increases range from one-fourth of one per-cent on passbook accounts up to no limit on \$1000, four year certificates of deposit.

Through communications with the United States Savings and Loan League, I am led to believe that Mr. Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and his associates were determined to raise rates before they ever met with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. From my conclusions, if correct; Mr. Bomar, Chairman of the FHLBB and his associates were told by the FRB that they were raising rates. The FHLBB had to go along or experience a "run-off" of funds from S & L's to banks. The S & L's in the U.S. finance one-half of the homes in the country. The industry could not afford to lose mortgage funds to the commercial banks, thus S & L's were forced to increase rates.

It appears to me that the FRB and FHLBB action, no matter how it came about, was extremely unfortunate, ill-advised, and displayed total disregard for:

1. The fight against inflation.
2. The low-middle to middle-income home-buying family. (Exhibit #1)
3. The fact that only investors will profit from this action.

4. The same set of circumstances which arose in 1966 and 1968. These were similar times, with similar happenings. Apparently the FRB learned little or nothing from these lessons.

5. The welfare of the S & L's, by reducing their earning capacities and reserve ratios.

Of all the foregoing I am most disturbed about how this action penalizes our home-buying middle-income families. This is a class alone that is hit the hardest by these events. Banks and S & L's will survive the raise by simply increasing their borrowing rates. Outlandishly high mortgage rates will go even much higher and the new home buyer will have to pay them in order to own a home.

Regulation "Q" comes up for consideration before August 1, 1973. Because I feel the FRB has little regard for anyone except the commercial banks, in administering Regulation "Q"; have been incompetent in setting deposit rates; and undermine a large section of our populace; I urge three things.

First, that Congress roll-back interest rates to the June 24, 1973 levels.

Second, that Congress control rates or mediate the setting of same.

Third, that Congress investigate the ma-

nipulating of our monetary system and take appropriate actions.

I am sorry to bother you with such a lengthy letter, but I feel this is a most urgent and important matter.

Respectfully yours,
QUENTIN L. STROPE,
Executive Vice President.

EXHIBIT 1

THE RISING COST OF BUYING A HOME

If you bought in.....	1963	1967	1972	After July 1, 1973
The same home would cost.....	\$17,040	\$20,000	\$29,000	\$30,600
If you had an 80 percent to value conventional mortgage, you borrowed.....	\$13,632	\$16,000	\$23,200	\$24,480
You probably had this rate of interest on your loan.....	5.5	6.5	7.6	8.5
If you had a 20-year term your monthly payment would be approximately ¹	\$93.56	\$119.30	\$188.30	\$212.60
In 20 years you will pay back.....	\$22,454	\$28,632	\$45,192	\$51,024
In 20 years you will pay back interest of ²	\$8,822	\$12,632	\$21,992	\$26,544
If you bought in 1963, you could have saved up to.....	0	\$6,770	\$25,130	\$31,282

¹ Principal and interest only.

² In the event of a 25- or 30-year term these figures are all the more dramatic.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED TO H.R. 9130

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House is scheduled to act on H.R. 9130, the so-called trans-Alaska pipeline bill. As part of proceedings under the 5-minute rule, Mr. OWENS of Utah and I will join, as we did in the Interior Committee, in offering the following amendments:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLENBACK AND MR. OWENS TO H.R. 9130

Strike paragraph (d) of Sec. 202, (page 13, lines 5-9) and substitute the following: "Proceedings in any United States federal court with respect to any action taken by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and relating to a permit to construct the proposed Trans-Alaskan pipeline shall be given precedence over all other cases pending therein, and assigned for hearing and determination at the earliest practicable date and all courts involved shall cause the case to be in every way expedited."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLENBACK AND MR. OWENS TO H.R. 9130

Sec. 203(a), (page 13, lines 14-18) strike the following: "and without further action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and notwithstanding the provisions of any law other than said section 28 and this Title II,"

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLENBACK AND MR. OWENS TO H.R. 9130

Strike subsection (d) of Section 203, (page 15, lines 13-22)

Earlier today a letter setting forth a brief summary of our reasons for supporting these amendments and for urg-

ing our colleagues to join in such support was sent to each Member of the House. The text of that letter, and the names of those who joined in sending same, follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, D.C., July 31, 1973.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We urge you to support an amendment which will be offered on the Floor when H.R. 9130, the trans-Alaska pipeline bill, is up for consideration. This amendment, which was offered in Interior Committee by Mr. Dellenback and Mr. Owens, would strike the provisions in the bill relating to overriding the National Environmental Policy Act, and ensure that any litigation filed under NEPA shall be given precedence over all other cases and shall be in every way expedited.

On Wednesday, July 25, the Interior Committee reported out H.R. 9130, a bill to widen rights-of-way which can be authorized under the Mineral Leasing Law of 1920. In addition the bill authorizes construction of the trans-Alaskan pipeline. Subject to the granting of a rule, the bill will probably be before us for action this Thursday, August 2nd.

The bill as reported contains provisions in one area which we feel must be changed. These are the provisions which would allow construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline without further compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. We feel such action would be an extremely serious mistake.

The 90th Congress enacted the NEPA to provide safeguards for our environment by requiring a study of the environmental impact of projects and programs on the surrounding environment. Currently the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement filed for the trans-Alaska pipeline is being challenged in court by three citizen groups. H.R. 9130 seeks to block any further court test of the adequacy of this Impact Statement.

We see three serious problems in the bill's provisions on this point:

(1) In accordance with NEPA, safeguards have been proposed to protect the environment if the oil from the North Slope is brought out through an Alaskan pipeline. It has not been determined, however, whether these measures are adequate. H.R. 9130, as reported by Committee, would attempt to block the courts making that final determination.

(2) To brush aside the proper functioning of NEPA as proposed by H.R. 9130 sets a dangerous precedent for undermining this critically important Act. Once justified in this instance, it would become easier to justify suspension of NEPA in future actions.

(3) Although the bill seeks to block any further litigation in connection with the proposed trans-Alaska route, actually it cannot and does not do so. On the contrary, in our opinion, it raises a series of new potential grounds for litigation. These new grounds are apt to take longer to work their way through the courts than would be the case if the present court test of the adequacy of the NEPA Impact Statement were permitted to be concluded.

Again, we urge you to join us in supporting this very important amendment. If you have any questions about this amendment or about the issue, please call Dana on 56416 or Jim on 53011.

Sincerely yours,
 John Dellenback, Wayne Owens, Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Bill Frenzel, Ralph Regula, Howard W. Robison, John P. Saylor, John D. Dingell, Bob Kastenmeier, John Heinz, Patsy T. Mink, John B. Anderson, Phillip Burton.

Ken Hechler, Charles Vanik, Frank Thompson, Jr., Dave Obey, Les Aspin,

John M. Zwach, T. J. Dulski, Martha W. Griffiths, Charles A. Mosher, Hamilton Fish, Jr., James G. O'Hara, Joseph Karth, Bob Eckhardt, Henry S. Reuss, Don Rlegle, John E. Moss, John F. Seiberling, Leonor K. Sullivan, Gerry Studds, Pete McCloskey, W. M. Malliard, Phil Ruppe, Manuel Lujan, Jr., Guy Vander Jagt.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, at the opening meeting of the National Urban League's 63d annual conference, the league's executive director, Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., gave the keynote address. Mr. Jordan's statement at this major gathering has extraordinary significance for all Americans both black and white, at a time of national distrust, misunderstanding, and turmoil.

In his statement, Mr. Jordan declared:

I believe that the single central task for this nation in the 1970's is to assure every citizen capable of work a decent job at a decent salary. The nation can escape the stain of Watergate and the shame of poverty by instituting a national Full Employment Policy of guaranteed jobs and minimum training and salary standards that will open careers and meaningful work for all of its people.

I fully support this statement by Mr. Jordan. When Congress reconvenes, I will introduce a full employment bill that would guarantee every citizen's right to a meaningful job at a decent wage.

The keynote address follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY VERNON E. JORDAN, JR.

A decade has passed since a quarter of a million Americans—blacks and whites together—came to this city in the historic March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom. It has been a long, friction-filled decade in which black people made the great leap forward to at least the beginnings of a more equal participation in our society. Each and every victory of that crucial decade was stained with the blood of martyrs and with the sweat and tears of millions of black people.

There are those who would belittle the achievements of the past ten years. They have forgotten all too soon what it meant to be segregated and Jim Crowed; to be cast out of the political life of the country; to be denied the vote; to be victimized by private and public institutions, and to be brutalized through the violation of constitutional and human rights.

Still others, complacent in the minimal gains that have been torn from a reluctant nation, mistakenly believe that the hopes and dreams of the marching masses of 1963 have been fulfilled. They think that the rights won, the laws passed, and the observable progress made are sufficient, and that black people no longer need trouble this society with the remnants of our unfinished agenda. Time is a great healer, they say, and time will cover the scars of the past and bring full equality in the very near future.

Both of these widespread views are mistaken. The gains of the past decade, the glowing achievements of this Second Reconstruction, were sweeping and historic. But they stopped far short of what was necessary. Too many of the rights conferred

gather the dust of indifference; too many of the programs begun have lingered underfunded and unwanted, while others have been ended. The gap between whites and blacks has grown, the bright promises and dreams of a decade ago have been betrayed; and the pain that seared the lives of millions still hurts.

The Second Reconstruction is unfinished, and is now threatened by a counter-revolution that appears to be trying to turn the clock back and to arrest the progress that has been made. Every swing forward of the pendulum of social change creates its counter-movement backward, and it is that dangerous, regressive phase in which we find ourselves today.

The seeds of this counter-revolution were planted some years back—with the coining of code words like law and order; in the politicizing of phony issues like busing and quotas, and in the desertion of some former supporters from the civil rights movement. In the past year the new American counter-revolution has swung into high gear with the refusal to reform the welfare system, with publication of a budget that neglects human resources and human needs, and with the proposals for a revenue sharing scheme that would effectively divert the nation from the establishment of national goals and national priorities.

Watergate, in this context, is no passing scandal. It is a reflection of the moral bankruptcy of the architects of the end of the Second Reconstruction. It is a Pandora's Box of illegality, suspicion and fear. The contempt it shows for the democratic political processes goes hand-in-hand with the contempt its makers show for the constitutional rights and social and economic equality of minorities.

Black people, like all Americans, watch the sordid spectacle unfold on their television screens. But many bring to it a perspective perhaps not shared by others. For as we watch one after another of major figures in the government confess their misdeeds and portray an atmosphere of paranoia and deceit, we are painfully aware that these men also found time to launch the attack on the achievements of the Second Reconstruction.

We learn of the former Attorney General's part in the cover-up, and recall his attempts to weaken the Voting Rights Act and to pack the Supreme Court with judges indifferent to our constitutional rights. We see the former White House Counsel confess to his part in the cover-up, when his proper role was to resist the illegal impoundment of funds for social programs and the illegal dismemberment of anti-poverty programs. We see people on the White House payroll confess to bugging, burglary and breaking and entering at a time when other federal officials were cutting programs, fighting court desegregation orders and sabotaging efforts to integrate some construction trades unions. And so when the pernicious "enemies list" was revealed, black people were not surprised, for many had already come to the conclusion that black Americans and our aspirations were the targets of federal disfavor.

Watergate has created a terrible vacuum at the heart of our system. The executive branch is all but paralyzed by the widespread personnel changes, by the cynicism and suspicion of the people and by the ever-present threat that the scandal will result in further proceedings of the most far-reaching nature. Just as the press, the courts and the Congress have filled the moral vacuum left by Watergate, so too, must they fill the policy vacuum it has created.

The role these free institutions have played in exposing and correcting the Watergate scandal has vindicated the democratic system. In this time of uncertainty they have a responsibility to turn their attention to the unfinished business of the Second Reconstruction—the press, by publicizing the

need for continued social change; the courts, by defending the constitutional rights of minorities, and above all, the Congress, by reversing the new counter-revolution that seeks to undo the accomplishments of the past and by reviving and extending the economic and social goals of the March on Washington.

Congress especially must fulfill its responsibilities to take the initiative in domestic affairs. It must act because Watergate has left the country adrift in indecision and inaction. The First Reconstruction was launched by the Congress over the objections of the executive, and Congress, by advancing its own program of reform, can now reverse the trends that threaten the Second Reconstruction. It must act too, in order to preserve its rightful place as a co-equal branch of government, a constitutional role that has been undermined by the unilateral dismantling of Congressionally approved programs, by impoundments of monies it has appropriated, and by the institution of sweeping changes in federal-state relations to which it has not consented.

There are three broad areas that call for immediate Congressional action.

The first and most urgent of these is for Congress to restore the budget cuts made in health, housing, education, manpower and other human services. These programs have been cruelly slashed, imposing crushing burdens on poor people, both white and black. The main beneficiaries of such federal programs have overwhelmingly been white citizens, and their impact on black people has been considerable, because we are disproportionately poor. If a sharp knife has to be wielded on federal spending, there are far riper targets in a budget of over \$268 billion than those that train young people for jobs, provide health care for infants and put unemployed people to work again.

A second Congressional priority should be the overhaul of a welfare system that corrodes human dignity. The principle of an income floor beneath which no family should fall was embodied in the Administration's Family Assistance Plan. It is a good principle, but the political dictates of the time resulted in the principle being strangled by punitive and vicious amendments. The failure to pass a humane welfare reform bill is a key indicator of the strength of the counter-revolution. In the wake of the moral disaster of Watergate, the Congress should now understand that it treated the poor as enemies, just as the conspirators treated political opponents as enemies. Now Congress can make amends. It should now resurrect the principle of a federally-administered income floor that preserves the dignity and the rights of those among us who are victims of the failures of the economy.

Thirdly, the Congress must address itself to the crucial problem of revenue sharing, and it should reassert the primacy of national priorities to be met by national programs paid for and supervised by the federal government.

The effect of revenue sharing on white people is likely to be harmful; for black people, it promises to be devastating. The federal government has historically been the protector of minority citizens. While it has often been the frailest of reeds, historically it has been more responsive than state or local governments.

The March on Washington was a March demanding federal action on civil and economic rights; it was a March seeking federal protection from the abuses of state and local governments. It was a March supporting federal solutions to problems of national importance. We looked to Washington then and we look to Washington now, just as white people looked to Washington for federal programs that helped them to survive the Depression, to move to suburbia, and to prosper economically. Now, just as it has come to be

black people's time to benefit from federal action, it is proposed that the rules of the game be changed and that we rely on some magical mixture of local goodwill along with a heavy dose of individual initiative. And why, black people rightly ask, must we give up this game that worked so well for white Americans just as we get to the batter's box?

Under the slogan, "returning power to the people," revenue sharing would strip away from local community groups the funds and programs under their control and force them to compete with more politically powerful local interests for funds and programs. It would take present federal programs out of the purview of competent and relatively sympathetic federal agencies and turn their funds over to state and local governments for uses that may not be as relevant to the needs of the minority community.

This fracturing process makes difficult, if not impossible, the establishment of national domestic policy goals and their implementation. It also imposes great burdens on national organizations in the private sector. Further, I have little faith in the competence and record of 50 state governments and thousands of local governments to make humane judgments and institute responsible programs. And I fear that many agencies, most of them small community groups, will be left and minority communities will suffer tragically.

This is not intended to be a blanket indictment of all local governments. They are also caught in a bind by revenue sharing, which shares problems but not resources. The money being made available to state and local governments for social service programs is less than the money that would come into cities through the present system of categorical grants. Mayors and governors are thus placed in the cruel dilemma of limited resources and heightened public expectations encouraged by Administration rhetoric about local control and decentralization.

In countless cities all over the country local officials are tooling up to make the best possible use of the monies they will get from revenue sharing. A considerable number of Urban League affiliates report that mayors in their cities plan to commit these funds to solid programs in the social services, and that the black community will participate as administrators and as beneficiaries of local programs. But it is safe to say that these cities will be the exceptions and not the rule. A prime task for black people and for the Urban League will be to carefully monitor the use of the revenue sharing funds and to insure that minority citizens are not unduly penalized by the federal abandonment.

This is doubly important in view of the unwise use of much of the general revenue sharing funds already committed. A report issued last month by the Federal Revenue Sharing Office itself, demonstrates the unwillingness of the state and local governments to use federal grants for human services. Some five billion dollars have already been sent to local governments and have been used primarily for capital expenses and for reduction of property taxes. Others used it to build golf courses and tennis courts. Social services for the poor and for the aged ranked last among their priorities, and only eight percent mentioned it as a top priority.

It seems clear from all this that revenue sharing is anything but "returning power to the people." Still less is it the cornerstone of the "new American revolution." Rather, it is old wine turned sour in its brightly labelled new bottle. It is a return to the past; part and parcel of the counter-revolution that is clearly designed, in a word spawned by Watergate, to render the Second Reconstruction "inoperative."

The situation facing those of us in the human rights movement is difficult. The Second Reconstruction is in grave trouble, and the goals of the March on Washington

for Jobs and Freedom remain, after a decade, as haunting reminders of ideals not yet fulfilled. The road ahead is uncharted and unmarked.

The freedoms envisioned by the March have largely been won. But freedom without economic power is freedom without substance. Remember, the March was for Jobs AND Freedom; Jobs came first. It is time now to get those jobs.

We must get those jobs because economic security is a fundamental freedom from which other freedoms flow. As Justice Douglas has written: "Man has indeed as much right to work as he has live, to be free, to own property." And we must get those jobs because the black community is suffering an economic depression the depths of which have been unknown to white Americans since the Great Depression.

The job question is the cornerstone of a rational approach to solving the many problems facing black people. With jobs, dollars and economic security, we will be equipped to deal fully with the dismal realities of poor health care, inadequate housing, and unequal educational opportunities. Our battle for equality must be fought on many fronts, but it is the economic front that is most crucial for our survival.

The tragic plight of black Americans has been masked by the blind acceptance of economic benign neglect—the false comfort derived from statistics that show progress made by some sectors of the black community. Skilled young people who have made it into the labor market are entering jobs and making salaries that represent a clear improvement over previous years. Recent black college graduates are approaching parity with their white classmates.

But beyond these favored few, there are millions upon millions of black Americans who are being crushed between the rock and the hard place. There are millions upon millions of black people for whom a morsel of meat is a luxury, a decent home a dream, and a job a hopeless fantasy.

Last year, while over one million white citizens moved out of poverty, more than 300,000 black people entered the growing army of the poor. In the past four years, over 600,000 black people became poor. By the government's own admission, and using its own grossly inadequate standards of what constitutes poverty, there are nearly eight million black Americans who are poor. Nearly half of all black children are in poor families. Black income is declining in relation to white income, and in the decade since we marched for jobs and freedom, the median income gap between whites and blacks has grown from \$3,000 in 1963 to \$4,700. Black earnings are not only falling behind white earnings, they are falling far behind the most elementary decent living standards. The typical black family earns about \$700 less than the government's own minimum acceptable living standard. So for the majority of black Americans, boasts of this nation's high living standards are a grotesque and bitter joke.

What I have just described is a situation of desperation. Hidden by the cold impartiality of numbers and statistics are broken lives, wasted efforts, and hopeless frustrations. Behind these numbers and the malignant neglect that hides them from the country, is mounting anger and explosive despair. The economic deprivation inflicted on black Americans is an obscene horror, a mark of shame upon the nation that dwarfs the Watergate scandal and calls for swift, massive action.

I believe that the single, central task for this nation in the 1970s is to assure every citizen capable of work a decent job at a decent salary. I believe that the central goal of the human rights movement in this perilous time must be the achievement of guaranteed jobs for each and every American—

white and black. I believe that the unfulfilled half of the aims of the March on Washington—Jobs—must be our basic goal. This nation can escape the stain of Watergate and the shame of poverty by instituting a national Full Employment Policy of guaranteed jobs and minimum training and salary standards that will open careers and meaningful work for all of its people.

Few people—white or black—are fully aware of the extent of unemployment in this so-called "booming" economy. Officially, almost five percent of the labor force is unemployed, a notch above the four percent generally accepted as "full employment." The five percent of the labor force means that almost four-and-a-half million people are jobless.

The facts are that there are millions of people who are not officially counted as being unemployed because they have given up looking for jobs, or because they are working part-time. Adding these discouraged job-seekers and underemployed workers to the official unemployment figures, we find that there are about ten million unemployed Americans, over two million of them, black. The real unemployment rates in this country then, are about ten percent for the total labor force, and twenty percent for black workers.

I refuse to believe that this supposedly booming economy has no place for ten million people who want to work. I refuse to believe that the only jobs it can offer another ten million people are jobs whose wages for a year of full-time work amount to less than \$5,000.

We are talking here of more than a crisis of political morality; more than the isolated misery of individual people without work, more than the betrayal of the dreams of the 1963 marchers: we are talking about the collapse of our economic system and of its apparent inability to provide work for a significant part of its people.

The failures of this economy are not temporary lapses due to passing changes in the economic climate; they are structural weaknesses that threaten the foundations of this system. The labor force has become split-level, with an upper tier who have good jobs, union membership, decent salaries, and fringe benefits, and a lower tier that has none of these. This bottom layer of economically desperate people is made up of disproportionate numbers of Vietnam veterans, of black people and other minorities and of young people.

A million white teenagers and a quarter of a million black teenagers are in the labor force but are jobless. One out of every three black youngsters officially listed as looking for full-time work can't get a job. This country is fostering a significant portion of a generation of workers who are unskilled, inadequately educated, and unemployed. The future for these young people is bleak and the prospects for their country are dim, unless the vast human resources they represent can be put to meaningful labor.

Some people have suggested that teenage unemployment can be partially solved by a wage differential that allows employers to pay less than the minimum wage for young people. Others say that will result in firing the father to hire the son. My own feeling is that this nation has already done too much to foster sub-standard wages and working conditions, and the teenage salary differential could be the opening wedge of a general attack on wage levels. Such a wage differential would be a step that subverts the already inadequate wage structure and punches holes in the already leaky net that fails to protect other categories of workers. If high teenage unemployment is supposedly solved by lower pay rates then logic would demand that other groups whose unemployment rates are high such as women or black people, should also be paid sub-standard wages. We cannot accept this.

The structural dislocations of an economy that has no place for disproportionate numbers of teenage workers, of veterans, of women, and of minorities, can be solved by massive national job-creation. If this country can subsidize Russians who want to buy our wheat, it can subsidize its own citizens who want work.

The time for training people for non-existent jobs and for forcing them into inactivity or into substandard menial jobs that don't pay the rent is over. The time for a rational national policy of developing precious human resources and putting people to work doing the things this nation needs done is at hand.

I believe that this nation should embark on a Full Employment Policy that includes realistic job-training, institution of performance-oriented job standards that do away with present unrealistic tests and credentials, a national economic development program that helps create jobs in the private sector, and a massive job-creation program for public services.

A Presidential Commission has estimated that federal, state and local governments could put five million people to work in public service jobs in schools, in hospitals, in parks and in other areas of our community life. Instead, the measly 100,000 jobs provided by the emergency public employment program are slated to be dropped by the federal budget.

We marched for jobs ten years ago and didn't get them. We call for jobs today, and we must build the power and the alliances to succeed this time. A massive human rights movement for jobs for all holds the promise of depolarizing our divided society, for this is a goal that transcends the artificial boundaries of race or of ideology.

All people—white or black—can understand the value of work and the need for jobs. There are 16 million white people who are poor and over seven million who are jobless. White people too, can see this as their cause. And black people, be they nationalists, separatists or integrationists know that what the black community desperately needs above all are jobs and paychecks. A massive drive for jobs for all can dynamite the stereotypes and myths about the economic boom, about welfare, and about people not wanting to work. If this Administration really believes in what it preaches about the work ethic, about the superiority of our economic system, and about the virtues of labor, then let it begin now with Phase One of a Full Employment Policy that assures every citizen a decent job at a decent salary.

By putting America to work we can transcend the bitterness and divisions that threaten to tear her apart. By backing a program of jobs for all we can help unite a human rights movement that has lost a central focus and was diverted by ideological abstractions. By mounting a drive for a Full Employment Policy we can fulfill the faith placed in us by those of our brothers and sisters who are poor and who are jobless.

By instituting a Full Employment Policy America can finally redeem its promise of justice and equality. "We have come to the capital to cash a check," Martin Luther King told the March on Washington. "Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check," he said. "A check that has come back marked insufficient funds. But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity in this nation. So we have come to cash this check. A check that will give us the riches of freedom and the security of justice."

And I say that America is still in default on its promissory note of jobs and freedom and the interest compounds daily. It's time now for a collections suit that says to America pay off or get out of the business of democracy. And pay off not in pennies and

nickels, but in dollars and gold—our equal share in the prosperity of this nation.

The belief we brought here a decade ago has become tarnished with countless defaults, betrayals and injustices. The strains of "We Shall Overcome" have been muted by the silent suffering that stalks the ghetto streets. The faith that sustained us through the dungeons of slavery, through the dismal days of segregation and separation, through the trials and tribulations of the 1960s ebbs slowly as we see the promises of the Second Reconstruction giving way to isolation, apathy and hostility.

Black Americans want to keep that faith. We want to continue to believe in America. We want to believe that we shall overcome the brutalities of indifference, neglect and poverty. We want to believe that we shall overcome the mean attempts to end the Second Reconstruction and to institutionalize poverty and joblessness. We want to believe that we shall overcome the moral bankruptcy that gives us Watergate instead of bread, and scandals instead of jobs. We want to believe that we shall overcome; that right will triumph over hollow might. We want to believe because our cause is anchored in justice and our hearts and minds unburdened by doubts of the righteousness of our mission.

In the midst of our doubt, let us renew our faith, let us believe again. For as Whitney Young told the March on Washington, "Our March is a march for America. It is a march just begun." We are the heirs of that inspiring historic moment. It is our task to redeem the promises made and the pledges broken. It is our duty to move on from that great gathering of hope to make its dreams and its goals come true. It is our mission to recapture the moral fervor and to bring to reality the aims of those who marched here as a declaration of faith and witnessing.

Many of those who were here ten years ago are no longer with us. John F. Kennedy is gone. Malcolm X is gone. Martin Luther King, Bobby Kennedy, Adam Powell, Walter Reuther and our own Whitney Young are dead. Ralph Bunche, Jackie Robinson and Lyndon Johnson are gone. Others too, who fought for us and died for us, are no longer here in body, but their spirits infuse our will and inform our purpose.

Like the March itself, they have transcended their brief moment in time and live on in our hearts and minds. They live on in the inspiration and determination they kindled in us. They live on in the movement that battles today in adversity as it did in their time. From the pantheon of the fallen great, they look down upon us and upon our efforts, and they are telling us to keep on, to keep the faith, to continue what they began, to push forward in the face of hypocrisy and callousness; to fight on and march forward until their dream is reality.

Others too, are looking at this Urban League Conference with the mixed emotions of doubt and despair, of hope and confidence. Millions of black people and other minorities who don't have bus fare, let alone plane fare, to the nation's capital, people who have neither the credit or the cash for a room at the Hilton; people for whom a party gown or a banquet seat is an elusive dream; people who cry out tonight from the crevices of this nation for a decent job at a decent wage, for food for their children, warm clothes on their backs, and a non-leaky roof over their heads.

They are looking to the Urban League for help. It is on their behalf that we exist. It is for them that we meet here this week. They are what this Conference is all about. This Conference is no Boujje Ball. For we are here this week to work and to work hard for the constituency we serve. We are here to analyze, synthesize, strategize; to come up with concrete programs and goals that will make life better for all Americans.

This is the most important week of the year for the Urban League movement; it is the week in which we pull together the single strands of our labors and come together as a movement with one voice, loud and clear; a voice that responds to the cries within the ghetto's walls, a voice of soul and concern, a voice of hope and dignity, above all, a voice of and for our people.

And the eye hath not seen nor the ear heard that which we can do to gather united, determined and unafraid.

BARTRAM NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to authorize the Department of the Interior to conduct a study of the feasibility of establishing the Bartram Trail as a national scenic trail. This trail is named for John and William Bartram, a father and son who played an important role in American history in the study of ecology, botany, and wildlife conservation. In 1765-66 these two tough, studious Quakers from Philadelphia explored the South, starting in Mobile, Ala., heading through the Montgomery area and proceeding due east to the Georgia border and through to the Savannah, Ga. area, then south to Florida with the journey terminating in the area of Manatee Springs, Fla., after passing through the area of Jacksonville, south along the Saint Johns River to Lake George and through the Alachua Savannah to the Suwannee River. Throughout their long and arduous journey the Bartrams kept exciting journals and made detailed drawings describing the land, plants, and animals of the southeastern coastal region, as well as the Indians native to the area whom they treated with respect.

From the Bartrams and their followers has sprung the American conservation tradition which espouses the nobility and morality of primitive, unspoiled nature. The Bartrams inspired such men as George Catlin, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry Thoreau, and Theodore Roosevelt in their leadership of the movement to defend the natural environment, a movement which now thrives particularly in my beautiful home State of Florida.

As a tribute to the valuable contribution made by John and William Bartram to the advancement of the natural sciences in our country, it is fitting that they be memorialized in a national scenic trail. As envisioned in the bill, it would be similar to the Appalachian Trail stretching from Georgia to New England which thousands of hikers enjoy each year.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce that this bill has the cosponsorship of the entire Florida congressional delegation as well as Mr. DICKINSON of Alabama, Mr. BLACKBURN of Georgia, Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia, Mr. MIZELL of North Carolina, and Mr. MANN of South Carolina. It is identical to S. 1157 which was introduced by all of the Senators

from Florida, Georgia, and Alabama. Among the organizations that have endorsed this legislation are the Florida Audubon Society, Environmental Council of Highlands County, Historic Gainesville, Inc., North American Trail Complex, Florida Federation of Garden Clubs, Inc., Florida Chapter of the Sierra Club, the Alabama Conservancy, and Friends of the Bartram Memorial Trail. With prompt action, the trail could come to fruition in time to make a handsome gift to ourselves on the occasion of the bicentennial celebration of the founding of our Nation.

AGAINST PAY INCREASE

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain why I voted yesterday against the rule permitting debate of S. 1989, a bill that, in effect, would have permitted pay increases in the near future for Members of Congress, Federal judges, and approximately 5,000 top-level Federal employees.

At present, a Presidentially appointed citizens commission is scheduled to meet every 4 years to consider pay adjustments for Congress, Federal judges, and top executive officials. The President may change the recommendations before sending them to Congress. The proposals take effect unless vetoed by either House of Congress within 30 days. S. 1989 would have required the President to submit the recommendations of the Federal Salary Commission by August 31 of each odd year.

It is especially appropriate that the vote on S. 1989 came at the very time that the U.S. Government was initiating its phase IV plan to halt the inflationary spiral. A key element in the phase IV plan is an attempt to terminate deficit spending by decreasing Federal expenditures. It is a call to Congress to exercise fiscal responsibility, to put the interests of Americans as a whole above the interests of any special group which would attempt to pressure Congress into appropriating money which will benefit only a few.

S. 1989, however, represents the antithesis of the spirit of patriotism and fiscal responsibility which this country badly needs. It comes, significantly, in a nonelection year. By the fall of 1974, this increase would have been forgotten. In this way, Congress could have avoided taking a pay increase during a politically sensitive election year. But this would break the implicit contract which each Congressman signed last fall by agreeing to serve for \$42,500 a year. It would probably, in fact, set a precedent for biennial salary increases in odd years.

The measure, furthermore, represents another Government outlay, one which other groups around the country could cite as a precedent for increasing their own salaries or wages. If Congressmen cannot exercise fiscal restraint in their

own affairs, they cannot honestly expect others to do so.

Congress rejection of S. 1989 is a first step in the direction of fiscal responsibility, but it should not be the last. Congress could terminate the present procedure for pay increases, which was instituted in 1969. Pay increases should require a congressional vote, rather than mere tacit approval. Members of Congress should be required to vote on salary adjustments affecting themselves, just as they did before 1969.

BEN GRAUER MOVES ON

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Ben Grauer's long career in broadcasting for NBC has drawn to a close. His outstanding contributions to radio and television will long be recalled as shining moments in the development of American reporting in the electronic media.

As we move toward the final quarter of this century, we begin to realize how greatly changed this Nation has become because of our shifting emphasis from the written to the spoken word. Ben Grauer has enriched the fabric of this Nation's history with his wit and wisdom as he chronicled the American experience over the last 43 years.

We are fortunate, for although Ben leaves NBC and regular reportage, he joins the Voice of America and will continue to comment on the life and future of this Nation. I look forward to his continuing illumination of the men and events which shape our destiny.

I am including an article from the New York Times which relates Ben's thoughts as he leaves NBC. We welcome his continuing involvement in this Nation's news and I wish him well in his newest role.

The article follows:

BEN GRAUER REFLECTS ON SIGNING OFF

(By Richard F. Shepard)

Ben Grauer began announcing for the National Broadcasting Company in 1930, when radio staffers wore tuxedos for evening shows because they were going into the American home, unseen but heard.

Mr. Grauer, having reached the age of 65, at which point personnel policies insist that enough is enough, is leaving the network during a period when television newsmen, visible as well as audible, come into the home in shirtsleeves and crackerbarrel informality.

"I go back to the day when there was a sense of dignity of entering the American home," said Mr. Grauer the other day, as he was cleaning out the desk that he formally left at the beginning of the month. "Then, the American Academy of Dramatic Arts gave me dictation medals, and the good announcer had a sanitized, elegant delivery. Then gradually this broke down with a new emphasis on appearing as human beings."

WITHOUT REGRET

This contrast was noted in no particular terms of distress. Having grown up in change, Mr. Grauer does not lament the things that were or might have been.

During his 43 years on the air, with some

time off for sleeping and seeing his family and pursuing a bibliophile passion, Mr. Grauer covered most of the political conventions, the burning of the cruise ship Morro Castle in 1934 (he scored a beat when he grabbed a survivor just washed ashore and interviewed him as both were jammed into a telephone booth), all sorts of disasters and triumphs and, as announcer, such nineteenth-thirties and forties favorites as the Arturo Toscanini radio concerts and Kay Kaiser's "College of Musical Knowledge."

He developed with broadcasting, and small wonder that so many things he did were as much "firsts" for broadcasting as for himself.

"I've had more than 40 years in which America grew up," he said. "I sensed the innocence that was in the land, even during the Depression and World War II. World events made us aware, and they have been driven home by TV. This is totally different kind of world."

Having placed his career in historical perspective, Mr. Grauer, who scarcely looks like a man about to turn in his washroom key, got down to the nuts and bolts of now and then. After all, he was not only a standard radio fixture but also an advance man of sorts for TV, for which he and John Cameron Swayze did the first convention coverage in 1948.

"We were a novelty there," he recalled. "I noticed once that Thomas E. Dewey looked 'beardy' and I whipped out a stock of make-up and put it on him. One of his aides objected, saying that he'd look too feminine with make-up. Times have changed."

GREATER POWER

"TV has enormously increased the impact of the electronic journalists," he continued, "His power is far greater than what the broadcast journalist had 40 years ago."

"In the nineteen-thirties, forties, even the fifties, you had nightly commentators with 15-minute newscasts giving their editorial views, such as H. V. Kaltenborn, Raymond Gram Swing, Quincy Howe, Boake Carter."

Although he allows that expressing a preference for radio or TV is not unlike saying one would rather drink red wine than white wine, his affection for radio is undisguised.

"In radio, particularly on a breaking story, it's all in a reporter's hands," he said. "You decided the mental picture the audience was going to get, and you could give your own emphases and playdowns. I worked with just a legman and an engineer."

"Today, a film crew or live production unit has 30, 40 or 50 men, and the picture leads you. If the director punches up picture A, you have to speak of picture A. More like writing outlines for a picture in the newspaper."

Mr. Grauer took a well-modulated breath and forged on: "In radio, the reporter had to keep a constant barrage of words going, partly from the excitement of the thing, partly from the need to fill. That's what they used to call 'the magic of radio.' The voices were rotund and stentorian. The keynote now is to be a regular guy."

Only last year, Mr. Grauer and John Daly shared a Peabody award for broadcasting virtuosity for the job they did in covering the conventions and election for the Voice of America. It was a bit different from the sort of coverage Mr. Grauer had been accustomed to giving directly from source material.

"We sat in a room and, courtesy of the three networks, took their feeds," he said. "There were three tubes burning in front of us. John would be looking at one thing, I at another, and we'd decide whose was of more urgency and go on the air with it. It had all the flexibility of radio reporting."

TV SERIES CONTINUES

Although Mr. Grauer has vacated N.B.C., he is by no means about to remove his voice from the public. He has been doing and plans now to intensify a TV series for the

Voice of America. It's called "New York, New York with Ben Grauer."

As an experienced interviewer, he knows that he should project America abroad through his guests, whose names run the breadth of the nation from Harold Prince and Michael Burke to Russell Lynes and Truman Capote.

"It's beamed all over the world," Mr. Grauer said, disclosing that he is about to embark for Europe on vacation. "Just do not get the idea across that I am retiring."

LEE HAMILTON'S AUGUST 1, 1973, WASHINGTON REPORT, ENTITLED "THE FOOD SCARE"

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my August 1, 1973, Washington Report entitled, "The Food Scare":

THE FOOD SCARE

A dramatic change in our attitudes toward food has occurred recently. For most Americans food has always been plentiful, relatively inexpensive, and food shortages something that only happened in far-away places with strange-sounding names.

Suddenly, or at least so it seems, food prices skyrocket (at an annual rate of 25 percent since January), prices for basic commodities (wheat, rice, feed grains) reach historic highs, housewives protest and boycott, food shortages and price controls appear, the Secretary of Agriculture reverses a decades-old government policy and calls for all-out production in 1974, and the President shuts off exports of soybeans causing severe repercussions abroad. Food and how it gets to our table has become a matter of consuming interest to all of us. No longer is the old joke very funny about the fellow who said we don't need farmers any more because there is plenty of food in the supermarket.

How did all of this happen to us so quickly? Basically there are two reasons: more people, and more people eating better food.

Across the world population expands at 2 percent a year and will double in little more than a generation. The world consumption of grains has gone up 60 percent in the last 20 years. During the period from 1940 to 1972, America's population grew 57 percent and the average American has increased his beef consumption from 55 pounds a year in 1940 to 117 pounds in 1972. Moreover, with rising affluence in many countries, as in Western Europe and Japan, their eating habits become much like ours. Protein is especially in demand, but expanding the sources of protein—beef, soybeans, fish—is proving difficult.

At the same time that demand for food was growing, limitations on increased production have appeared. Expanding arable land, the traditional way to expand production, is limited by competing uses for urban development and recreation and the lack of water. The costs of production increases have risen, and the energy shortage threatens to increase them even more. In the past many food surplus countries have had grain reserves and the U.S. has had plenty of idle cropland under its farm programs, but the grain reserves are now sharply down and the U.S., which has had roughly 50 million acres out of production in recent years, is bringing the idle land back into production. It has become apparent that the best hope for expanding

the world food supply rests with developing the agricultural potential of the poor nations of the world.

All of this adds up to a picture of scarce food and high food prices for some time to come. Even with the era of relatively cheap food, which Americans have enjoyed for many years, coming to an end, food remains the best bargain in the land. In 1971 the American consumer spent an average of 16.3 percent of his income on food—less than half of what he had to pay in 1929.

Across the world food supplies and prices will remain major public issues for decades to come, and food policy will be characterized by the shift from production restraints to accelerated expansion of production. The U.S. will be at the center of the debate because we are the world's leading agricultural producer. With only 6 percent of the world's people and 1 percent of the world's agricultural labor, the U.S. produces 15 percent of the total value of world food production, and is the leading exporter of agricultural products, with 16 percent of the value of world agricultural exports.

The new situation in food also means, I suspect, a new status for the American farmer. He has always been one of the most important people in the world, but we just haven't acknowledged it. In 1952 each farmer supplied 15 persons with food. Now he produces enough for 51 persons. Without him, we and a lot of other people don't eat. He has become the key man in our efforts to achieve a fair price for himself, an ample supply of food at reasonable cost for the consumer, and an orderly world economy.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE TO STRIKERS

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the following statement issued today by the Executive Counsel of the AFL-CIO to the attention of the House and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE TO STRIKERS

Anti-labor forces, led by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, are conducting a concerted campaign to penalize the children of strikers as a device to nullify the legal right of American workers to strike.

Their efforts have recently resulted in:

The vote in the House of Representatives to prevent the children of strikers from receiving food stamps without any determination whether the family needed such help.

The ruling by HEW Secretary Caspar Weinberger—despite contrary opinion from churches, governors, social welfare agencies and unions—that states may deny welfare benefits to the children of strikers no matter how compelling their need.

A just and humane society must reject both actions as gross violations of the simple and basic rule that need must be the sole criterion for public welfare.

Workers are taxpayers. Their taxes include the costs of welfare and food stamps. The right to strike is a legal right of Americans continually reaffirmed by the courts. The payment of taxes is the obligation of all Americans. Workers have the right to receive public assistance when their families are in need.

To deny a family in need the meager benefits of taxes paid while they were working—i.e. welfare and food stamps—because that person is exercising a legal right is patently vicious.

The only relevant question is need. It is not a question of who is wrong or who is right in a labor dispute. Surely the govern-

ment should not starve strikers into submission to whatever conditions an employer unilaterally offers. This would make a mockery of free collective bargaining and the legal right of workers to strike.

Society has an obligation to insure that the children of this country are not denied adequate food, decent housing and clothing. The government has no business forcing a worker to choose between his children and his legal rights; rather, the government should take care to preserve both the legal rights and physical health of its citizens.

These recent actions are the direct result of the high-pressure campaign by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to penalize workers for exercising their legal right to strike. It is not the result of abuses of welfare or food stamps by strikers.

Therefore, the AFL-CIO Executive Council directs:

1—The Legislative Department of the AFL-CIO to vigorously oppose any legislation, specifically including the Farm Bill, that includes a ban against food stamps being furnished families of strikers in need.

2—Officers of AFL-CIO State Central Bodies to fight any efforts within their state to implement the HEW regulation permitting states to deny welfare benefits to the children of strikers.

TV BLACKOUTS OF MAJOR SPORTING EVENTS

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the very unfair situation facing millions of sports fans across the country, especially football fans, now that the fall season is approaching. They are denied the right to see their home teams, because the National Football League blacks out television coverage of all home games.

The Congress enacted an antitrust exemption in 1961 for the National Football League with the express purpose of insuring its financial stability and to save the sport from fading from the American scene. Television blackouts were considered a necessary adjunct for the sport's protection. These blackouts, in my opinion, are no longer either necessary or desirable. In fact, the blackouts have led to an almost complete monopoly by season ticket holders over seats at regular season games.

The situation in New York points up the inequities engendered by TV blackouts. One of the byproducts of the antitrust exemption is that the New York Jets have been able to increase attendance at NFL regular season games an astounding 303.7 percent in just 10 years. The current ratio of season ticket sales to paid attendance is better than 94 percent for the Jets. Over 90 percent of fans present at New York Jets games are season ticket holders. There are Jets and Giants fans who have been on the waiting list for season tickets for years. Those fans who are lucky enough to find an individual game ticket to purchase must pay over \$7. The result is that most fans are regulated to reading the game scores in the next day's papers.

I am keenly aware of the frustration these fans feel, because of the stubborn and arrogant refusal of the NFL to lift their blackout policy.

Television has been a major factor in the rise in the popularity of football. Rather than hurt attendance at the stadium, TV has increased gate receipts by increasing the number of devoted fans who brave traffic and inclement weather to participate in that very special excitement generated by the large crowd. Claims by promoters that televising home games will hurt paid attendance are unproven, especially when the stadium has been sold out.

Today I introduced H.R. 9760, a bill to prohibit television stations from blacking out any exhibition of a professional sport when tickets have been sold out for at least 48 hours before the game. The bill covers football, basketball, and hockey and is limited to a 1-year trial period. This legislation is designed to provide for the viewing pleasure of the fans, while, at the same time, protecting the professional clubs. It should also go a long way in dealing with past abuses of the present system such as ticket scalping. I urge early consideration and passage of this bill in order to rectify this desperate situation. I insert the text of this bill into the RECORD at this point:

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 for one year with regard to the broadcasting of certain professional home games

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"BROADCAST OF SOLDOUT PROFESSIONAL HOME GAMES

"SEC. 31. (a) If (1) during the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this section, any professional football, basketball, or hockey game is broadcast under the authority of a league television contract, and (2) tickets of admission to such game are no longer available for purchase by the general public forty-eight hours or more before the scheduled beginning time of such game, then television broadcast rights shall be made available for television broadcasting of such game at the time at which and in the area in which such game is being played.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'league television contract' means any joint agreement by or among persons engaging in or conducting the organized professional team sports of football, baseball, basketball, or hockey, by which any league of clubs participating in professional football, baseball, basketball, or hockey contest sells or otherwise transfers all or any part of the rights of such league's member clubs in the sponsored telecasting of the games of football, baseball, basketball, or hockey, as the case may be, engaged in or conducted by such clubs."

NO SUBSIDY FOR READER'S DIGEST

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debate on proposed postal legisla-

tion a number of statements were made about the Reader's Digest Corp. Reader's Digest has written to me answering some of these statements. I would like to insert a copy of their letter in the RECORD for the benefit of the House:

READER'S DIGEST,

Pleasantville, N.Y., July 27, 1973.

HON. PETER A. PEYSER,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEYSER: Your friends and constituents at the Reader's Digest were shocked to read in the Congressional Record of July 23rd (pages 25477-25482) references to a so-called "subsidy" our magazine allegedly receives throughout the structure for second-class postage rates.

We believe that a fair-minded evaluation of the matter of the Digest's postal rate payments would not only fail to support allegations that the Reader's Digest receives a subsidy, but would indeed lead an impartial observer to conclude that we are paying much more than our fair share. Following are some of the reasons why we make that claim.

The references to the Digest's alleged "subsidy" stem from the Minority Report of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on H.R. 8929. Acting on information supplied by the U.S. Postal Service, the Minority Report charged that Reader's Digest will enjoy "a taxpayer's subsidy of \$14,815,000" during the next five years, until existing law reaches the full rate set by the Postal Rate Commission. That averages out to about \$3 million per year.

The Minority Report further alleged—again on the basis of figures from the U.S. Postal Service—that under a 10-year phasing provision of H.R. 8929, this "subsidy" would double to \$29.6 million—or still about \$3 million per year.

Facts are the Postal Service has no cost figures for the Digest, or for any other individual publication. That was true in 1969 when Senior Assistant Postmaster General for Finance, Ralph Nicholson, testified that the Post Office could not determine a subsidy "for any given magazine, but only for the class as a whole." It remains true today.

Moreover, the "subsidy" charge is based not only on information that cannot be accurately determined for any given magazine—the Digest or any other—but it is based on a look at only one class of mail. While the Digest paid \$6 million for second-class postage in 1972, it was also paying \$30 million in postage for other classes of mail.

Let's examine the total picture of all Reader's Digest mail.

Using the same data from the Postal Rate Commission that was used in the Minority Report on H.R. 8929, an analysis of all postal expenses shows that Reader's Digest more than pays its own out-of-pocket costs, and that it also contributes more than \$11 million annually to overhead costs of the Postal Service.

This is how we arrive at that conclusion.

According to the Postal Rate Commission (June 5, 1972 Opinion, Appendix K), 49 per cent of first-class revenue is an excess over attributable (or out-of-pocket) costs and is a contribution to institutional (or general overhead) costs. Reader's Digest paid the U.S. Postal Service over \$15 million for first-class postage in 1972. Thus, using the Rate Commission's own figures, the Digest last year contributed \$7.5 million in first-class postage to the overhead costs of the U.S. Postal Service.

Similarly, the Postal Rate Commission declared that 52 per cent of third-class postage is a contribution to Postal Service overhead. Thus, of Reader's Digest's \$7.5 million third-class postal bill in 1972, \$3.9 million paid for overhead costs of the Postal Service.

Therefore, last year, the Digest contributed \$11.4 million in first- and third-class postage

toward overhead costs of the U.S. Postal Service. And this contribution will surely increase as first- and third-class rates will surely increase.

Even deducting the \$3 million "subsidy" that the Postal Service claims the Digest will enjoy each year until the phased rate increases are fully effective, the net Digest contribution to postal overhead would still be more than \$8 million a year!

Put another way, if there were no Reader's Digest, the taxpayer or someone else would have to pay \$8 million more to support the U.S. Postal Service.

And that isn't all. Recently the Postal Service submitted figures to the Postal Rate Commission showing that if a mailer fully presorts his first-class mail, Postal Service costs are reduced by more than 1¢ a piece. The Digest mailed about 200 million pieces of such mail in 1972, nearly all of it pre-sorted.

So, according to the Postal Service's own cost data, the Digest overpaid nearly \$2 million.

The Postal Service submission also shows that handling of Digest Business Reply Mail caused no more expense than that incurred in handling regular first-class letters. Since the Digest paid a 2¢ surcharge for each of the 14 million pieces of business reply mail it received last year, that means it overpaid the Postal Service by some \$280,000 in 1972.

Adding the above two figures, it is clear that the Digest paid nearly \$2.3 million to the Postal Service in 1972 for services that are received for most letters, but which were not required for Digest mail.

Thus we find that, even after deducting the alleged \$3 million second-class "subsidy," the Digest overpaid the Postal Service \$2.3 million in 1972, and also made a net contribution to Postal Service overhead of well over \$8 million.

Sincerely,

KENT RHODES.

H.R. 9359

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I have today cosponsored H.R. 9359, introduced by the Honorable Ms. BELLA ABZUG. This legislation provides for the issuance of a postage stamp to honor the life and work of Jeanette Rankin, the first woman to be elected to the U.S. Congress.

Miss Rankin was an innovator and leader in the fields of women's rights and peace issues. In the early 1900's, she introduced bills to give women the right to vote, and helped to push through the 19th amendment, which nationally enfranchised women.

Jeanette Rankin's total commitment to U.S. Government, not only as a civil servant, but as a woman, are admirable. She was a longtime advocate of electoral reforms, with goals toward a greater diversity among Representatives. She will also be remembered as the only Representative who voted against U.S. involvement in World Wars I and II. Miss Rankin was a truly courageous woman in American politics, whose consistency in beliefs recognized that violence cannot solve human disagreements.

I therefore feel that it is commendable that we honor her life and work by is-

suing a commemorative postage stamp. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE POSTAL SERVICE

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, Americans demand excellence in their Postal Service and rightfully so since the mails are extremely important to the smooth operation of their homes, their businesses, and their Government. Regrettably, ever since the Congress approved legislation to establish an independent Postal Service, criticism of the mail service has been growing. We have all noted that everything from the high cost of a first-class postage stamp, through economy reductions within the post office, to the use of cluster boxes for mail delivery, seem to have received the brunt of these complaints.

However, some of this criticism may not be deserved when one realizes the monumental task which faces our Postal Service. The sheer number of items mailed each day in the United States boggles the imagination. Regardless of the complaints, however, the United States still has the best postal system in the world and indications are that the future holds even better service for the public.

Nevertheless, like many of my colleagues, I have received numerous complaints about the Postal Service. One such matter came from Mr. George F. Eisenbrown concerning the shoddy service which his organization, the Windsor Mount Joy Mutual Insurance Co., was receiving, he thought, from the U.S. Post Office in Hamburg, Pa. In an effort to be of the most possible assistance to Mr. Eisenbrown, I contacted the Postal Service to inquire about a possible remedy to his problem.

The response from the Washington Office of the Postal Service and the Hamburg Post Office was indeed gratifying. I believe the efforts of the Postal Service in this matter are not only indicative of their response to and concern for problems within their organization in general, but also of their efforts to correct any deficiency in particular.

Most significant, however, is the fact that the Postal Service in this instance was able to determine that Mr. Eisenbrown's problems were within his own company and did not concern the post office at all. I believe that we will continue to see such cooperation by the U.S. Postal Service and the citizens it serves as the mail service moves forward in the future. Certainly, the valuable assistance which Mr. Ray S. Kinsey and Mr. Curtis Dietrich gave Mr. Eisenbrown was extremely important in the satisfactory solution to this problem. Consequently, I would like to include the full text of Mr. Eisenbrown's letter for the benefit of my colleagues. The letter, which gives credit where credit is due, follows:

WINDSOR MOUNT JOY
MUTUAL INSURANCE Co.,
Hamburg, Pa., July 24, 1973.

Congressman GUS YATRON,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YATRON: With reference to your letter of July 10 and Mr. Matukonis correspondence of July 5, 1973, I take this opportunity to thank you both for your kind cooperation in the matter of looking into the Postal problem here in Hamburg.

Mr. Ray S. Kinsey, Customer Service Representative, and Mr. Curtis Dietrich Postmaster of the Hamburg Post Office made a personal call to our office July 23, 1973, for the purpose of discussing the program entirely.

I have been assured of several factors: (1) That the mail is normally ready for pickup at 8:30 a.m. and (2) If I can arrange to have our outgoing mail into the Post Office by 4:30 p.m., the same will be given immediate attention as with all other outgoing mail.

With the kind cooperation of the two men mentioned above, I was able to determine that unfortunately, a good deal of the problem lies within my own organization, caused by that old familiar problem of employee "dilly-dallying". This, of course, causes me to have an extremely "red face". I can assure you I will make every effort to rectify this particular situation.

The most I can do at this point is to offer my thanks for your kind assistance and apologize for the short-sightedness on our part as regards laxity of participation in correction of mail pickup and delivery.

We are most pleased to know that even though we must retain a considerable amount of the "blame", your representatives were most cordial in their approach to the problem and I commend them for not being retaliatory in approach when they may have had a right to be.

Again, my personal thanks for your kind cooperation and prompt service.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE F. EISENBROWN,
Secretary.

MARIO VALADEZ: 40 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an event honoring an important citizen which took place recently in my district. On June 29 a reception and dinner were given by the friends of Sr. Mario Valadez to honor him on the occasion of his 40th anniversary as a member of the management team of the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Corp.

Mario Valadez is, by anyone's standards, an extraordinary person. Born and raised in Mexico, Mario moved to Los Angeles in 1926 at the age of 19. Although he had attended business college and had been employed as a secretary for 5 years in Mexico, Mario was unable to find employment as a secretary in Los Angeles. Undaunted, he accepted a job as a window washer at the Rosslyn Hotel and began to attend evening classes to better his command of the English language and to improve his shorthand and typing.

As if these activities were not enough,

Mario became an instructor in Spanish and wrote a booklet entitled "Learn Spanish Pronto," which sold a quarter of a million copies.

Forty years ago, in 1933, Mario was invited to act as an interpreter at a meeting of a group of merchants on Olvera Street, the oldest thoroughfare in Los Angeles. Soon after that first meeting, Mario became closely associated with this group of merchants, now better known as the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Corp., as an assistant in the planning and development of Olvera Street.

During World War II, Mario, by then a naturalized citizen, took a break from his career with the Olvera Street project to serve in the Federal Government's Office of Censorship, where he became head of the Receiving and Classification Division. He also distinguished himself at that time by his record sales of war bonds.

At the end of the war, Mario returned to Los Angeles and resumed his business activities with the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Corp. In 1963, he was appointed to his present position as managing director.

This corporation has taken Olvera Street, the oldest street in the city, and made it into a delightful marketplace, specializing in items of Mexican origin. In addition, the corporation has carefully restored numerous historical buildings in the Olvera Street area and has played a leading role in the establishment of the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Park.

Mario Valadez' genuine, warm, and friendly approach to his work has enabled him to attract many thousands of visitors to southern California to view the unusual charm and significance of Olvera Street and the Historical Park. Mario's contributions to the preservation and restoration of the historic Olvera Street district have been contributions made for the benefit of the entire nation. I am grateful to Mario Valadez for his efforts to preserve the Mexican heritage of our country for all of us, now and in the years to come.

YUGOSLAV-AMERICAN SOCCER CLUB OF SAN PEDRO, CALIF.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, throughout the centuries, countries and cultures have put aside political, social, and religious differences and participated in athletic competition. And instead of the rivalry that could lead to attempted conquest and ill will when countries of the world compete against one another athletically, friendship and goodwill usually follow.

I am extremely proud that a group of individuals from my district will have the opportunity to display their friendship and goodwill to the people of Yugoslavia.

Recently the Yugoslav-American Soc-

cer Club of San Pedro, Calif., was invited by an organization in Yugoslavia—Centralni Odbor Matica Iseljenika—which is devoted to the promotion of goodwill between the people of Yugoslavia and their compatriots who emigrated to various countries to be their guests and play against some of the top teams of Yugoslavia.

The San Pedro team and the accompanying Board of Directors will be staying in Yugoslavia for 3 weeks. While touring Yugoslavia, the team will be playing in Belgrade, the capital city of Yugoslavia; Ljapun and Pancevo, in the Republic of Serbia; Sarajevo, capital city of the Republic of Bosnia, and Herzegovina; Split and Sibenik, in the Republic of Croatia; Zagreb, capital city of Croatia; and Kotor in the Republic of Montenegro.

The board of directors are: Gavrilo Cucuk, president; Velisa Vukotic and Sinisa Vuksic, vice presidents; Anton Spanjol, secretary; Novak Tomic, coach-manager; and Kemal Begovic, activity and publicity director.

In addition, the traveling group will include Bernie Evans, San Pedro News-Pilot sports editor, and Joe Zaninovich, honorary chairman of the board of directors.

Since its beginning 6 years ago, the Yugoslav-American Soccer Club of San Pedro has twice been named the Western U.S. Open Cup champion, and in April 1973, won the coveted Greater Los Angeles Soccer League's major division championship, one of the Nation's most prestigious soccer titles.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Yugoslav-American Soccer Club of San Pedro for their successful 6-year history, and extend my best wishes for their trip to Yugoslavia. I am certain the tournament will be another manifestation of the already close and friendly relationship between the people of Yugoslavia and the United States.

The soccer team members are:

Warner Mata, Ronald Mata, George Benitez, Jack Kordich, Kresimir Lakos, Dragan Djukic, Marko Pejovic, Vlada Konnenic, Lazo Lazarevic, Bogic Ristic, Roban Jovanovic, Branko Jovicevic, Zoran Djukich, Bogdan Baranovski, Kazimir Urani, Ruben Fernandez, Miguel Brigida, Louis Sanabria, Manuel Munoz, Jesus Para, Asuncion Miranda, Joe Duran, Peter Simons, and Lotar Spranger.

BRINKLEY'S AUGUST NEWSLETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the information of our colleagues my August newsletter and questionnaire which will be mailed this month to the Third Congressional District of Georgia, which I am privileged to represent.

The newsletter and questionnaire read as follows:

U.S. CONGRESSMAN JACK BRINKLEY REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON
"NO GREATER LOVE": BRINKLEY NAMED TO NATIONAL MIA COMMITTEE

Third District Congressman Jack Brinkley participated in a very special ceremony on June 14th sponsored by No Greater Love—a nationwide organization which is based in Washington, D.C.

During the ceremonies the son of one of the MIA servicemen—Jimmy Plowman of McLean, Virginia, the son of Navy Lt. James E. Plowman who was shot down over North Vietnam on March 24, 1967—was presented with a flag which was flown over the United States Capitol Building.

"This is the first of many United States Flags which will be offered to children in similar circumstances over the coming months," Rep. Brinkley said. "It represents the fact to young Jimmy Plowman that his fellow Americans cannot and will not forget the sacrifices his father and the fathers of others like him have made and are making in the name of this great Republic," he emphasized.

The No Greater Love program was started in 1971, Rep. Brinkley explained, in an effort to help ease the plight of the children of U.S. POW's and MIA's.

In its functioning No Greater Love is similar to the "Big Brother" organization. However, its membership is composed primarily of sports stars—such as Henry Aaron, Johnny Unitas, and Ted Williams. These men, as well as entire professional teams, make personal visits and phone calls, and send autographed pictures and sports equipment to the sons and daughters of the some 1300 MIA American servicemen.

Rep. Brinkley noted that assistance from U.S. athletes for these children has been exceptional and that not one athlete has ever turned down a request for help from No Greater Love.

Among those participating in the June 14th No Greater Love program were Congressional leaders from both the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate as well as former prisoners of war and numerous sports stars.

The No Greater Love ceremonies were held in conjunction with the observance of National Flag Day in the House of Representatives on June 14.

BOB HOPE IS GUEST SPEAKER: HOUSE OBSERVES SIXTH ANNUAL NATIONAL FLAG DAY

The Sixth Annual National Flag Day ceremonies were observed in the Chamber of the U.S. House of Representatives on June 14th with comedian Bob Hope as guest of honor. Others participating in Flag Day 1973 were Army Staff Sergeant Gary J. Guggenburger of Cold Springs, Minnesota, a former Prisoner of War who led the House in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, as well as the United States Navy Band, and the Navy Sea Chanters. Bob Hope was specially cited in the House Chamber for his 31 years—and millions of miles of travel—to entertain American servicemen around the world. His moving and poignant address to the House on the deep personal meaning which our Flag holds for him was received with a standing ovation. Portions of his speech are reprinted below.

(Excerpts from the speech of Bob Hope in the House of Representatives on June 14, 1973:)

Mr. BOB HOPE. Mr. Speaker, distinguished Members of Congress, Joint Chiefs of the Military, and ladies and gentlemen

We saw a wonderful demonstration of what love for country is when the prisoners of war came home. It was truly inspirational seeing so many returning veterans stand and salute the Flag. What astounds me is the fact that these prisoners had more faith in our country while they were in prison than a lot of us Americans who are walking around here free.

And they brought a Flag home with them, one they had made while they were in the Hanoi Hilton, a small Flag but a powerful force of hope for those great Americans.

You really cannot describe what the Flag means.

We try with words, music and song salutes, and these are fine. Yet how do you put into words the feelings of goosepimples when the Flag is being raised or goes marching by? You can only stand in reverence and offer a silent prayer of thanks that the Flag still waves for you and me and for all Americans. And long may it wave. Thank you.

THIRD DISTRICT STUDENTS TO RECEIVE FEDERAL TUITION LOANS

More than 420 students in five colleges in the Third Congressional District will receive a total of \$193,844 in federal tuition loans next year, according to U.S. Rep. Jack Brinkley.

The funds will be provided under the National Direct Student Loan Program, Rep. Brinkley said, and will provide 90 percent of the new capital contributions of the Student Loan Program with a matching college contribution providing about 10 percent.

Colleges receiving contributions, the amount of the allocation, and the estimated number of student borrowers are:

Columbus College in Columbus (17,388—38 borrowers).

Fort Valley State College in Fort Valley (\$63,516—141 borrowers).

Georgia Southwestern College in Americus (\$24,469—54 borrowers).

LaGrange College in LaGrange (\$68,948—153 borrowers).

Tift College in Forsyth (\$19,523—43 borrowers).

Rep. Brinkley noted that students interested in obtaining these loans must apply through the financial assistance office at the particular college receiving the federal allocation.

(The Military Construction Authorization bill for Fiscal Year 1974 provides \$528,000 additional funding authority for the completion of the Lindsay Creek By-Pass to the Martin Army Hospital. This will bring to fruition the 2nd on-Post leg in a project sponsored by Congressman Brinkley for a beltway connecting Metro Columbus through Fort Benning to Lawson Army Airfield.)

LETTERS FROM BRINKLEY

Concerning our newsletter

During the 93rd Congress I hope to continue to send quarterly newsletters. It is planned for these to be sent Postal Patron since this covers everyone in the Third Congressional District, without being limited to any special list or grouping. The cost of a newsletter is high, but I believe that good communication with constituents is well worth it. I'm grateful for the Appreciation Dinner of 1972 which makes the publication of our newsletter possible.

Open house in LaGrange

On Saturday, August 25th, we will be holding an Open House at our new District office in the Hammett Building at 301 Broome Street in LaGrange. I am personally looking forward to being there and sincerely hope that everyone who possibly can will come by and visit with me and members of our District staff.

Thank you

The mailbags delivered to my office during April were stuffed to capacity with completed questionnaires. Although it wasn't possible to personally acknowledge receipt and appreciation for your participation, you may be sure that your opinions count heavily with me.

This newsletter contains another questionnaire which I hope will have an even better response. The tabulated results really are an excellent indication of just how you feel on issues which are of particular national sig-

nificance. Your thinking is important to my decisions.

FACTS AND FIGURES

Rep. Jack Brinkley is the first Member of Congress elected from Columbus in this century (prior to Rep. Brinkley the last Congressman elected from Columbus was the late Thomas W. Grimes who served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1887 to 1891); has traveled between Washington and the Third District an average of more than 33,000 air miles per year and

has a 95 percent-plus voting record during his Congressional service.

Congressional adjournment dates for the past six years:

1967: December 15.
1968: October 14.
1969: December 23.
1970: January 2, 1971.
1971: December 17.
1972: October 18.

MINUTE QUESTIONNAIRE NO. 2

1. Should the U.S. Senate's Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities discontinue its inquiries into the Watergate Affair?

Yes No

2. Would you favor the construction of a trans-Alaska pipeline as a means of alleviating our present fuel shortage?

Yes No

3. Do you think the President's economic policies are working effectively?

Yes No

4. Should Congress place private pension plans under Federal regulation to guarantee that retirees get the cumulative benefits they have earned?

Yes No

5. Do you think Congress should give the President authority to continue the bombing in Cambodia after August 15th?

Yes No

Please take a minute during the day to fill in this questionnaire and return it to: Congressman Jack Brinkley, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

(NOTE.—Our next newsletter will include a legislative report for 1973.)

COMMENTS ON PHASE IV

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received Robert Nathan's observations on phase IV and I would like to share them with my colleagues. Mr. Nathan has made some important comments on the latest phase of the infamous Nixon-omics.

We all hope that phase IV will end the terrible inflation. However, we all hoped that phase I would work, then phase II, and there was even some misplaced optimism that phase III might help.

I fear that any slowdown in price rises will be the result of a recession, caused in part by putting on the monetary brakes too late and too hard. Just as the driver of a car must watch for road signs and changes in traffic, the President's economic advisers should have observed changes in economic factors and reacted to them early.

Mr. Nathan gives two examples of administration mismanagement: The first is the food shortage brought about, in

part, by our restrictive farm policy while world demand for food was rising; the other is the second devaluation of the dollar before all the effects of the initial devaluation were felt. Let us hope that the President is not depending on a recession to fight rising prices. In 1970-1971 Mr. Nixon managed to have inflation in the midst of a recession.

The following observations of Mr. Nathan are, I am afraid, accurate. The President seems to have a death wish for the American consumer, and his policies do not help business either.

COMMENTS ON PHASE IV

The most disturbing aspects of the fanfare surrounding the unveiling of Phase IV relate to the emphasis that the end of controls will come at the earliest possible date. To read the statements of the President and of his top officials and advisers, one cannot help but conclude that the main role of Phase IV is to serve primarily as a vehicle for getting out of the disastrous freeze that started on June 13th and to arrive at an early end to all wage and price controls. There seems to be far more emphasis on hurrying down the path toward the end of controls than on the need to break the inflationary spiral. Wishful thinking continues to be the order of the day.

It is clearly evident that the Administration has given up in real degree the battle against inflation through direct action. The prospects for success of any system of controls became perilous with the end of Phase II in January 1973 and receded more and more as each month's statistics revealed the unprecedented and fearsome peacetime rate of inflation.

The mistake made in January when Phase II was scrapped and a largely innocuous Phase III was introduced can well be described as the worst economic decision in decades. One need only look at prices—and this does not mean food and farm prices alone but also industrial and other non-food goods—to observe that inflation during Phase III was at an annual rate many multiples the rate that prevailed during Phase II. Two columns in Table 4 of the July 6th BLS release on wholesale prices show the following rates of inflation during Phase III as compared with Phase II:

SEASONALLY ADJUSTED ANNUAL RATES OF CHANGE IN THE WPI AND MAJOR COMPONENTS BEFORE AND DURING THE ECONOMIC STABILIZATION PROGRAM THAT BEGAN IN AUGUST 1971

	14 months phase II November 1971 to January 1973	5 months phase III, January 1973 to June 1973
All commodities.....	6.9	24.4
Industrial commodities.....	3.5	14.4
Farm products, processed foods and feeds.....	16.1	49.8
Consumer finished goods.....	5.6	18.6
Foods.....	10.6	25.4
Finished goods, excluding foods.....	2.3	14.6

So far labor has behaved with a remarkable restraint but the escalator clauses are really beginning to hit very hard. When new settlements of the more militant unions come around, I am sure we are going to see a serious resumption of a severe degree of the inflationary spiral.

What is most disturbing is the combination of lack of foresight in January and the continuing evidence that the Administration is impervious to learning! The movement of farm and food prices during 1972, especially wholesale farm prices, give plenty of proof that the on-going rise in food prices in 1973 should not have come as any surprise

at all and certainly was clear when the January fiasco was planned and announced. Prices of farm products were already rising at the wholesale level in the spring of 1972. Then with the huge sale to the Soviet Union, it should have been clear that prices were going to rise at a much faster rate. In fact, from June 1972 to December 1972, wholesale prices of farm products rose at an annual rate of over 25 percent. It is difficult to fathom the degree of blindness or self-deception that prevailed in White House ranks in January 1973.

Since these facts were evident and since the farm prices were not under control, it is reasonable to expect that sensible (and sensitive) officials would have loosened up on farm acreage limits and crop limits in the spring or early summer of 1972 and certainly at the time of the Russian sale rather than wait until December and January. Better late than never, but it seems the desire for a big farm vote margin took precedence over sound supply policies.

Also, it should have been quite clear in January 1973 that not all of the impact of the first dollar devaluation had worked its way through the domestic price situation. Devaluations of the dollar or revaluations of foreign currencies are inflationary in that the goods brought into the United States come in at higher dollar prices. Also, as a result of lower prices, expressed in other currencies, of our exports, there is an increase in total demand. Both of these add to inflationary forces. Further, the rate of recovery from the recession was very rapid late in 1972 and such a time is hardly proper for decontrolling prices. These factors added to the gravity of the impact and magnify the absurdity of the big mistake which was made.

The freeze on June 13th was very belatedly imposed because it was finally evident that the degree of price inflation had reached tragic proportions and that there was no indication that all the earlier promises were going to be fulfilled. As a matter of fact, that is why the economic posture and policies of the Administration over the past several months, if not years, can properly be characterized as "Watergate Economics." It has been a mixture of fact and fantasy, a scene of rose-colored hues projecting the slightest favorable development and purposefully obscuring any significant declines. It has been a matter of using binoculars to magnify good news and then looking through the other end of the glasses when there was bad news.

Promises have been made over and over again that have been absolutely devoid of sincerity or fact. Rhetoric has been served up to try to lull the people into the belief that the problems of inflation were just about over. As a matter of fact, even though the President and his economists are saying that they are not again going to predict rapid improvement, they are nonetheless promising that it is going to be possible to get rid of controls and achieve economic growth and price stability in the near future. Careful reading of announcements and speeches and television performances indicate that Phase IV is designed primarily to get out of the ill-designed freeze and to serve as a vehicle to bring an early end to controls.

The way things are going, the only vehicle the classical economist will have left for any anti-inflation effort will be a recession. It probably will be about as ineffective a weapon in 1974 as it was in 1970-71. It was the failure of the recession to bring an end to drastic inflation which led to Nixon's decision to introduce controls in August 1971.

It is sad but true that there is little basis for being optimistic about Phase IV. The odds are large against it because its architects and operational staff do not believe in any controls. They are still trying to cope with inflation with mirrors rather than with tough

policies and the vigorous pursuit of price stability along with essential flexibility. Price stability cannot come about with just mirrors or rhetoric. The chances are that inflation will get worse and worse in the months ahead and that there will be a recession as an alternative to inflation. But a recession is not going to bring us price stability. This is a most tragic conclusion, but a likely one.

The January horror story and the interim rate of inflation makes it extremely difficult to reduce the rate of inflation any time soon. Yet the country needs such an effort—tough and well designed and well staffed and flexible. It is not going to come from this Administration.

EFFECTS OF ANTITRUST LAW ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have often heard it said that this country's antitrust laws injure the competitive position of American business participating in international trade. The view has been stated that when competing in international markets, American firms must contend with foreign business not subject to the same antitrust constraints that we have here. On the other side of the argument, it is pointed out that American businessmen are unable to cite specific examples where their overseas activities have been constrained by antitrust law.

Regardless of which argument is correct, perhaps the most important consideration is that misconceptions about antitrust enforcement will "chill" ultimately legitimate projects. For this reason, it is important that the record be set straight and that evaluation of the effects of antitrust law on international trade be made on the basis of that record. Last March, Mr. Donald I. Baker, Director of Policy Planning for the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, spoke on this subject before the International Law Committee of the New York City Bar Association. I commend his remarks to my colleagues:

THE MULTINATIONAL CORPORATION AND THE GREAT ANTITRUST MYTH

Today in antitrust, we seem to be faced with a great myth; namely, that antitrust undermines our national interests in international trade and investment. According to the myth, businessmen are afraid to export or to invest, because of the ominous threat of antitrust prosecution.

The antitrust myth is not supported by hard facts. Certainly, there are no recent government prosecutions against exporters—no fierce threats by law enforcement officials. Nor can I find any beneficial arrangements abandoned out of fear of antitrust enforcement....

Antitrust is simply not a major part of our international trade problem. Ironically, the very fact that the Department has brought so few international cases has provided support for those who claim uncertainty in the law....

Our antitrust enforcement interest in the international field has been quite limited. Our goal has been twofold: first, to protect domestic consumers by assuring fair access

to the United States market for goods and services from foreign countries; and secondly, to assure fair access to foreign markets for United States exporters. These are, it seems to me, values to which enlightened Americans should subscribe. So far so good.

Our main international effort has been to challenge classic international cartels. The typical cartel involves leading firms in different countries agreeing with each other that they would not poach on each other's "home" markets. . . .

The evil of the classic cartel is clear: it denies the American customer the benefit of foreign competition and it denies the American firm the opportunity to export and compete abroad. Clearly, such agreements are not designed to serve the interests of the American public or the interests of the United States as an exporting nation. Rather, they serve the private interests of the parties—the classic private interest in having a quiet life.

For convenience, let me divide my discussion of international antitrust enforcement between these two major categories: first, protecting American consumers; and, secondly, protecting business opportunities for U.S. firms abroad. The former is far and away the more active field. The cartel cases cover both.

PROTECTING AMERICAN CONSUMERS

Foreign competition has proven particularly important to Americans in two circumstances. The first concerns the situation where most or all of the goods originate abroad. The second occurs where we have a sluggish domestic industry, which very much needs the spur of outside competition. The latter situation has been particularly apparent in a number of our large oligopolies—and, as a result, we have seen such products as small cars and stainless steel razor blades become available in this country largely because of the pressure of foreign firms selling here. It is an important goal of antitrust policy to preserve this kind of foreign competition as a factor in the American market—and to deal with international cartels that prevent it from happening.

Our enforcement effort has covered a number of different kinds of situations. The first is the classic foreign selling cartel covering goods for which we have no reasonable domestic substitutes. The international quinine cartel offers a recent example. It involved foreign firms and some foreign subsidiaries of American firms engaged in a long-term and broadly successful effort to control the world prices in quinine—a product of which America consumes about a third of the world's supply.

Even where the goods in question are produced in the United States, we have an important national interest in seeing to it that major foreign firms are not kept out of the United States market. Thus, to take a current example, in the *Westinghouse-Mitsubishi* case, the Government is challenging agreements which have been enforced for more than forty years and have many more years to run. They cover both patented and unpatented products. They have had the broad effect of keeping two of the world's largest industrial firms out of each other's "home" markets. This is particularly important to the American consuming interest where the domestic markets involved are highly oligopolistic.

A related type of antitrust enforcement is designed to preserve foreign firms as actual or potential competitors in the United States market. This arises in the merger field. The threat of such potential competition is important . . . and therefore the Department must be concerned about preventing dominant domestic firms from eliminating their leading potential domestic competitors through acquisition. . . .

To summarize, competition from foreign

owned firms—here or abroad—can be a vital spur to competition in the U.S. market, and the Department of Justice welcomes it for that reason. . . . I can say unequivocally that our policy has been and continues to be to welcome foreign investment as a source of new competition. Once here foreign firms can expect—and will receive—the same antitrust enforcement that U.S. firms get. Since the latter are not always keen on what they get, we should not assume that foreign firms will always be happy.

PROTECTION OF EXPORT OPPORTUNITIES

As I indicated, a second aspect of our antitrust enforcement effort is concerned with protecting the export and overseas investment opportunities for American firms. These issues can come up in several different ways.

First, where one American firm enters into an exclusive arrangement with a major foreign customer, which expressly prevents that customer from dealing in the future with any other American firm, this may violate the Sherman Act. Its plain effect is to restrain the foreign commerce of the United States. It may be in the form of a tie-in or exclusive dealing arrangement. Generally speaking, I think, these arrangements would be looked at under the "rule of reason" in the international context, and that therefore they would be judged on the basis of how important the foreign buyer was in its own market and in the total market for U.S. exports.

Another example occurs where a joint venture is formed among the leading firms in an industry to promote exports to a foreign country or countries. Such a joint venture cannot exclude the remaining American firms, where this would deprive them of the benefit of making export sales. This is but a particular application of the standard antitrust principle that, where different firms in an industry jointly control an essential facility, they must grant equal access to it to all comers in the trade; this principle has been applied to enterprise as diverse as a terminal railway, a fish market, the Associated Press and the New York Stock Exchange. It seems fully applicable to joint arrangements designed to promote or sell American goods or services abroad.

In discussing the foreclosure of foreign business opportunities for American firms, one must look at the hard antitrust issues which arise because of the direct role that government plays in many foreign economies—particularly within the Communist Bloc. Exclusive arrangements with a foreign government or state trading monopoly may necessarily exclude all other American firms.

The antitrust answer to these circumstances is generally as follows. Where a foreign government, as sovereign, requires an American firm to engage in some activity which would be otherwise offensive to our antitrust laws—then this is the end of the antitrust inquiry. The same is not true where the American firm has been the *moving force* in getting the anticompetitive contractual restrictions adopted—or has discretion in how they are administered. . . .

THE OTHER SIDE

So far, I have focused on the areas of direct antitrust interest—namely restraints (and mergers) limiting imports into our economy, and restraints on the export opportunities of our businessmen. Once beyond these areas, the businessman has a broad scope for overseas activities without significant problems under our antitrust laws.

A year ago, the Department tried to be specific on this point in some testimony given by then Deputy Assistant Attorney General Walker B. Comegys before the Senate Commerce Committee on something called the Export Expansion Act of 1971. In that testimony and the appendices to it, we sought to deal with the only specific factual situations

which had been given to us in relation to foreign trade problems. We noted for instance that vertically imposed territories, and even horizontal territorial restrictions, were unobjectionable as between various foreign countries from the standpoint of U.S. antitrust law (although they might be quite objectionable from the standpoint of foreign antitrust law). We noted that tie-ins on foreign licensing arrangements were probably all right as long as they did not foreclose competing American sellers (as opposed to foreign sellers) of the tied products. We suggested that "joint ventures abroad by American companies in cooperation with foreign companies present no antitrust problems unless (1) participation in the joint venture is a prerequisite to competition and some American firms are excluded . . . or (2) the activity of the joint-venturers has some substantial impact on the domestic commerce of the United States." We suggested that formation of a joint venture among various American firms to submit a single bid on a foreign construction project of itself raises no particular antitrust problems. Finally, we stressed that various governmental "restrictions . . . applying to commerce in the host country and imposed by the host government will create no antitrust hazards for the American company."

The Webb-Pomerene Act turns out to be of little practical importance, in view of the rules I have been discussing. It was enacted in 1918 to help American exporters deal with foreign buying cartels and to allow smaller firms to share the costs of selling abroad.

In fact it has been little used—except on the overseas sale of primary products where the United States has been one of the principal exporting nations and American firms could create a genuine export cartel. Webb-Pomerene has not proved particularly useful as a joint selling tool for highly technical or differentiated products—for here each American firm wishes to push its own distinctive product, rather than to make a joint effort for all. And these technical and differentiated products are our most important national exports. . . .

A SUCCESS STORY

I hope my message is clear: what we need for our antitrust inquiry are more facts and less theory. In this spirit, I offer you the example of a local "hometown" industry here which seems to be doing well against tough international competition, without any special antitrust protection.

My case study is commercial banking. Since 1963, when the Supreme Court decided the *Philadelphia National Bank* case, commercial banks have been fully subjected to the antitrust laws. Nor do they qualify for any Webb-Pomerene exemption, since they do not deal in "goods, wares, or merchandise." Abroad our banks have to compete with very large institutions on their own home ground. Our banks do not enjoy any benefits falling from powerful patent rights or industrial property. On top of that, our banks' average wage rates are presumably higher than most of their foreign competitors.

This all sounds like an invitation to disaster, under the great antitrust myth. Has it occurred?

Of course not. Our banks are doing very well abroad. First National City Bank made approximately 54% of its earnings last year on foreign operations—and it did this on the basis of only having about 47% of its deposits from abroad. Manufacturers Hanover made about 38% of its earnings abroad—although it had only about 24% of its deposits there. Bankers Trust made about 35% of its earnings abroad—and it had about 28% of its deposits there. Others had substantial foreign earnings which were more or less proportionate to their foreign deposits: thus Chase Manhattan and Bank of

America each appears to have had about 35% of its earnings and deposits from abroad. . . .

We should consider such cases before we reach any rash conclusion about antitrust acting as a key deterrent in foreign business operations of American firms. The banking experience suggests that the key to success abroad are the classic virtues of skill, foresight, and industry—the skills of the Yankee trader.

SENATE WATERGATE HEARINGS: LYNCHING, AMERICAN STYLE

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the publicity surrounding the Senate Select Committee's hearings on the Watergate affair, it might be instructive to have an outsider's reaction to this controversy. I, therefore, commend to my colleagues the following article by Bernard Levine, columnist for the London Times, written after spending 10 days at the hearings. I feel sure that they will find it an insightful and well-written article:

A POLITICAL POSSE RUNNING THE AMERICAN INQUISITION

(By Bernard Levin)

I have just come back from ten days or so in America, where I watched a good deal of the Senate inquiry into the Watergate affair; the proceedings are being carried live and in full on television, with generous repetition in the evenings. I do not know what sort of viewing figures the business is getting, but it must certainly run into millions, perhaps tens or scores of millions. And it is just about the most scandalous violation of every standard of justice to take place in a free society since the Southern gentry abandoned lynching as their favorite outdoor sport.

Mencken called the United States Senate (and in a piece commiserating with Presidents on some of the burdens of their office, at that) "the windiest and most tedious group of men in Christendom", and it does not seem to have changed much, except for the worse, since his day. To start with, the conduct of the Chairman, Senator Sam Ervin, is so deplorable that the lack of any serious protest against his behaviour is in itself a measure of the loss of nerve on the part of so many distinguished Americans, in the press, the academic world and politics itself, who would once, in similar circumstances, have been campaigning vigorously to bring him to heel. (As far as I know, nobody has even bothered to draw pointed attention—or unpointed attention, for that matter—to the fact that Ervin is up for re-election next year.)

Senator Ervin, in his chairmanship of the committee, has clearly determined on two things. First is that he is going to play the role of simple ol' Sam Ervin from Dogpatch, North Carolina, first cousin to Mammy Yokum and dispenser of the same brand of homespun wisdom that grows 'way down among the grassroots. He does not (at least he didn't while I was watching) actually chew tobacco and spit the juice into a brass spittoon, snap his galluses or use a fly-swatter, but the mugging and grimacing, the posturing and posing and hamming, which would get the sixteenth spear-carrier from the left flung out of Barclays Bank Musical and Dramatic Society even if his father was the chairman, indicate, as clearly as if he had a sign up admitting as much, that he is hav-

ing a whale of a time in his first experience of nationwide limelight, and that he not only knows when the cameras are on him, but exactly when they start to move in for a close-up.

One of the sadder phenomena of this business is the way in which the liberal establishment of America, in its insatiable greed for President Nixon's destruction, has tried to suggest that Ervin is a kind of reincarnation of Clarence Darrow, which would be all very well if it were not for his record of implacable opposition to civil rights legislation, and, incidentally, his no less consistent record of support for the American involvement in Vietnam. (But the American liberal—or, more correctly, pseudo-liberal—establishment does not mind how muddy is the stick with which it beats its devil-figures; Senator William Fulbright, whose record on civil-rights legislation is hardly less lamentable than Ervin's, and who topped even this sorry aspect of his career when he sneered that it couldn't possibly matter to a Vietnamese peasant whether he lived under a Communist or a non-Communist Government, was the great hero of the sloppier American left, whose concern with Negroes and Vietnamese alike was in many cases a good deal less than their enjoyment of the nice, warm feeling their opposition to the Vietnam war gave them.)

Worst, however, than Senator Ervin's yokum-hokum is the way in which he has clearly decided that some of those appearing before him under suspicion of various malpractices are heroes, and some villains. Mr. Maurice Stans, for instance, was a villain; his interrogation (and most of the rest of the committee seem to take their cue from Ervin, or at least to realize the advantage of getting their own bread in any political gravy that might be going) was relentless, entirely hostile and plainly based on an assumption that Stans was guilty of everything of which he was accused and a good deal more besides. The odious Mr. Jeb Stuart Magruder, however, who followed Mr. Stans before the committee, was a hero; Ervin and others—especially the ridiculous and maudlin Lowell Weicker, who looked several times as though he was going to cry at his own benignity—fell over themselves to congratulate Magruder on being a fine upstanding young man with a splendid future in front of him despite this setback.

The technique, of course, was exactly the one used by Senator Joseph McCarthy. Those who stood up to him, denied his accusations and refused to implicate anybody else, were torn to pieces; those who agreed with everything he said and hastened to add the names of others were given an easy passage and congratulated at the end of their session. So it was Stans and Magruder. The former admitted nothing and pointed the finger at nobody; the latter readily agreed on his own complicity in crime, and sprinkled handfuls of names, about with cheerful abandon. Their respective treatment at the hands of Ervin and his posse was eloquent testimony to the fact that the lesson taught by McCarthy had been learnt.

But there is a wider, and more important, aspect of this scandal that needs examination, though before turning to it I cannot resist one digression, in the direction of yet another member of the Ervin committee. I nearly fell out of my chair when the wizened face of Senator Herman Talmadge came up on the screen. For this Talmadge is no stranger to constitutional irregularity. Apart from being one of the strong opponents of Negro rights in Congress, he was once guilty of an action from which Huey Long himself might have flinched. Herman Talmadge's father, Eugene, was Governor of Georgia (and also used to campaign for white supremacy and against Negro advancement); after one re-election to the post, however, in 1947,

he died before being inaugurated. The state constitution provided for the lieutenant governor (that is, the deputy) to succeed, in such circumstances, to the unexpired term. Talmadge junior, however, backed by his tame state legislature, demanded the governorship for himself and seized the state capitol and posted armed guards to keep the rightful governor out. And now here he was, quoting Woodrow Wilson and plainly determined to gun down sin; it was like the town harlot reporting the clergyman's son to the police for kissing his girl goodnight in the church doorway.

Such grotesqueries make the whole business nastier; but they are not in themselves the cause of the distaste and concern that must be felt by any viewer of the Senate proceedings who retains some sense of proportion. What is really wrong with this inquisition is that it appears to be a judicial process but is in fact a political one. There seem to be no rules of evidence; certainly hearsay and even "opinion" evidence is freely admitted and even encouraged. No opportunity for confrontation of accused and accuser is permitted; no cross-examination of accusers by counsel for the accused takes place; nobody is there to see legal fair play. Men are having their reputations destroyed in full view of millions; worse, men who may shortly have to face a criminal trial are having their cases literally prejudged, without any of the safeguards of true legal proceedings. Backed up by a press now overwhelming determined to find President Nixon guilty of every accusation flung at him, the senators of the committee are conducting a tainted trial the nature of which would still be indefensible even if the motives of every one of them were beyond reproach.

President Nixon may be the greatest scoundrel unchanged; or wholly innocent of any kind of complicity in the Watergate activities; or anything in between. The same goes for all those whose names are being exchanged like trading-stamps. It is very important indeed that the truth should be determined in every case, and that full justice should be done to the innocent and to the guilty. But the method of Senatorial inquisition, certainly as it is actually being conducted by the Ervin pack and almost certainly however it was conducted, is unable to determine the question of guilt or innocence in respect of any individual, or even the question of what actually happened. What it will quite certainly do, however, is to ruin a number of men, some of whom will not deserve ruin, and none of whom will deserve ruin before such a forum and in such a manner. "My conscience", Senator Ervin has said, "will not permit me to follow after a great multitude to do what I conceive to be evil." But at the moment, the great multitude is following him and in a very disturbing direction too.

THE VALUES OF ROTC

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, William F. Miller, vice president and provost of Stanford University, was the principal speaker at the Annual Commissioning Ceremony for Cadets and Midshipmen in the Reserve officers' training program at the university recently.

His comments are indeed noteworthy, and I want to share them with the Members of this body. Therefore, I am insert-

ing the text of his speech at this point in the RECORD:

THE VALUES OF ROTC

(By William F. Miller)

I should like to take this opportunity to speak briefly on the values of ROTC—values to the nation as well as to the cadets and midshipmen.

The role of the citizen-soldier and soldier-citizen has long been a distinguished one. I speak here of both citizen-soldier and soldier-citizen. In the first case I refer to the citizen who may fill the role of soldier when called upon by his government to do so. In the second case I refer to the professional soldier who may take up at various times the role of citizen in government service, university service, or in business and industry. In this country as elsewhere, the citizenry has contributed substantially to the makeup of the military services and, conversely, the military services have given generously to leadership in civilian roles.

The value of the citizen-soldier is perhaps most prominently displayed in war time when the nation's needs for soldiery are very apparent. My distinguished predecessor on this podium, the late Professor David Potter, pointed out perhaps the most famous example is that of the early Roman, Cincinnatus, who is said to have left his plow standing in the field while hastening to take command of Roman legions defending the gates of Rome from Volski and the Aequians in 458 B.C. Having led the Romans to victory, he put down his weapons and returned to the field, taking up the plow to become a civilian again. We have many, many outstanding examples of such citizen-soldiers, including the man who is known as the founder of our country, George Washington.

But I would suggest that the value of ROTC to the nation, though demonstrated most clearly in war time, is most effective, though in more subtle ways, during peace time. For I believe a principal value of ROTC is not just the reserve strength, the added strength, brought about by having a reserve force. It is also the influence brought to the military service by officers who have been taught and trained principally in a civilian atmosphere. The purposes of the military services must be to serve the nation, to serve the people of the nation, and not to serve themselves. The validity of that statement, of course, is not self-evident. It is an expression of value on my part. It has not always been that armies existed to serve the population of the nation. Throughout history there have been armies which served themselves by asserting their will upon whomever they could. While civilian supremacy has long historical roots in the United States, in the western hemisphere today a majority of the governments are military governments, not civilian governments. Whereas I believe that it is important to have a professional soldiery today, I also believe that the proper purpose of an army is to serve the civilian population of the nation.

The ROTC-trained cadet and midshipman bring to the military services a diversity of college and civilian experiences that perpetuates the notion of civilian values while perpetuating the notion of military service to the nation. There can be little doubt that courses of study in history, political science, literature, and the sciences receive different emphases and different orientations in the setting of the public or private university than they do in the setting of a military academy. Simply the notion that most of the students in the classroom are bound for civilian careers itself provides an emphasis and orientation. Additionally, the ROTC cadets and midshipmen in their major studies have opportunities for more diverse career training and more diverse academic offerings through the many universities with ROTC programs than could be the case in the few military academies.

The military services today are very dynamic organisms, and without question in my mind those reserve officers trained in an environment of the frontiers of thought in engineering, science, the social sciences, as well as in the humanities, bring supplemental competency to a modern military service which requires sophisticated science and technology, sophisticated understanding of psychology, politics, and history, and a strong grasp of philosophic and humanistic values. Soldiers must see themselves as human beings and understand their roles in the development of the nation and mankind. This latter observation is perhaps brought out most forcefully by the report of Captain James Stockdale, U.S. Navy, on his return from being a prisoner of war in Viet Nam. I quote:

"... I address myself to the sorting and sifting of a common denominator which allowed those at Alcatraz, and scores of other exemplary prisoners of war with whom I served, return home with heads held high. A structured set of values supporting a basic tenet of self-respect was fundamental to the performance of these men. I do not presume to identify the primary source of values for others; they varied from individual to individual.

"My primary focus along these lines was acquired as a result of my association with Dr. Phillip Rhinelander, a professor of philosophy at Stanford University. During my difficult days in prison, I traced many of my needs for self-discipline to the readings he had assigned and tutoring he had given me during my post-graduate study..."

To be sure, we are not preparing our students and our soldiers to be prisoners of war. But without doubt values developed and the qualities of our students which are more clearly revealed in periods of great stress serve them well during less stressful periods also.

Before turning to another point let me emphasize my premise that the shaping of the understanding of the role of the military, the development of strategies during peace time, is perhaps the most important input of the ROTC-trained officer. This is in addition to the provision of technical skills and the provision of reserve power. Reserve power is, of course, important. Although the efforts toward peace among the major powers seem to be more intense and earnest than ever, it is unlikely that the need for well trained reserve forces will substantially diminish.

Let me turn now to the values of ROTC to the student, that is to the cadets and midshipmen. First is additional career opportunity or option. Through ROTC training, the student is provided with an opportunity for service in one of the military forces. A number of distinguished officers have capitalized on that opportunity and devoted themselves to satisfying careers in the military services. Stanford is quite proud to have contributed to a number of such officers in the services, as have other ROTC programs in the nation.

Secondly, without electing for a full time military career, the student, through reserve status and continued reserve training, is provided the opportunity for service to his country in times of national need. It can indeed be quite satisfying to realize that one can pursue a civilian career and at the same time continue to develop one's potential for service to the nation through reserve officer training.

A third opportunity is that for personal development. Officer training does provide a high degree of training for leadership and decision making. The qualities developed in the course of this preparation serve the individual well in later life, either in the military service or in a civilian career. These programs develop what one might call a command presence, a quality that comes from tactical and strategic training inherent in officer training programs. The training that

leads to the command presence develops the ability to delegate, the ability to sum up, the ability to analyze, the ability to decide, and the ability to command. These are talents of great value which will serve the individual well throughout later life. Many of us found our first opportunities for leadership in the role of an officer in the military service. Although leadership in other careers may require additional talents and additional experience, the poise and presence and the qualities that lead to decision making and leadership are often the same. Junior grade officers in the American military services generally have more opportunity for assumption of responsibility, for decision making experiences, and for supervision of people than any other entry level position in our society.

And finally, ROTC has been an important source of financial aid to many students. Increasing costs of higher education may well make this feature more attractive in the future. Careful attention to the design of a program that provides the student with opportunities for development as well as financial aid may well pay off in the attraction of future students to ROTC programs.

I should like to comment on the closing of ROTC programs at Stanford. The closing of these programs does not mean the end of military opportunities for students, nor does it mean an end to opportunities for military officers to continue their studies here, as many do. All three services still conduct open recruitment on the campus for programs leading to commissions, one of which involves current students in summer training.

Without question the development of an all volunteer force will lead to certain new military personnel needs and certain new emphasis in the type of preparation of officers for this volunteer force. This in turn may lead to a reevaluation of ROTC and perhaps to some new forms of ROTC. As a faculty-student committee noted in the spring of 1970, on a long-term basis "the universities and the Department of Defense ought to be able to devise a form of officer training that a university student might receive concurrently with his university education."

It is quite encouraging to note that the military services are exploring new forms of ROTC programs with increased flexibility in terms of the curriculum to be provided. No doubt a number of institutions, including Stanford, will be examining these opportunities in terms of student interests, academic standards, and the historic role of citizen-soldiers in democratic societies.

But today we are here to honor you Stanford cadets and midshipmen who are being commissioned in your respective services. I congratulate you, and wish you well in the careers that lie ahead of you as citizens and as military officers.

COUNTEE CULLEN: "TO MAKE A POET BLACK, AND BID HIM SING"

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Countee Cullen was one of the truly great writers that America has ever produced. Born and raised in New York City, Cullen went on to make profound contributions to our Nation's literary heritage.

At the Countee Cullen Regional Library in my home community of Harlem, a year-long arts festival honoring the poet is now under way.

It is my hope that the young people who view this exhibit will come away with a greater understanding and a deeper feeling for the arts and for a black man who was a towering figure in the field.

I now submit for the attention of all CONGRESSIONAL RECORD readers, an article that recently appeared in Tuesday Magazine concerning the life and work of Countee Cullen:

THE NEGRO IN WORLD HISTORY—COUNTÉE CULLEN

(By Phillip St. Laurent)

When Countee Cullen died in 1946 the obituaries—a full column in *The New York Times*, for instance, a page in *The Saturday Review of Literature*—seemed even then to evoke a remembrance of things past, although he was only 42. Success had come early to him, even before he had graduated from high school, and in the intellectual ferment of his and this century's '20s and early '30s he had been in the forefront of that awakening of consciousness and revolt of the spirit which became known as the Harlem Renaissance. The most active part of Cullen's career had ended by the time he was 30 and, although at his death he was at work on new projects, he was employed full time as a teacher of high school French. Yet he was remembered at his death and is remembered still for those 15 years of frenetic activity when by sheer force of will and genius he made himself the best-known black lyric poet in the United States, a man who, in *And Yet Do I Marvel*, wrote: "Yet do I marvel at this curious thing, To make a poet black and bid him sing!"

Cullen embodied the spirit of the Harlem Renaissance: in many ways he was the Harlem Renaissance, intricately bound up with his friends Arna Bontemps, James Weldon Johnson, Langston Hughes and others in that churning cauldron of ideas and dreams that first impressed upon America the idea that Negro artists had other to offer the world besides jazz, going to receptions with the rich and to rent parties with the poor in Harlem, rapping with white critics and authors for recognition and with the white wealthy for support and talking, talking, talking with each other about their hopes and dreams, their poetry and their writing.

Already, so soon after his death, Countee Cullen's origins are shrouded. He was born Countee Porter in May, 1903, probably in Harlem, and lived with his maternal grandmother until she died in Harlem Hospital when he was 13, leaving Countee only with some distant relatives in Kentucky. A friend persuaded the childless Reverend Frederick Cullen and his wife, Carolyn Belle Mitchell Cullen to adopt the boy. He was extraordinarily precocious and attended De Witt Clinton High School, then New York's chief college preparatory high school and overwhelmingly white, and won honor after honor; poetry prizes, an oratorical contest, editorship of the high school newspaper, associate editorship of the high school yearbook, vice-presidency of the senior class. Long before the country began to worry about the problems of the drop-out and the deprived he formed a committee called HELP designed to interest and encourage younger students in their studies. "He stuck his finger in every pudding," the year-book, the *Clintonian*, said when he graduated with top honors in 1922.

He credited a De Witt Clinton teacher—Cullen didn't identify the teacher but some believe it was the noted critic Lionel Trilling who taught at Clinton at the time—with interesting him in writing poetry. "I had a teacher in high school," he said, "who believed that the pupils of high school age had poetic thoughts and could express them

if they had the right sort of coaching. From then on I began to work at writing verse." His first published poem—in free verse as opposed to all his later work—was called *To a Swimmer* and was reprinted in 1918 in the *Modern School Magazine*. He won a poetry contest sponsored by the Federation of Women's Clubs, also while at Clinton, with the poem *I Have a Rendezvous With Life*, with which he was identified for the rest of his life although he was later to call it "immature."

He went on to New York University, where he continued to cut a wide swathe, not only through the undergraduate world but increasingly in the rarefied New York literary world. In 1922 the Poetry Society of America announced that Cullen's *The Ballad of a Brown Girl*, based on the English ballad of the same name which Cullen interpreted as resolving around racial prejudice, had won second prize in the Witter Bynner undergraduate poetry contest at NYU. The poem prompted a letter from George Lyman Kittredge of Harvard calling it the finest modern rendition of an old ballad he had read. In May, 1924, *Poetry* published two pages of his poems; *Simon the Cyrenian Speaks*, a tribute to the black man who carried the cross for Christ, and three short poems somewhat imitative of the style of Edgar Lee Masters. In November of the same year, when he still was 21, Cullen made his debut in H. L. Mencken's *American Mercury* with *Shroud of Color*, a long, allegorical work questioning God's concern for the Negro. It quickly became the talk of New York's literary salons and, more than any of his earlier works, established him as a serious poet. The same year his prize poem from high school, *I have a Rendezvous With Life*, showed up in *Current Opinion* and other poems were accepted by *Century*, *Harper's*, *The Bookman* and *The Nation*. William Allen White predicted that Countee Cullen would become one of America's foremost lyric poets.

In 1925 Cullen was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, the honorary scholarship fraternity, won the Amy Spingard Prize and first prize in the Witter Bynner contest, and his *Threnody for a Brown Girl*, published in the May issue of *Poetry*, won the John Reed Memorial Prize. That same year, while still a senior at NYU, he established himself, if he hadn't already, as a leader of the burgeoning Harlem Renaissance with the publication of *Color*, a volume of his poetry. Such prominent critics as Mark Van Doren praised it lavishly. Carl Van Vechtan said of Cullen's poetry: "It is characterized by a suave, unpretentious, brittle, intellectual elegance . . . some of it by a haunting lyric loveliness." A mockery of racial pride of whites and its presumption of the inferiority of other races—long before such statements were common in the black community—can be heard in one of the poems in the collection, *A Song of Praise (For One Who Praised His Lady's Being Fair)*.

In the collection *Color*, Cullen also showed a mastery of the classical verse forms and unashamedly asserted the quality, the worth and the beauty of the black race as well as referring in the poem *Heritage* to Africa, the ancestral home in which Negroes of the time were beginning to adopt a new degree of in-terest.

Cullen graduated from NYU in 1925 and went on to win a master's degree from Harvard, where he was a friend and classmate of Robert C. Weaver, later to become Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in President Lyndon Johnson's cabinet.

During these years of work and school, the "love's dark throat" (as he put it in *A Song of Praise*) for while Cullen yearned belonged to Nina Yolande DuBois, daughter of W. E. B. DuBois of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Reverend Cullen, Countee's adoptive

father, was a founder and the pastor of the Salem African Methodist Episcopal Church in Harlem, president of the Harlem chapter of the NAACP and one of the founders of the National Urban League. He had worked to obtain the employment in 1911 of New York's first Negro policeman and had accompanied James Weldon Johnson to Washington when Johnson presented his clemency appeal for the Houston Rioters (the name given a group of soldiers from an all-Negro unit who revolted against flagrant discrimination in September, 1917, and rioted in Houston: 17 whites were killed and, with only the slightest pretense of a trial, 13 Negroes were hanged and 41 imprisoned for life). As a result of his activities, Reverend Cullen had come to know DuBois well and their children had known each other all their lives. Yolande went to Fisk University where her schoolmates asked often, half jokingly, about her famous boyfriend. During school holidays they dated, often on country picnics in Maryland, New Jersey and New York.

Out of school, Cullen became, in 1926, assistant editor of *Opportunity*, a monthly magazine published by the National Urban League devoted to Negro literature and scholarship. He was in charge of selecting the magazine's poetry and of writing a column, *From the Dark Tower*. For two years with the magazine Cullen commented on theater, literature, and literary personalities and ran a report on the most popular books at the Harlem branch of the New York Public Library.

Already, in his first years away from college, Cullen was at the center of the Harlem Renaissance. A writer of the time described him:

"In place of the masque of boredom assumed by the intelligentsia, he wears a chubby, baby face lit by two sparkling eyes and a disarming smile. He has been endowed with a superior mind and has been blessed by a simple, intelligent home environment, which has resulted in producing a brilliant and lovable young man. His virtues are many; his vices unheard of."

This paragon could often be found at the home of Mrs. A'Leila Walker Robinson, who was perhaps the hostess of the Harlem Renaissance. A familiar figure at her gatherings was Carl Van Vechten, who usually could be seen at the foot of the stairs that led to the rooms on the upper floor of her home on 136th Street resting an elbow on a convenient banister and greeting the guests without the trouble of having to battle through the crowd. There was a crowd because Mrs. Robinson always invited more people than the place could hold on the theory that those who did get in arrived with the feeling of accomplishment. Countee was always at her parties, and his friends, Langston Hughes, Arna Bontemps and Harold Jackman, a teacher and one with whom Cullen enjoyed discussing literature. There were, too, all the other leading figures of the Renaissance: Florence Mills, Jimmy Lunceford, Paul Robeson, Duke Ellington, James Weldon Johnson, Walter White. A special room in the Robinson home was known, in deference to Cullen's column, as the "Dark Tower," and it was available on Saturdays during the summer to students for tea dances.

Despite the fluttering social life, Cullen kept busy creating. *Copper Sun*, another book of verse appeared in 1927 and, writing in *The New York Times Book Review* section with all the supercilious smugness, sense of superiority and lack of perception which characterized those times, Herbert S. Gorman said the collection showed "inborn Negro impulses disciplined by culture and an awareness of restraint and the more delicate nuances of emotionalized intellect. There are times when he is the more obvious Negro poet sentimentalizing about himself and his

people, but the admirable aspect is in the direct evidence that he transcends this limitation time and again and becomes a sheer poet."

That same year one of Cullen's major contributions to the Harlem Renaissance, "Caroling Dusk," appeared. It was a landmark in many ways, because an important publisher, Harper & Brothers, brought it out and because it was a collection by Cullen of the works of 38 Negro poets, an anthology that included poems by Johnson, Hughes, DuBois, Claude MacKay, Paul Lawrence Dunbar and others. Its role in helping Negroes gain recognition in the arts was significant. Although devoted exclusively to poetry, the poets represented in it were also writing fiction, painting, composing, and the anthology, as much as any other one event of the '20s, helped focus the public eye upon them and their art.

In 1927, too, Cullen made his first trip to Europe, accompanying his father on a trip to the Holy Land—Reverend Cullen brought back water from the River Jordan for use in the church—and the young poet was enraptured: the things and places and men he had read about, dreamed about, patterned his verse after, came alive to him. He saw the lands of the *Grecian Urn and Adonais*, of Keats and Shelley and Byron, Saharan Africa, the Sphinx, and it all brought him renewed inspiration. When he returned he applied for, and in 1928 won, a Guggenheim Memorial Fellowship for a year's study at the Sorbonne. But, before leaving, he married Yolande in one of the Atlantic seaboard's major social events of the year.

Some 1,200 were invited and more than 3,000 who tried to crash the wedding were turned away. All his friends were there; Bontemps, Johnson, Hughes, Jackman, Dr. Alain Locke, who was a professor of philosophy at Howard, editor of *The New Negro* and a strong influence on Cullen's life. It was a tight-knit group, fond of each other, mutually protective, united alike by race and ambition. Yolande didn't go with Cullen to Paris but fulfilled a commitment she had made earlier to work at a YWCA camp at Bear Mountain, New York. She went to Paris in 1929 but, somehow, the childhood romance didn't survive marriage and she returned ill, went to work in Baltimore, and they were divorced in 1930.

In Paris Cullen found a freedom he had never known before from the race consciousness he had known at home. Restaurant seats did not remain vacant beside him, he was neither catered to nor ignored. And he was taking part in the last gasps of the era of the expatriates. Josephine Baker had migrated from St. Louis to become the star of the Folies Bergeres. Gertrude Stein, Henry Miller, Ernest Hemingway, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ezra Pound, James Joyce and James Thurber all were there. Sooner or later they met in the cafes or in the offices of American Express on the Rue Scribe. Artist Palmer Hayden, sculptor Augusta Savage, writer Eric Walrond, all were there. And Cullen kept busy writing. Another collection, *The Black Christ*, was published during his sojourn in Europe.

He returned in 1930 to a United States wallowing in the first throes of the Depression, and, apparently, to some serious personnel readjustments. Throughout the '20s he had not been as politically passionate as his friends, who were caught up in the social crises of the times; the back-to-Africa movement of Marcus Garvey, the Scopes Trial, the Sacco-Vanzetti case, later the Scottsboro Boys, all the events which had inspired the poetry of many of his fellows and shaped their political views. But in 1932 he surprised his friends by announcing that he was joining the Foster and Ford Committee, a group of prominent writers, including Lincoln Steffens, Sherwood Anderson, Edmund Wilson

and Langston Hughes, pledged to support the Communist ticket in the 1932 elections. It seemed afterwards to be more impulse than conviction: there was little, if any, indication of socialist ideas in his writings and in 1939 he remarked that he had "never been interested in politics."

Meanwhile, he turned his attentions to his first novel, a story of an intensely religious young Negro woman married to an unbeliever called *One Way to Heaven*, which appeared in 1932. It was a cynical detached piece of work and, with a few exceptions, marked the end of his serious published writings. In 1934 he left the active literary scene to become a teacher of French at Frederick Douglass Junior High School in Harlem.

Cullen is best remembered for those years of frenetic activity between his high school student days and the time he was 30. They were years of success, of course, and a measure of fulfillment, but there seemed always to be a contradiction in Cullen and in his work. He said many times that poetry should be "a lofty thought beautifully expressed. Poetry should not be too intellectual. It should deal more . . . with the emotions." As a result he rejected dialect verse and often talked of his wish to be accepted as a poet instead of as a "Negro poet." In his introduction to *Caroling Dusk* he attacked the notion that there is an American Negro school of poetry, and said that Negro poets have far more to gain from Anglo-American poetic traditions than from "atavistic yearnings toward an African inheritance." His favorite poet was Keats and his favorite recent poet Edwin Arlington Robinson. Yet, obviously, for a man who had written *Heritage*, *Ballad of a Brown Girl*, *Color* and the rest, the whole body of his poetry rested on what he stated he personally rejected. As early as 1926 he was concerned with the chasm between what he said and what he wrote.

"In spite of myself," he said, "I find that I am actuated by a strong sense of race consciousness. This grows upon me, I find, as I grow older, and although I struggle against it, it colors my writing, I fear, in spite of everything I can do. There may have been many things in my life that have hurt me, and I find that the surest relief from these hurts is in writing."

He never said what these hurts were. He was, in fact, remarkably restrained about his childhood and wrote only that he "was reared in the conservative atmosphere of a Methodist parsonage," which was not precisely true: if Reverend Cullen was religiously conservative he was certainly, for his time, a political activist. Cullen didn't fully absorb either attitude. And, whatever the hurts were, he minimized them in 1939 when he was interviewed for the Myrdal-Carnegie study, which produced Gunnar Myrdal's landmark book, *An American Dilemma*. "I have met with very few instances of discrimination during my life," he said. "I don't mean to convey the impression that I'm still not aware that I'm a Negro, and being a Negro there are some things that will always be closed to me. I'm speaking now of everyday experiences and how little actual difference it makes in New York if you are a Negro or a white." Yet his professed inability to remember instances of discrimination or see "little actual difference" is directly contradicted by one of his early poems, *Incident*, and two other poems from the collection *Color—Atlantic City Waiter* and *For a Lady I Know*.

Regardless of the cross-tides of his life and mind, Cullen continued sporadically to write while teaching, although a critic wrote after his death that it was fitting that "Cullen's active career stopped with the end of the Harlem Renaissance. Had he written in the '30s when whites could not afford the Harlem vogue and when Negroes had so many more pressing concerns than the lionizing of Negro poets, Cullen would not have won the fame he did . . . for he reflected and

typified the notions that whites and Negroes wished to have of the Harlem Renaissance."

Still, in 1935 he translated the *Medea* of Euripides into powerful prose, although the choruses were in verse, and it was set to music by Virgil Thompson for the stage version. He became interested in the theater and, although he was childless, in children's books, writing *The Lost Zoo* in 1940 and *My Lives and How I Lost Them* in 1942. Twice he refused chairs at universities and he lived at the Salem church's parsonage with his father until he remarried in 1941. The poet's widow, Mrs. Ida Mae Roberson Cullen, still lives in Harlem.

His interest in the theater grew as he withdrew farther from poetry and he and Arna Bontemps collaborated on a play, *St. Louis Woman*. The music was by Harold Arlen, the lyrics by Johnny Mercer, it was directed by Rouben Mamoulian. The famed dancing Nicholas Brothers were in the cast, Harold starring as Little Augie, and Fayard in a lesser role. Ruby Hill was the "St. Louis Woman," Pearl Bailey made her Broadway debut and Rex Ingram and Juanita Hall were also in the cast. And Cullen, apparently contented at last, commuted happily from the home he and Ida had purchased in Tuckahoe, N.Y., to school and the rehearsals, spent weekends putting in his garden, and seemed to have found a new career.

But just a week after final rehearsals began Cullen was taken ill, and died in New York's Sydenham Hospital. The obituaries were ample. "Mr. Cullen was one of the most brilliant of the young poets of the era between the two World Wars," *The New York Times* said. "Although he had race consciousness, his dominant interest was poetry, the consensus of critics being that his roots went very deep into lyric soil." *The Saturday Review of Literature* commented: "He was a true poet and wrote brave and beautiful things. . . . It is a loss to all of us that such a fine young poet is gone." Five years later Charles S. Johnson, president of Fisk University, speaking at the ceremony changing the name of the 135th Street branch of the New York Public Library to the Countee Cullen Branch said Cullen "was utterly uncomplicated as a personality; even tempered with an unexcited eagerness for the friendship of people and books."

As the final coming of circle of history, to expand the library the home behind it, facing on 136th Street, had been bought and razed. It had been the home of A'Leila Robinson, site of the "Dark Tower."

CURRENT DROUGHT SITUATION IN CENTRAL AND WESTERN MONTANA

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, there is currently a severe drought situation in the State of Montana, especially in the central and western sections. The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—ASCS—is finalizing a request by some 19 affected counties that they be declared disaster areas by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The major importance of having these remarks placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is that the drought in a food-producing State like Montana will affect the Nation on the whole. It is therefore, imperative that Members be kept informed of the situation.

The following is a set of findings re-

sulting from a drought disaster tour in Montana:

DROUGHT DISASTER TOUR IN MONTANA

On Friday, July 20, we made a helicopter tour of an 18 county area and made five stops to meet with farmers, ranchers, county commissioners and U.S.D.A. county committees and personnel to discuss with them the U.S.D.A. disaster designation.

Those on the inspection trip were: Terrence Harmon, Western Regional Director A.S.C.S. U.S.D.A., Washington, D.C.; Leo Kolstad, Executive Director, Montana A.S.C.S.; James Wilson, Montana A.S.C.S. state committee; Max Maberry, Montana A.S.C.S. Administrative Officer; Forest Wesen Montana F.H.A. Office; George Lackman, Commissioner of Agriculture; Doug Smith, Agriculture Coordinator; and, Richard Goffrey, K.R.T.V.

We made stops and met with concerned citizens at Missoula, Hot Springs, Augusta, Martinsdale and Deer Lodge at each stop. Between 25 and 100 people were waiting for us.

The following are the results of the drought:

1. Unusually heavy marketing of cow-calf pairs at reduced prices because Montana ranchers cannot absorb them in Eastern Montana.
2. Feed Grain prices are extremely inflated for Barley and Oats, as an example, Barley was selling at the unheard price of \$4.27 per cut on Friday, July 20.
3. U.S. Forest Service is forcing permittees off our forests by early August and mid August.
4. Fall weaned calfer will have low weaning weights and cows conception rates will be lower next year because of lack of calcium, phosphorus and Vitamin A in dry feed.
5. If we approve an emergency feed grain program it will last until next May or June.
6. Many ranchers have reduced herds by 50% which they have taken a lifetime to build up. You don't jump in and out of the cow business over night.
7. Consumers will pay more for beef which is already in short supply because of abnormally early marketing, selling off food stock and high feed prices.
8. Hay prices are extremely high, \$60 per ton, and impossible to buy at the present time.
9. Livestock water supplies in reservoirs and wells is diminishing rapidly.
10. Irrigation water is way down meaning only a 50% hay crop on many irrigated areas.
11. Ranchers cannot find pasture or hay, thereby don't know whether to sell out or what.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

CONGRESSMAN STEIGER'S ANALYSIS OF THE ANTI-IMPOUNDMENT BILL

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention a perceptive analysis of the recent anti-impoundment bill passed by the House, made by my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER). BILL STEIGER has a reputation on both sides of the aisle as a man who does his homework and knows the issues. The August 1 newsletter he sent to his constituents, illustrates why that reputation is deserved.

The newsletter clearly sums up the import of last week's vote: By requiring only one house, rather than both houses, to disapprove Presidential impoundments, the House allowed the Senate to assume a new dimension of control over spending decisions, thus violating the tradition prerogative of the House in the spending area. Moreover, by acting only to control Presidential spending decisions, rather than acting also to create its own congressional budgetary controls, the House dealt only with the effects of overspending, and avoided the cause of that overspending.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Congressman STEIGER's newsletter at this point in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman WILLIAM A. STEIGER)

The House last week passed a bill attempting to limit Presidential power to refuse to spend appropriated funds. In doing so, it once again showed its propensity for confronting politics. The anti-impoundment bill is not good legislation. It is combative and almost surely invites a Presidential veto.

Both the Senate and House have now passed anti-impoundment legislation. The House version provides that the President must notify Congress if he decides not to spend certain funds. If either house disapproves his action within 60 days, he must release the funds for spending. The bill, which would be in effect only until June 30, 1974, would establish a spending ceiling for Fiscal Year 1974 of \$267.1 million.

The bill has a number of flaws, and several amendments by House Republican Conference Chairman John Anderson (R-Ill.) which would have corrected those flaws were unfortunately defeated. The most important of his amendments would have required both houses of Congress to disapprove impoundments by concurrent resolution. The proposal lost twice on Tuesday by a 205-206 margin and on Wednesday by a 208-212 vote. The result is twofold: the House, in effect, is denied equal standing with the Senate, and it also opened the door for one house of Congress, acting with fiscal irresponsibility, to overrule the wishes of not only the President, but the other legislative body as well.

Even more fundamentally wrong is to take up a measure to end Presidential spending controls without acting at the same time to control congressional spending. At least the House bill is only for one year, rather than the permanent provisions of the Senate bill. The one-year stipulation maintains pressure for action on a pending bill, which I am co-sponsoring, to insure congressional budgetary control. My bill would require Congress to set over-all budget figures at the beginning of each year and stay within them. If it failed to do so, it would have to raise revenue to meet the added costs.

I also think it important that we put the whole impoundment question in proper perspective. For all the attention it's been given in the last year, one would almost think that impoundments are an invention of the Nixon Administration. This is simply not true. They date back as far as Jefferson and have been used ever since. In fact, impoundments under President Nixon are smaller in terms of total outlays (3.1%) than those under the previous two administrations (approximately 6%).

Further, it has not been the human resource side of the budget, but rather the space-defense-public works side that has had the biggest share of impoundments. The latter category accounted for some 70% of impounded funds in FY 73; only 9% were in the areas of community development housing, education, manpower, health, and income security. I have felt that the President

erred in some of the areas in which he chose to impound funds and informed him of my feelings when he impounded housing and agriculture funds. But the fact remains we have gotten a distorted view of his impoundment actions.

The House bill is not the best approach in the fight for fiscal responsibility. It has good intentions, as in the setting of a budget ceiling and in providing a means for stronger Congressional voice in the budget process. Unfortunately, those intentions got clouded in the partisan consideration of the bill. I want to share some comments Congressman Anderson made during debate on the legislation Tuesday:

"H.R. 8480, as it now reads, is not a responsible and responsive bill; it is a scenario for constitutional confrontation and political game playing. One of my Democratic colleagues on the Rules Committee put it another way when he said this bill is 'worthless,' 'silly,' and 'meaningless.' He went on to say that when we have a real opportunity to strike a blow for our prerogatives, we run for cover."

That Democratic Rules Committee member hit the nail on the head when he used those words. In fact, as we near the Congressional August recess, I think they are an all too appropriate assessment of the first seven months of the 93rd Congress. Unless those controlling the Congress show a willingness to seek responsible solutions to the problems facing us, the record of this Congress could be even less notable and productive than that of the 92nd Congress.

THE PROFITABLE CRISIS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, with so much attention focused upon Watergate, the public is unknowingly being victimized by another scandal, one that affects each and every American: "Oilgate." The major oil companies are using the "energy crisis" to rob the consumer, pollute the environment, and boost their own profits.

The severity of the petroleum shortage is uncertain. What is certain is that six major oil companies reported higher profits and revenues this year than last. The six—Standard Oil of California, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Continental Oil Co., Atlantic Richfield Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., and Marathon Oil—cited increased sales and production and higher prices as reasons for their "improved performance."

Atlantic Richfield, for example, recorded net income during the second quarter of this year as 50 percent higher than the same period of 1972. Standard Oil of Indiana reported first-half profits up by 29 percent over last year. Yet the day before these reports reached the papers, the chairman of Standard Oil warned the National Press Club that the growing shortages could render the Nation "effectively paralyzed," according to the Washington Star-News of July 25.

During the same period that these majors gained earnings of at least 20 to 30 percent over last year, some 1,200 independent gasoline stations have been forced to close and independent refiner-

ies around the Nation are operating at 50 to 75 percent of capacity. To the independents, and to the consumers, the shortage is all too real.

Before approving an Alaska pipeline bill which threatens not only the environment, but the authority of the courts, and which permits the powerful majors to extend their monopolistic control over the oil industry, I urge my colleagues to seriously consider the evidence that the majors are manipulating the shortage for the sake of higher profits.

In this regard, I commend the following testimony to my colleagues. It was submitted, upon my request, by former Senator Fred R. Harris to the Energy Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, in connection with its current hearings on the causes and effects of the gasoline, fuel, and diesel oil shortages:

STATEMENT OF FRED R. HARRIS

Members of the Public Works Committee: I commend those who have been involved in setting up this hearing. It is important that American consumers and taxpayers not be stampeded by the big oil companies and the big utility companies because of the so-called "energy crisis."

The real energy crisis is that there is too much subsidization and too little competition throughout the entire energy industry.

The major oil companies escape about one-half of their federal income tax liability by means of the depletion allowance and the intangible drilling costs write-off. They escape about three-fourths of the rest of their federal income tax liability by being allowed to treat foreign royalty payments as tax payments, and, thus, as credits against U.S. income taxes.

These special tax favors are subsidies. They come out of the taxpayer's pocket to make a few people and big corporations richer. But no one is asking what we get for our money. If it is more oil reserves we want, why do we give the depletion allowance to the landowner? If it is more domestic reserves in America we want, why do we allow the depletion allowance for foreign production by U.S. companies?

The truth is that the big companies have rapidly driven the independent producers—those who have historically found new domestic reserves—out of business. And while the sixteen largest U.S. oil companies paid an average federal income tax rate of only 7.5% on their 1971 earnings, they were putting the majority of their exploration and discovery investment into foreign operations.

There is no competition in the energy industry. Utility companies are private monopolies for private profit, generally powerful enough to control those who are supposed to regulate them. Oil companies are huge conglomerates that have rapidly bought up the competition—not only the competition in oil, but also the competition in gas, coal, uranium, tar sands, and thermal power. And they have a cartel on world oil production.

There is an energy crisis. It is a crisis of too much power in too few hands. Watch the oil companies cut off the independent gas stations. Watch them cut off what few small refineries are left. Watch them gobble up the few independent producers that still hang on.

Watch them raise their prices. Watch their profits continue to zoom upward. Watch them use the energy crisis to scare us and our public officials into giving them more of our money for greater private profit and smaller public return.

These things are already happening (1500 independent gasoline marketers were forced out in the recent scare) and they will continue to happen unless the people stop them. I believe that can be done, a belief based on

two assumptions: first, that people are smart enough to govern themselves; and, second, that the democratic process can be made to work. This hearing is a good place to start.

MAKES NEWS REPORTS TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 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:

FEDERAL CRIME LAWS NEED REVISION

In a message to the Congress this week, President Nixon announced his intent to submit to the Congress the Criminal Code Reform Act aimed at providing a comprehensive revision of existing Federal Crime laws. This act proposes needed changes and closely reflects the thinking of the citizens of the 13th Congressional District who recognize the need for more effective law enforcement and criminal prosecution.

The need to reinstate the death penalty, the need to halt the frequency of criminal acts and the need to take positive action against drug offenders are three of the most widely voiced views appearing in the letters received by Congressman Price. The President's Criminal Code Reform Act would be a step in the right direction toward restoring respect for the law and bringing an end to the recent era of permissiveness.

The Criminal Code Reform Act acknowledges the death penalty to be a valuable deterrent to crime and would dissuade individuals from taking the lives of others in the course of committing another crime. As proposed, the death penalty would be imposed for war-related treason, sabotage, espionage, and when the death of an innocent person has been caused due to serious offenses such as kidnapping and aircraft piracy.

The act also provides for stricter penalties for narcotic pushers. Under the new act heroin or morphine pushers would receive higher mandatory sentences with second offenders who are convicted of trafficking in more than four ounces of heroin or morphine receiving a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment without parole. Those charged with trafficking in heroin or morphine would also be denied pre-trial release. The President has also urged that marijuana not be legalized.

It is time that the loopholes surrounding criminal acts are plugged—it is time to insure that our laws and system of criminal justice work, not only to insure the rights of the criminally accused, but also the rights of society and the innocent victims of crime.

CONGRESSMAN BOB PRICE IMPROVING

Congressman Bob Price returned to his room in the general care section of Bethesda Naval Hospital this week. The Congressman, who underwent additional testing and treatment last week in the coronary unit, has recently been showing signs of improvement and is conducting a limited amount of office business.

The Congressman's office has recently been receiving many letters and petitions from citizens nationwide voicing their support of his constitutional amendment which would permit voluntary prayer in our Nation's classrooms. This bill has been referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

The United States Department of Agri-

culture announced this week that farm commodity exports will reach an all time high of \$11 billion during Fiscal Year 1973. This figure means a gain of \$5 billion during the last four years. These figures prove that agriculture is demonstrating that it is one of our major growth industries and that it has the strength to produce adequate food for nutritious American diets while shipping to major countries abroad at a record pace.

With the return of our POW's from Vietnam, the controversy surrounding the question of amnesty for draft evaders and deserters has once again come under extensive debate. Despite the ending of American participation in the Vietnam Conflict, Congressman Price has reiterated his belief that the granting of wholesale amnesty would undermine the respect for all law. Historically, amnesty has been granted only under limited circumstances, and public opposition toward granting amnesty to all deserters and draft dodgers is showing signs of being on the increase.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN SERVES ON IMPORTANT COMMITTEES

Congressman Price this week announced the details of two appointments which he has received. Through a letter from House Minority Leader Gerald Ford, he was informed of his reappointment to the House Republican Policy Committee where he will serve as one of seven Members-at-Large during the 93rd Congress. As a member of the House Republican Policy Committee, the Texas Congressman will work closely with other members of the House leadership in conjunction with the White House to formulate and expedite the enactment of proposals as part of an overall legislative program. In a separate announcement, Congressman Bob Price was also named to serve as a Member of Subcommittee Number One of the House Armed Services Committee, whose major responsibility is legislation affecting programs of research and development for the Department of Defense.

Congressman Price's office is continuing to respond to correspondence and inquiries arriving daily from the Congressman's constituents. The Congressman, who is presently convalescing at Bethesda Naval Medical Center outside of Washington, is receiving information about the various issues of concern to his constituents.

In recent days, a large volume of correspondence, much without return addresses or names, has been received in Congressman Price's office concerning a proposal by a Veterans Administration official to lower the rating schedule for service-connected disability compensation. An inquiry by the Congressman's office has revealed that President Nixon had no personal knowledge of this proposal, nor had he authorized it to be formally presented to the Congress.

Legislation has been introduced which will, if enacted, limit the authority of the Veterans Administration by freezing the service-connected disability compensation rating schedule as in existence in January, 1973. This legislation will also make any proposed changes subject to the approval of the Congress.

PRICE PROPOSAL PASSES HOUSE

Congressman Bob Price continues to make good progress toward recovery at Bethesda Naval Hospital where he has been a patient for the past two and one half weeks.

Doctors there report that additional comprehensive testing and observation of Congressman Bob Price over the past several days have revealed no evidence of a heart attack or further cardiac damage following an incident of chest pain Monday.

The Congressman, who had been readmitted to the coronary unit for further evaluation, has since been moved back to his room in the general care ward of the

hospital where he continues to rest comfortably.

Late Thursday, February 22, the House passed legislation, similar to that introduced earlier this year by Congressman Price, to amend the Farmers Home Administration Emergency Loan Program by a vote of 269 yeas to 95 nays. The bill as passed by the House was a more expensive version of the Price legislation. If this legislation is enacted, the "grandfather" amendment attached to the bill Thursday will give all farmers and ranchers in Secretariially designated disaster areas an 18 day period in which they may apply for 1 percent disaster loans under the \$5,000 forgiveness clause. Furthermore, this legislation provides for a 5 percent interest rate for those loans provided for under the provisions of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act. This legislation is now awaiting further action by the Senate.

During this week while the Congress is in recess in honor of Lincoln's Birthday, Congressman Bob Price continues to make good progress at Bethesda Naval Hospital where he has been undergoing extensive testing and treatment following a mild coronary occlusion last week. Doctors have determined that no complications have been detected and the Congressman is responding well to treatment. Price is expected to remain in the hospital for another two to three weeks before being released.

This week in one of his most strongly worded letters to President Nixon, Congressman Bob Price expressed opposition to any plan or scheme to provide economic assistance to North Vietnam as part of the peace settlement. Price's office has received a tremendous number of letters from concerned constituents who have registered their opposition to any plan for aid to North Vietnam.

The text of Congressman Price's letter to the President is as follows:

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to express my objection in the strongest of terms to any plan which would involve American financial or economic aid to the government of North Vietnam.

Those of us in the Congress who have stood resolutely with you in opposition to the demands among various dissidents in and out of the Congress for peace at any price have done so because of our agreement with your stated premise that Americans who have fought, died, and "paid a price" to resist Communist aggression shall not have done so in vain.

After ten years of cruel war it would be unconscionable to lavish over two billion dollars of assistance upon a government which has been responsible for the deaths of over 50,000 Americans, hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese, and has practiced the most sadistic and brutal forms of inhumanity and has scoffed at the most elementary rules of civilization and human decency.

It is true that the United States helped rebuild our former enemies of Germany and Japan at the close of World War II, but that was after the militaristic and dictatorial regimes of both nations were deposed. In North Vietnam today the same persons who have attempted to defeat and humiliate the United States are still in control of the government, and any attempt to buy or bribe their friendship or cooperation is as doomed to failure as every other giveaway program this Nation has undertaken in the past.

Mr. President, I supported you in your bid for an honorable conclusion of the Vietnam conflict. Let us not reward those who have

forced upon this Nation our darkest hour since the Civil War. Sir, my conscience will not permit me to do this.

Respectfully,

BOB PRICE,
Member of Congress.

THE JULY CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, both here and abroad the 1973 Captive Nations Week was fervently observed. The results of the annual observance clearly show that countless citizens and our friends abroad are steadfastly mindful of the reality of the captive nations in Central Europe, within the U.S.S.R., Asia, and Cuba. This is a most encouraging phenomenon as the following examples indicate:

First, proclamations by Mayors Norman Y. Mineta of San Jose, Calif., Richard H. Marriott of Sacramento, Calif., Gerald W. Graves of Lansing, Mich., Randolph Wedding of St. Petersburg, Fla., and Russell G. Lloyd of Evansville, Ind.; and

Second, a striking statement on the week by Anthony Harrigan of the United States Industrial Council.

The articles follow:

CITY OF SAN JOSE, CALIF., PROCLAMATION

Whereas, this coming July 15-21, 1973 will be the 15th observance of Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas, Congress established this necessary annual observance by passing in 1959 the famous Captive Nations Week Resolution, which President Eisenhower signed into Public Law 86-90; and

Whereas, the recent talks with Brezhnev cannot erase the fact that the peoples of the Captive nations in Central Europe, within the USSR, in Asia and Cuba still are captive under totalitarian Red rule as they were in 1959; and

Whereas, pragmatic deals with despotic communist regimes do not include for any true American the deal to sell the captive nations into permanent captivity;

Now, therefore, I, Norman Y. Mineta, Mayor of the City of San Jose, do hereby proclaim July 15-21, 1973, as "Captive Nations Week" in the City of San Jose, and invite the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas, in the midst of the general well-being enjoyed throughout the free world, it gives us pause to consider that not all of the earth's population is free to think, to worship, to speak as it may please any individual, and

Whereas, in that spirit of reflection, let us again renew the cry that those populating the captive nations must enjoy those same freedoms taken for granted by so many of us;

Now, therefore, I, Richard H. Marriott, Mayor of the City of Sacramento, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15 through July 21, 1973, as Captive Nations Week, and do urge all our citizens to meditate upon the hardships endured by those whose lives are not yet their own.

PROCLAMATION

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, Gerald W. Graves, Mayor of the City of Lansing, by the power vested in me, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 15, 1973, as "Captive Nations Week in Lansing" and call upon the citizens of this City 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.

PROCLAMATION—CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG

Whereas, by Joint Resolution on July 17, 1959, the Eighty-Sixth Congress authorized and requested the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas, fourteen years have passed and there have been many changes in international affairs but one thing that has not changed is the desire for national independence in Eastern Europe;

Now, therefore, I, Randolph Wedding, Mayor of the City of St. Petersburg, Florida do proclaim the week of July 15-21, 1973 as Captive Nations Week and urge the people of St. Petersburg to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and to renew their devotion to the high ideals on which our nation was founded and has prospered and to sustain with understanding and sympathy the just aspirations of the peoples of all nations for independence and human freedom.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, many peoples in Central Europe, in Soviet Russia, in Asia and Cuba still are captive under Totalitarian rule;

Whereas, the week of July 15-22 has been established by the Congress of the United States as Captive Nations Week;

Whereas, the Congress has requested that people of the United States do observe Captive Nations Week, with appropriate ceremonies and activities;

Whereas, such activities will sustain the hopes and aspirations of the captive peoples;

Now, therefore, I, Russell G. Lloyd, as Mayor of the City of Evansville, Indiana, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15-22 as Captive Nations Week and do urge all citizens of this City to take proper cognizance thereof.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The essential thing to bear in mind about contemporary Europe is that half of the continent is under the rigid control of the Soviet Union, operating through a system of satellite powers. Half of ancient Christendom, in other words, is a pawn of the communist empire.

It is against this reality that Americans should view the European Security Conference, the first phase of which recently opened in Helsinki, Finland. The conference is being widely hailed as another step toward peace, another indication that the Soviets are sincere in their desire for detente with the Western nations.

This is a naive approach, however, which ignores history and the current actions of the USSR. The Conference on European Security was first proposed by the Soviets in 1966. Their objective then and now is to give international recognition to legalizing its hold over captive nations and to win acknowledgment from the West of the USSR's position of supremacy in Eastern and Central Europe. In the process, Communist East Germany will be given new international status and West Germany will be at least partially neutralized.

Many Americans can't get it in their heads that the Soviets have a tradition of militant diplomacy and that they doggedly persist in advancing their interests under cover of "peace" propaganda. No sooner had the Helsinki meeting opened than Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko contended that the conference should recognize the "inviolability" of existing European frontiers. Svevoid Sofinski, spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry, asserted that the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia wasn't interference in a country's internal affairs. Thus old-line Stalinist concepts and propaganda lines continue to dominate in what is supposed to be a wholly new era of East-West relations. Clearly, the cold war is not over.

The European Security Conference won't get into arms reduction discussions. But it is worthwhile noting that the Soviet diplomatic positions on Europe are reinforced by the existence of 31 Soviet divisions in Eastern Europe, with a further 60 maintained in western Russia. The U.S. has fewer than 15 divisions in its entire army.

Perhaps it is too much to hope for that the U.S. delegation to the European Security Conference will take a strong stand in favor of emancipation of captive peoples in Eastern Europe. Yet now is the time—if there ever is to be a time—to discuss the captivity of the Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians.

Now is the time to recall that on August 23, 1939, Foreign Minister Ribbentrop of Nazi Germany and Foreign Minister Molotov of the Soviet Union signed the infamous Moscow pact under which three Baltic countries—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—were handed over to the Soviet Union. The people of these Baltic countries were treated to all the cruelties at the hands of the Soviet Union that Nazi Germany reserved for the Jews of Eastern Europe. This handover was one of the great injustices of modern times and should be remedied.

The desire for national freedom continues to flourish in the Baltic lands, despite a generation of Soviet persecution. It would be intolerable if the United States and other free nations gave formal recognition to Soviet rule of these captive nations.

Of course, the Baltic people aren't the only captive peoples in the Soviet empire. All the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe live under the Soviet gun. The periodic Soviet military exercises are a frequent reminder to Yugoslavia and Romania. For example, that Soviet armed forces could descend on them at any time.

In short, the Soviets continue to maintain an infamous system. For all Brezhnev's

clowning in America, the Brezhnev doctrine of direct, armed interference in East and Central Europe remains Soviet foreign and military policy. The Soviets also are encouraged by their success in getting the U.S. to accept inferiority in strategic arms through the SALT agreement. Now they want international recognition of their territorial lines and power base in Europe. This is their objective at the Helsinki meeting and at the Geneva gathering which will constitute phase two of the conference.

For their part, the free world nations should uphold the cause of freedom in Europe, the ancient seat of Western civilization.

CONSIDER THE ALTERNATIVES TO THE TRANS-ALASKA OIL AND GAS PIPELINE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, by permission previously granted, I am inserting information relative to the importance of the Canadian oil and gas pipeline route as opposed to the proposed trans-Alaska route.

I urge this material to the attention of our colleagues as prepared by the Alaska Public Interest Coalition:

ALASKA PUBLIC INTEREST COALITION,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: As you consider how you will vote on H.R. 9130—The Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act—we believe you will want to consider this:

Michigan will receive no oil, now or later, which flows through the trans-Alaska pipeline to the West Coast. Not one farmer, businessman or citizen in your state will benefit directly from the Alaska oil by that route.

The reason for this is simple. There are no oil pipelines crossing the Rocky Mountains from the West Coast to your part of the country. It is not feasible to move oil over the Continental Divide, so Alaskan oil will be delivered to and remain in a West Coast pool if it isn't exported. Whatever benefits may come from the Alaska oil, they won't come to your state or constituents directly, nor for a long, long time.

This is why the National Oil Jobbers Council, representing America's independent oil marketers, staunchly supports a Canadian alternative!!! They know your part of the country is where this resource of domestic oil is most needed.

By contrast, a trans-Canadian pipeline from the North Slope would bring Alaskan oil directly into your state. At Edmonton, that line would connect into the existing Interprovincial-Lakehead Pipeline System—already being expanded to handle a greater flow. And that existing oil transportation network connects directly to your state, and could be pumping Alaskan oil to your constituents just as soon as a Canadian line were built.

But that's the hitch. Pressured by the major companies who would own the Alaskan line, the Congress may just approve the trans-Alaskan route before the alternative that would better serve your constituents has been fairly considered. More profits for these firms may result—but what about the farms, factories, schools and households in the farm belt, the Midwest, the Atlantic Coast and the South?

As environmentalists, we are convinced by

available evidence that the trans-Alaska route is fraught with very real dangers. We believe impartial study will show the Canadian alternatives superior. Either way, we are convinced that the real energy need, and the main shortage, is in your region.

Proponents of H.R. 9130 will ask you to support the trans-Alaska route. They will ask you to oppose the amendment that would keep the National Environmental Policy Act in application to this project, and the amendment which would assure an accelerated 6 month study of the Canadian alternative so that Congress could have full answers about oil delivery via the Canadian route. We ask only this—that you remember that conservationists do not oppose development of Alaskan oil, and that the environmentalists' court suit—which this bill would block—is aimed at getting fair consideration of the Canadian alternative.

The Alaskan oil will flow before long. Wouldn't it be best to get it flowing where it's really needed?

DOUG SCOTT.

WHO IS ADVOCATING THE PROPOSED MACKENZIE VALLEY OIL PIPELINE

Participating U.S. and Canadian companies in Mackenzie Valley Pipe Line Research Ltd., sponsor of the recently completed \$7 million, four-year feasibility study for a 48-inch trans-Canada oil pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Edmonton, Alberta, are:

AMOCO Canada Petroleum Co., Ltd.
Ashland Oil Canada, Ltd.
Cities Service Co.
Elf Oil Exploration and Production Canada, Ltd.

Gulf Oil Canada, Ltd.
Imperial Oil Ltd.
Interprovincial Pipe Line Co.
Mobile Oil Canada Ltd.
Shell Canada Ltd.
Standard Oil Co. of British Columbia Ltd.
Texaco Inc.
Trans Mountain Pipe Line Co., Ltd.
Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Ltd.

WHAT THE TRANS-CANADA CONSORTIUM SAYS ABOUT A MACKENZIE PIPELINE

Here are highlights from testimony of David Waldon, president, Interprovincial Pipe Line Co. and vice president, Mackenzie Valley Pipe Line Research Ltd., taken from the transcript of the Senate Interior Committee hearing of May 2, 1973:

Some of the participants in Mackenzie Valley still feel that the first oil from the North Slope should go to the Mid-Continent area. p. 235. Some quite strongly. pp. 251, 255.

As far as the length of time before either line could be operational, trans-Canada is not as far off pace as some people make it out to be. pp. 235-6.

Interprovincial and Lakehead (its subsidiary) which connect Edmonton with Chicago, Toronto and Buffalo already have the necessary right-of-way to beyond Chicago and already are expanding their existing system with 48-inch pipe. p. 236.

The two companies are prepared to put up the hundreds of millions (not billions) to expand the 1,565-mile line to Chicago and it could be completed without any undue delay. p. 236.

Transmountain can also be enlarged to carry Alaska oil from Edmonton to the west coast. p. 237.

A 1,738-mile Mackenzie Valley Prudhoe-Edmonton pipeline can be built within four years of final decision to proceed, provided final government approvals are granted within the first year, according to feasibility study. p. 238.

The trans-Canada backers have reason to believe that the Canadian government's attitude is generally favorable. p. 240, and p. 247.

Waldon can't conceive of the Canadian

government stopping U.S. production going through Canada. p. 248. Predicts U.S.-Canada agreement. p. 250.

He doesn't know any pipeline company unwilling to increase its capacity if production is there. His company would start doing it immediately. p. 248.

Waldon thinks problems such as native claims can be solved. p. 249.

Waldon doesn't think there has been sufficient discovery yet to justify a second pipeline. p. 251.

Prudhoe-Edmonton cost estimate is some \$3.5 billion. pp. 238, 239, 241, 243. Waldon thinks improved technology will offset some cost inflation. p. 253.

BACKGROUND MEMO: WHERE A MACKENZIE PIPELINE WOULD TAKE ALASKA OIL

The 1,738-mile trans-Canada oil pipeline proposed by a consortium of major U.S. and Canadian companies (see list, upside) would take Prudhoe Bay crude oil to Edmonton, Alberta. From Edmonton it would be pumped through existing Canadian-U.S. pipeline systems already supplying refineries in eight states.

The 1,900-mile Interprovincial-Lakehead system, largest crude oil pipeline system in the western hemisphere, transports western Canadian crude oil to U.S. refineries at:

Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota.

Wrenshall, Minnesota.

Superior Wisconsin.

West Branch, Michigan.

Alma, Michigan.

Bay City, Michigan.

Trenton, Michigan.

Carson City, Michigan.

Detroit, Michigan.

Toledo, Ohio.

Canton, Ohio.

Warren, Pennsylvania.

Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Laketon, Indiana.

Chicago, Illinois.

Buffalo, New York.

The 711-mile Trans Mountain Pipeline transports Canadian crude from Edmonton to four U.S. refineries on Puget Sound.

**NATIONAL OIL JOBBERS COUNCIL*:
RESOLUTION No. 3**

Whereas the national energy shortage mandates the speedy transportation of Alaskan crude oil to the "lower 48", and

Whereas in District II the shortage of energy impinges most severely because its geographic location denies its access to alternative world sources to which coastal areas have access, and

Whereas the shortage in District II is more than can be supplied from Districts III and IV, and

Whereas the nation has traditionally found and still finds a strong ally in our Canadian neighbor, an alliance buttressed by treaties and other joint enterprises for our common defense, and

Whereas large quantities of crude oil and natural gas flowed and currently flow into the Midwest from Canada, and

Whereas there is widespread support for a Mackenzie Valley pipeline to bring natural gas from Alaska to the Midwest, and

Whereas American oil companies have made and continue to make large investments in Canada, and

Whereas one of these investments is one of the world's largest networks capable of transporting substantial volumes of crude oil from Canada to the United States which the companies have recently enlarged, and

* Adopted at meeting in St. Louis, Mo. on April 27, 1973. National Oil Jobbers Council is a federation of 38 state and regional associations of jobbers covering 46 states, with a membership of over 13,000. The NJOC members handle 25% of the gasoline and 75% of the fuel oil sold in the United States..

Whereas the Canadian Energy Minister has publicly stated his belief based on numerous studies that a crude oil line along the Mackenzie Valley would be environmentally safer than the Alaska pipeline, and

Whereas in the light of the delays to which the Alaskan line has been subject and will continue to be subject, a Mackenzie Valley pipeline will bring Alaskan oil to the area where it is most needed more quickly than it could be brought if an Alaskan line, a tanker fleet, and a line eastward from Seattle had to be constructed,

Now therefore be it resolved that the National Oil Jobbers Council and its officers carry to all appropriate executive and legislative agencies its strong support for a Mackenzie Valley pipeline to bring Alaskan crude oil to the "lower 48".

PRESIDENT URGED TO REVIEW HIS ADMINISTRATION'S STAND ON THE TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, by permission perviously granted, I am inserting today the text of a telegram addressed to the President urging that he review his administration's documentation on the proposed trans-Alaska oil and gas pipeline in view of the many pro-conservation statements the President has reiterated during his term.

The telegram, which I enclose at this point, from Mr. Thomas L. Kimball, executive vice president, the National Wildlife Federation, speaks for itself.

I urge the attention of the President, the administration and our colleagues to the following:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
Representative JOHN D. DINGELL,
Capitol Hill, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The highly controversial Alaska pipeline issue is now entering its final stage of debate in Congress. Quite aside from the merits of the plan to route the pipeline through Alaska, there is a momentarily-important side issue at stake. We are referring to the language in the proposed pipeline legislation (H.R. 9310) which would result in circumventing provisions of the national environmental policy act. The intent of H.R. 9130, i.e. to build a pipeline can be met without jeopardizing the continued viability of NEPA. For your administration to condone such a legally and environmentally-unsound precedent-establishing action, especially in view of your often-expressed concern for conservation of natural resources is unthinkable.

Conflicting views on the NEPA element of the pipeline issue apparently remain at the highest White House staff level. Hence, the National Wildlife Federation, on behalf of the 3 1/2 million citizens it represents urges you as matter of highest priority to review your administration's position in this matter.

We are confident that such a review will quickly lead you to speak out forcefully against any attempt to use the Alaska pipeline issue, or any other issue, to weaken the provisions of NEPA.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Vice President.

H.R. 9286

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as we approach a vote on final passage of the military procurement bill for 1974—H.R. 9286—I feel an obligation to my colleagues, and to my constituents, to inform them regarding my position on this legislation. As my record clearly shows, I have not voted favorably on military authorization and appropriation bills for a number of years. There were several reasons for this. A major consideration was my opposition to the Vietnam war, which took a major portion of all military funds for many years. The most effective way to express my opposition to that war was to vote against the funds to continue it. Such has been the role and responsibility of the representatives of the people in parliamentary bodies since at least the days of the Magna Carta.

Further reasons included my strong objection to that type of thinking which held that military force could solve all security and foreign policy problems. This thinking was reflected in a disproportionate devotion to all things military, and gave rise to an overriding political influence by that vaguely defined entity which President Eisenhower named "the military-industrial complex." This same type of thinking also resulted in a corresponding decrease in our ability to comprehend, attack and solve the more fundamental problems of an increasingly complex and troubled society.

I must say that we have not yet sufficiently changed that style of thinking, nor have we changed the resultant legislative priorities to the extent that we must if we are to meet the conditions of this constantly changing world. Yet we are now moving toward, instead of away from, such a proper balance. I shall try in the future, as I have attempted in the past, to contribute in this House toward a better understanding of where that proper balance is.

In attempting to establish criteria by which I could determine whether or not to vote favorably on military bills this year, I decided many months ago on two major factors. First, American military involvement in the war in Vietnam must be ended, and our troops removed. Second, the level of defense expenditures must be less than the level created by Vietnam. The first of these conditions was met with the signing of the peace treaty in January and the removal of the last U.S. combat soldier a few months later. The action of the Congress last month in mandating an August 15, 1973 end to all military activity in Indochina added additional confirmation to this action.

The second condition left me with greater doubts. The bill before us did not meet that condition in the form reported by the committee. I have therefore supported all reasonable efforts to bring it

below the level of 1973. Only with the adoption by this House of the Aspin-Rousselot amendment, by the substantial vote of 241 to 163, which reduced the overall level of spending authorized by this legislation by nearly a billion dollars, did I feel that this condition was met.

I shall therefore vote for this bill on final passage. In doing so I reserve the right, as we all do, to continue to work toward that more desirable balance between military and domestic spending which we must still seek. I do not intend to support all military spending in the future, nor to oppose it. But I will weigh it carefully by what I consider reasonable criteria, in the light of the overall needs of this country. I will apply a similar approach to domestic spending, much of which has also been wasteful and non-productive. If our collective wisdom is sufficient, perhaps we can make the progress we all desire toward the common good.

Mr. Speaker, I may have further to say about this measure at a later time, but, recognizing the fact that it is already late I will close for now.

BLACK ARTISTS IN LOUISIANA

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am most honored to introduce to my distinguished colleagues a man who has contributed to the world of art and literature a noteworthy revelation of the creative powers within the State of Louisiana.

Morris Taft Thomas is an author, artist, and assistant principal at Bolton High School, Alexandria, La.; he has just completed his second book entitled, "Contributions of Negro Artists in Louisiana." The book is a collection of artists' achievements which was undertaken by Mr. Thomas as a result of his desire to make the public aware of Negro contributions, especially in the world of art. More importantly, his book was written to pay tribute to those Louisianians who have used their creative talents in a constructive and artistic way, thereby directly or indirectly motivating young people to seek higher goals in the field of art.

This most timely monograph contains the lives, works, and artistic contributions of 20 nationally recognized Louisiana artists. Some of these notable artists are: David Butler, Frank Hayden, John Payne, Edward Barnes, Vernon L. Winslow, Clementine Hunter, Dr. Joseph Cardoza, and Alfred L. Stevenson. The great achievements of these artists proclaim an awakening for the cultural good of all Louisiana.

Mr. Thomas, his wife, Willola, and daughter, Joni, reside in Alexandria, La. He received his B.A. degree and M.Ed. degree at Southern University in Baton Rouge, La.

Mr. Thomas' first article was published in *Today's Art* magazine in 1966. Since that time he has written over 65 articles for national publications. His first book, "Activity Plan Book for Art Teachers," was published in 1971. He has won numerous awards in sculpture and ceramics. His work has been exhibited in Dallas, New York, Chicago, New Orleans, and many other great cities.

I know my colleagues will join me in urging Mr. Thomas to continue his task of alerting the public to the contributions of black artists.

NEW BEDFORD: THE FRESH-FISH CAPITAL OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the city of New Bedford, which is part of the district I represent, is the fourth largest fishing port in the United States in dollar volume. In its May, 1973 issue, the *Fish Boat* contained a special 32-page section on New Bedford, the "Fresh-Fish Capital of the United States." Because the history, problems, and hopes of the Port of New Bedford are exemplary of those of the fishing industry throughout our Nation, I insert the lead article of this special section at this point in the *RECORD* for the attention of my colleagues:

NEW BEDFORD: THE FRESH-FISH CAPITAL OF THE UNITED STATES

If you have ever read *Moby Dick* or heard of Herman Melville you have no doubt heard of the Massachusetts fishing port of New Bedford and were aware of its prominence in the world whaling trade for much of the 19th century. At one time more than half of the whaling ships were New Bedford ships and half of those that remained sailed out of New Bedford, where they outfitted and unloaded their cargo.

When whaling died out with the discovery of oil, New Bedford turned its attention to cotton and soon became a leader in the manufacture of fine garments. Even today the textile industry is prominent in the city but during this time fishing was not neglected. Although it came nowhere near the whaling and cotton industries in size or value it was always profitable and very stable, bringing many individuals a fine living from the sea. Because of its protected harbor at the mouth of Buzzards Bay and the southerly flowing Acushnet River, entrance and exit to and from the port was relatively easy for both the whaling schooners and the fishing vessels.

With the advent of synthetic materials in the 1920's cotton manufacturing slowed considerably and fishing took on added prominence. Soon New Bedford, once known as the whaling capital of the world, was known as the scallop capital of the world, with 90 per cent of the scallops taken from the sea being landed at the port of New Bedford. A scallop festival held yearly attracted visitors from all over the world. Other forms of fishing also flourished and New Bedford had once again turned to the sea as a prime source of its economy.

New Bedford was originally a small village in the township of Dartmouth, a tract of land purchased from the Indian leader Massasoit and his son Wamsutta. With New Bedford in the township were present day Fairhaven, Acushnet, Westport and Dartmouth.

In 1787 the township was divided into the towns of New Bedford, Dartmouth and Westport and the town of New Bedford became a prime whaling city. Fairhaven, originally a part of New Bedford, became a separate town in 1860. Fairhaven and New Bedford lie on opposite sides of the Acushnet River and the separation seemed natural. Today, however, their economies are so closely related there is often no real distinction between the two as far as the fishing industry goes. As it was with the whaling trade and as it is today, many of the boats are built and serviced in Fairhaven while New Bedford acts as the landing point and the home port.

LEADS ALL PORTS IN FISHERY VALUE

Today, New Bedford is the largest fishing port on the east coast in economic value. Scallops still play a role in the economy of New Bedford but yellowtail flounder is the primary fish landed. Other fish taken are flounder, perch, groundfish, hake, gray sole, haddock and cod. Occasional lobsters are mixed in with the catch.

But perhaps more than quantity, New Bedford is known for fresh, quality seafood. The flounder brought in each day is sold at a city-run municipal auction on pier 3 and delivered immediately to the processing plants where it is filleted and otherwise processed and shipped out fresh, usually the same day, to markets on the east coast. Some is frozen for use during slow seasons and when the quota is reached.

NEW BEDFORD SEAFOOD HAS REPUTATION

Fresh New Bedford flounder has a reputation all its own and is sold in the finest restaurants in the east where it is normally listed as being from New Bedford. Because of the problems of shipping fresh fish packed in ice, distribution is necessarily limited but some is flown to cities in the midwest and west where it has become established as a gourmet item.

TOP FACILITIES WITH HURRICANE PROTECTION

The harbor facilities in New Bedford are ideal for the fishing industry. First, the harbor is naturally protected by its location on the Acushnet River just inside Buzzards Bay. In addition, because some severe storms have left their mark on New Bedford, an \$18,000,000 hurricane dike was completed which has reduced the damage to a minimum. The dike spans the entrance to the harbor and permits access through channel gates.

Since the dike was completed by the Army Corps of Engineers with financing from the federal and state governments, as well as the cities of New Bedford and Fairhaven, there have been no serious losses from storms or excessive tides. In 1972 the dike was closed 18 times and prevented an estimated \$710,000 in flood losses during that year alone. If it had been completed prior to August 1954 an estimated \$26,000,000 in storm damage from one storm alone would have been prevented.

The dike is 13,000 feet long, with a 4,500 main harbor barrier and channel gate, and the rest connecting dikes.

TWENTY-FIVE ACRES RECLAIMED FOR HARBOR EXPANSION

Behind the protected barriers is the new South Marine Terminal or South Terminal bulkhead, a New Bedford Redevelopment Authority Project completed in 1971. Approximately 1,600 feet long, the bulkhead allowed the reclamation of about 25 acres from the harbor for expansion for the fish processing plants which had been operating in cramped quarters on dilapidated wharves for numerous years.

Begun in 1969 with Housing and Urban Development Funds the bulkhead has a draft of 30 feet along 1,000 feet of its length and 20 feet along the rest.

It is faced with mariner steel to protect against corrosion. At present there are three fish processing plants that have been completed along the bulkhead and two more in the final stages of completion. All of the plants have tie-up facilities for direct unloading from the fish boats.

WORK ON WHARVES UNDERWAY

Also in for a facelifting are the wharves along the waterfront of New Bedford, City Pier 3 and Pier 4 as well as Homer's Wharf and Leonard's Wharf are due for steel fenders. Work on Pier 3 and 4 is slated to begin in January 1974. The state pier is in relatively good condition and there are no plans for work there.

STORAGE, ICE MAKING AND FREEZING FACILITIES PLENTIFUL

North of the wharves the Redevelopment Authority has also completed the reclamation of about 19 acres for expansion of the waterfront community. A 1,000 foot bulkhead with mariner steel facing and a 32 foot draft, fronts the reclaimed land, known as the North Terminal.

Already established along the North Terminal are Quaker Oats Company which has a cat food plant and the Maritime Terminal, a large three building complex of freezer and storage space. According to Richard Viall, an officer with the firm, Maritime Terminal has 360 feet of deep draft frontage and a storage capability of 15,000,000 cubic feet. There is also 2,500,000 cubic feet of freezer space which can handle large amounts of whole tuna in addition to other fish. Storage is on galvanized steel pallets stacked 22 pallets high. One of their primary customers for the storage of frozen fish is the Frionor Norwegian Frozen Fish Ltd., the largest foreign seafood processing company in the U.S.

In addition to the storage and freezing facilities of Maritime Terminal, Ice Engineering, Inc., a relatively new ice manufacturing company located on Fish Island, has a freezer capacity of 200 tons. They also make flake ice for the fish processing companies and have another plant, New Bedford Ice, for block ice for the boats. Crystal Ice Co. on Pier 4 also manufactures block ice for the fish boats. Mullins Freezer on Middle St., Fairhaven, adds to the freezer storage capacity of the New Bedford/Fairhaven waterfront.

NEW HIGHWAY TO SERVICE INDUSTRY

Servicing the New Bedford waterfront will be a new highway presently under construction. A spur of I-95 East, it will parallel the waterfront from the Fairhaven bridge to Leonard's Wharf, move inland about one block and give access to the South Marine Terminal. The South Terminal roadbed is already complete and in use.

Some have maintained that the highway will effectively separate the heart of the city from the waterfront, and give that as the reason why it was planned in the first place. However, there will be easy access to both the waterfront and the city through an interchange at the Fairhaven bridge and Union Street at the foot of the State Pier. Paralleling the waterfront and the highway will be a service road for access to the individual piers and the highway. Overall, the highway should eliminate severe traffic congestion generated by the waterfront and allow for easier entrance and exit for trucks. They will be able to avoid the central city streets and get into and out of the waterfront faster thus allowing for even faster delivery of New Bedford's fresh fish.

INDUSTRY HAS SOME PROBLEMS

Of course, any industry is not without its problems, and the fishing industry of New Bedford has its share.

Most people connected with the industry will tell you without hesitation that the most significant problem is the Russian fishing fleet.

And what is it that the Russians are supposed to be doing that is causing trouble for the New Bedford fishing fleet? Mainly, it is overfishing and lack of conservation combined with disdain for the rules of the game which means they are not supposed to catch certain species. However, observation from many people including National Marine Fisheries investigators, has ascertained that the Russians do indeed violate these rules for catch limits and species limits and there is little, it seems, that can presently be done. A 200 mile limit has been asked.

The Russians are not alone in causing the trouble. There are a number of other nations fishing the same grounds and all or most appear to be in violation of the rules. Some say, the Spanish fishing fleet is by far the biggest troublemaker.

With overfishing and little attention to conservation the reserves of fish on George's Bank, the prime grounds for yellowtail flounder, have become seriously depleted and many fishermen and processors are worried that the fishing industry will suffer severe harm if the problem escalates.

PRICES AT ALL TIME HIGH

The catch is already down from previous years, due not entirely to foreign nationals, and the price of fish is up significantly at the municipal auction. Although the fishermen are temporarily happy with the price of fish, it may, in the long run, prove to be short lived unless something is done. Processors are asked to pay more and charge more and lately the price of fresh fish has skyrocketed.

With the high market prices driving potential customers away the industry will feel the sting eventually.

LOOK TO CONGRESS FOR HELP

There is some move in the Senate toward a resolution protecting the fishermen from among other things, the foreign nationals. It was introduced by Senator Eastland (D. Miss.) (State of the Fisheries, March, 1973) and had the support of 42 other senators.

HIGH COST OF INSURANCE BRINGS NEW PLANS

Other problems beset the fishermen of New Bedford aside from the foreign nationals. One is the high cost of insurance, especially Protection and Indemnity and another is the high cost of financing boats and equipment.

Some solutions may be forthcoming, however. Len Roach, president of Boatowners United, one of the two boatowner's groups in the city, tells of cooperative insurance plan his group has, but he won't divulge the name of the company. He says the premiums have gone down significantly since they began this new program.

NEW APPROACH TO BOAT FINANCING

Roach adds that some members of his group have also submitted applications for loans for boats and equipment under a new plan of the Production Credit Associations, a farm financing system in use for the last 40 years. Recently they have begun financing the fishing industry. (State of the Fisheries, March, 1973) This may help alleviate some of the financing problems in the fishing industry of New Bedford.

Other boat-owners have banded together in what they call a P & I club which allows them cheaper premiums for insurance. This program is through the Neptune Mutual Association managed by Independent Marine Services, Inc., Collingswood, New Jersey. Neptune itself is registered under Luxembourg law.

Another problem, but one that is not talked about as much, is the New Bedford reluctance to turn to new species such as redfish, squid, whiting, herring and dogfish. There is a con-

siderable market for dogfish in France and squid in Europe, in general.

FLEET NEEDS UPDATING

But perhaps the most significant problem overall is the state of the fishing fleet. Many boats are old and cannot compete with the foreign nationals. In addition most of the boats are side trawlers which are not as efficient as the stern trawler. Not too many additions have been made to the fleet and some processors, fearing that the fleet will deteriorate to such a state that they will have no fish, have begun to establish their own fleets.

NEW OPTIMISM PREVAILS

However, there is optimism in the air even if no one will overtly predict a return to former heavy landings. Many processing companies have built new plants in the South Marine Terminal in anticipation of better times. There is a general feeling that this time Congress will support the fishermen against the foreign nationals.

Various groups among the fishermen and dealers as well as the unions have been working toward a common goal of better conditions for the New Bedford fishermen and are beginning to recognize that if they get together they may be able to accomplish more than they could singly.

In addition with new insurance and financing plans there should be a general upgrading of the fleet with attendant increase in catch. The weather was also bad much of the early spring thus preventing much fishing and driving the price sky high. At press time, fish were coming in and the price was back toward a more normal level.

Some processors predict that the reluctance of the fishermen to catch new species, a reluctance that partly hinges on refitting boats at considerable cost, will fade as will the reluctance of processors to handle the fish.

The new facilities will also add to the overall appeal of New Bedford as a fresh fish port and once again the city will count its name among the most famous fishing ports in the world.

SOLAR ENERGY: BECOMING A REALITY IN DENVER

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in the July 25 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Congressman TEAGUE exhorted Members of the House to read a recent Washington Post editorial on the need for research into solar energy. The editorial quoted members of the NASA-National Foundation panel which is exploring solar energy use as saying "(t)en years from now . . . one out of every ten homes built in this country could be heated and cooled by solar rays." Such a projection, however, is based on the assumption that the Federal Government will begin a concerted program of development in this area.

I have recently learned that Denver has an architect, Mr. Richard L. Crowther, who has been exploring new and innovative architectural designs which will bring solar heating and cooling of homes in this country closer to a reality. Mr. Crowther is currently living in an ultramodern home he designed himself. The home is a living experiment which demonstrates that a residence can be built at a cost of under \$60,000 which

effectively conserves year-round energy supplies while maintaining comfort within the home. Less than 7 percent of the cost of the home was required to provide the energy conservation systems.

The home does not have a mechanical solar collection or a collection storage system, but due to the energy conservation methods employed, the home itself acts as a collector and conserves about 50 percent of the energy for heating and cooling normally used. In this time of inflation and energy crisis, this home is an invaluable example, heating 2,600 square feet at an average monthly cost of \$13.

The NASA-National Foundation panel suggested that "before solar energy becomes a substantial source of clean energy, industrial ingenuity and productive know-how must be mobilized to produce the hardware and services necessary to make the conversion devices economical." Mr. Crowther suggests that the careful orientation and control of solar radiation secured through proper location choice and design can readily be achieved in most new residences today and that such homes are easily convertible to solar power at a much lower cost. Thus, between the recent appropriations of funding to research into solar energy and innovative architectural design by individuals like Mr. Crowther, it appears that the beginnings of a solar age in housing may very well be upon us.

Lt. COL. ADDISON E. BAKER—A
HERO OF THE PLOESTI RAID

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today, August 1, marks the 30th anniversary of the daring air raid on enemy-controlled oil refineries and installations at Ploesti, Rumania, in 1943. As a result of this action, five Americans were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, including one awarded posthumously to Lt. Col. Addison E. Baker of Akron, Ohio, a member of the 9th U.S. Army Air Force. I would like to pay tribute to Lieutenant Colonel Baker and his comrades by placing his Medal of Honor citation in the RECORD at this point:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy on 1 August 1943. On this date he led his command, the 93rd Heavy Bombardment Group, on a daring low-level attack against enemy oil refineries and installations at Ploesti, Rumania. Approaching the target, his aircraft was hit by a large caliber anti-aircraft shell, seriously damaged and set on fire. Ignoring the fact he was flying over terrain suitable for safe landing, he refused to jeopardize the mission by breaking up the lead formation and continued unwaveringly to lead his group to the target upon which he dropped his bombs with devastating effect. Only then did he leave formation, but his valiant attempts

CXIX—1729—Part 21

to gain sufficient altitude for the crew to escape by parachute were unavailing and his aircraft crashed in flames after his successful efforts to avoid other planes in formation. By extraordinary flying skill, gallant leadership and intrepidity, Lieutenant Colonel Baker rendered outstanding, distinguished, and valorous service to our Nation.

OF HEROES AND HEELS—PRISONERS OF WAR AND PRISONERS OF "PEACE"

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, two groups of young Americans go overseas. The first group returns battered and bruised, the second boastful. The first group fights the enemy, the second fraternizes with him. The first group is captured by the enemy, the second is captured by him. The first group is devoted to its country, the second despises it.

The following remarks, Mr. Speaker, will attempt to contrast the startling difference which exists between that incredibly courageous body of 500 American servicemen, known as prisoners of war, who came out of the Vietnamese valley of death with that other group, the pitiful radicals and pathetic revolutionaries, who have made themselves prisoners of peace-propaganda. The latter group to which I refer calls itself the Venceremos Brigade—VB—a term aptly selected for the martial ring it has, as well as for its true nature and purpose. I will briefly comment upon this group first.

Between November 1969 and May 1973 six contingents of young, pro-Hanoi, pro-Havana, American radicals numbering about 1,800 members visited Cuba, at Castro's invitation, where they attempted to assist the Communist dictator resolve his growing economic problems by cutting sugarcane, planting trees, and pouring concrete foundations for workers' barracks. While in Cuba they met and worked with delegations from the armed forces of North Vietnam and from the Vietcong.

In return they received all the blessings of brainwashing which a grateful Communist state could bestow. Indeed, even the organization's title reflected the musings of a well-scrubbed brain; in English, "Venceremos" means "We Shall Win." The "We" of course was not you, nor I, Mr. Speaker, nor the U.S. Government you may be assured. The hoped-for winners were Hanoi abroad and its anti-American allies here at home who belonged to the so-called peace movement. The specific losers would be the American Armed Forces including the prisoners of war. Although the brigade's ostensible purpose was humanitarian, its actual mission was to prepare its members to be journeymen in the art of the propaganda put-down, that is, of Uncle Sam and all that he represents.

The VB members in Cuba viewed the Communist Vietnamese there with a fawning, child-like, almost grovelling awe which their own diaries and notebooks substantiated.

"What to make of these gentle Boy Scouts, formal and shy—of their funny brown faces and Terry-and-the-Pirates yakety-yak? They're beautiful." The above and the following glowing commentaries about a delegation of Vietcong and North Vietnamese soldiers in Cuba was made in a remarkable compilation of diaries, letters and notebooks by members of the infamous Venceremos Brigades—VB—during their visits to Red Cuba.

Martha Jo Trolin of Harrison, N.Y., wrote of her excitement when informed that the Vietnamese were coming to their Cuban camp:

All morning people painted signs, drew posters . . . People were getting ready to meet the Vietnamese. We lined up on both sides of the entrance road.

Several brigadeers "held cross stalks of cane." The banners of the NLF—the communist puppet government in South Vietnam—were painted on hats, headbands, shirts, and even machetes, she said, continuing:

The signal went off and four cars rode by . . . hands held out to us all, ten smiling faces. We walked in back of the cars and then led the Vietnamese Comrades to the recreation hall. * * * In front of the hall hung two huge pictures—Ho and Che.

Trolin then quoted a "sister" Vee Bee as having said:

The Vietnamese flag [Communist] is the symbol of militancy that we march behind in demonstrations. It is the one symbol that unifies us and gives spirit and strength to the revolutionary youth in the United States.

Joyce Beryl Suhl of New York City was equally thrilled by the arrival of the Communists from Vietnam:

Inside the recreation hall, where the speeches were to be held, the chants continued and became more frenzied. It was a jolting experience to be face to face with young Vietnamese guerrillas. . . .

North Americans couldn't stop chanting and clapping "Ho Ho, Ho Chi Minh, the NLF is going to win!"

"We must have seemed like overbearing giants to the 10 Vietnamese who were quietly sitting on the speaker's platform," she mused. They looked "very small, like boys and many of them were young." And those who spoke, she added, did so with "incredible humility and calm." It conveyed "such power over the 700 Americans that—a feeling of awe took hold of us." It was finally time "to listen to these most courageous people, from whom we had so much to learn," she concluded.

Not to be outdone, Miss Trolin warmed up to the mind-blowing event and cooed:

But to see them in the flesh, with their unlimited warmth and compassion for the people they have every right to despise! To sit in the same room to cut cane with the people who symbolize the strength and the consciousness that we are striving for, and then to be able to talk to them, ask them questions, answer their questions, to be considered comrades in struggle by Vietnamese people—that was the thing.

Another cane-cutting brigadeer, this one anonymous, was almost overcome. He wrote that "at moments I find myself almost in tears; years of words and chants touch down, touch us." The South Asians are changing huge parts of the world, he said. One Communist in particular appealed to him: "What thoughts are running behind that beautiful shy face with the straight teeth."

Some Americans apparently wanted to spend more time with the Vietnamese. Carl Glenn Lacy of Oakland, Calif., told how they chased the Vietcong, as they left the recreation hall, with more "weird questions" and cameras.

Later, during an evening session, Miss Suhl wrote that the Americans gathered around the visitors and asked questions in "hushed, respectful tones, and every word of the confident answers was anxiously waited for."

Morton Morris Vicker of San Francisco, one of the older delegates at age 53, seemed as impressed as the younger Americans were about this "very inspiring thing."

To think that these people who have been fighting Americans for the past ten years. . . can feel warmth and comradeship with Americans reveals at least a great amount of understanding, and maybe something more.

When an English journalist later asked him how he could applaud and be pleased by some of the speeches made by people who were killing his fellow Americans Vicker's true colors shone forth. He replied that he had fought against fascism in World War II and his support of the Vietnamese Communists against the "ruling class of Amerika" was "just an extension of the fight."

David Zeiger, another Vee Bee, was traumatically moved by the fact that the visiting Communists would stoop to cut sugarcane stalks with the Americans. To him, all this was just beautiful. Paired off with North Vietnamese gave Zeiger an incredible feeling, something which he had never experienced before. Desiring only to be but a comrade and friend to his cane-cutting colleagues from Asia, he came close to the mark in exposing what the psychological and political purposes of the Venceremos junkets were all about with the following outburst:

It was the first time here that I felt a real sense of international spirit—an understanding of who my enemy was and who my friend was—that had nothing to do with culture or political boundaries. *I am an ally of the Vietnamese and I live inside it's enemy. My home is behind enemy lines—words that carry so much more meaning now than they did two days ago.* (Italics added)

Patrick Ruckert of Seattle, felt compelled to apologize to one of the Communist soldiers because his brother, an American GI, had participated in the Vietnam action.

Gregory Lord Husband of Chicago could not restrain his emotions for the Communists and, pen in hand, poured forth this ditty:

GIANTS

Little yellow and brown Men with laughing eyes

Eensy weensy dudes who sound as if they're laughing, singing
Sounds like water bubbling and bells tinkling
Little men with giant souls whose smile is warm like the sun. . .

Steve Kramer of New York City said that the Vietnamese were "seen as the symbols of the most heroic people around," adding, and tipping his ideological hand in the process, that "everyone realizes that you can not provide a society with all the comforts or reach a Communist state until there is a revolution throughout the world."

Tarnel Abbot, a 16-year-old girl from Oakland, dialoged with a 22-year-old girl named Margarita from Hanoi whose brother was also in Cuba. Miss Abbot, apparently moved by the whole scene, said that they "talked and never stopped smiling." The lady from Hanoi warmed up to the occasion and told the American youngster that she was like a sister to her and should visit Vietnam after "we have our revolution in the United States"—italics added. Miss Abbott gushed, "I almost started crying."

James Loudermilk of Berkeley revealed proudly that he was now an internationalist as a result of his contacts with the Communists; "Nothing that ever happened to me before has done so much to make me an international person as this experience has."

Carol Brightman of Sharon, Mass., former editor of the pro-Hanoi, and now defunct Viet-Report publication, and a leading guru in Brigade affairs, implied that the fawning attitude of the Americans toward the Communist Vietnamese was perhaps a bit overdone:

With the Vietnamese we were perpetually "overcome with emotion"; worshipful and distant. The Vietnamese do embody the most exalted ideals open to human struggle. But does it have to follow that our appreciation of them leaves us speechless? Because we really hit them with the most trivial questions, and most of the time hung around like gawking giants.

Mr. Speaker, the above remarks speak for themselves concerning the veneration which the Vee Bee members held for the Vietcong cane-cutters in Cuba. But also, according to the Americans, revolutionary governments and revolutionary movements abroad had begun to develop a new respect for the budding movement here.

Julie Nichamin, a leading activist in the radical Weatherman faction of the Students for Democratic Society, and an organizer and national committeewoman of the Brigade, has pointed to the new respect which the Americans now enjoyed abroad:

They treat it with a great deal more seriousness now. They think that the fact that hundreds of young people have made the commitment to go down to Cuba, to break the blockade, to struggle in harvest, understanding that the struggle is an anti-imperialist [read USA] struggle, says a lot about the development of a revolutionary movement in this country.

The growing affinity between the Vee Bee members and the Vietcong could not have been made clearer as the following dialog between a brigadier and a Viet-

namese in Cuba reveals (on the subject of troop withdrawal).

(American) The movement in the United States now is really unsure of what kind of tactics, what kind of actions or organizations are necessary to really bring the troops out of Vietnam.

The Vietnamese comfortingly assured the American that:

(Vietnamese) Your action is little or much, but you go to the battlefield at the same time as we, and we are the same fighters on the same front. (Italics added)

That the Vietcong used their contacts with the Americans for the purpose of instructing the latter was brought out by James Loudermilk in his conversation in Cuba with a "diplomat from the NLF"—the Vietcong's political parent, the National Liberation Front. The unnamed diplomat, according to Loudermilk, told him that the Vietnam war "should be the priority item" for the radical U.S. movement.

Patrick Ruckert was told by a North Vietnamese soldier that he fully understood the problem of the American GI, adding that it was regrettable that they must fight each other. Ruckert also spoke and worked with the first secretary of the NLF mission whose name was Huynh Van Ba—a pseudonym—from Da Nang, South Vietnam. Huynh Van Ba told Ruckert that he had read hundreds of U.S. underground papers, and also, that the GI organizing program—a project by the new left to create disaffection within the Armed Forces—"was one of the most important things the movement in the U.S. was doing" (italics added).

Mr. Speaker, it is understandable why the Communist Vietnamese are well informed on American military personnel. During hearings held in Miami in October 1972, on the Venceremos Brigade by the House Internal Security Committee, a key witness provided some excellent testimony and insight into the comradeship existing between the Vietnamese and the American Vee Bees. Unknown to the Cuban hosts, or the Vietnamese, or the Brigade itself, this particular Vee Bee was Dwight D. Crews, a deputy sheriff of the Jefferson Parish, La., police department.

While in Cuba, Crews, whom the Vietnamese knew to be a former GI, was interviewed by one member of the North Vietnamese delegation for the purpose of soliciting information about GIs and veterans. He was asked, for example, about the type of benefits which a veteran received after his discharge; the benefits received by the families of GIs killed in action; and the future trend of the GI movement in the United States.

After Crews had given the North Vietnamese some general information on the subject including data about the \$10,000 GI life insurance policy, he asked the Asian why he wanted such material, having noted that his remarks were being written down. The North Vietnamese replied that, on his return home, he expected to get a job interrogating American POWs.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the second part of my remarks, namely that

noble and gallant group of over 500 American prisoners of war who came out of North Vietnam with their heads high and their hearts true to this Nation's principles. Perhaps John Wayne, the movie actor, best summed up this country's appreciation when he remarked at the White House reception for the POW's on May 24, 1973: "You hung in there when the going was rough—you love this country." He added:

I want to thank all of you for showing the kind of men we put up when the going gets rough. You're the best we have.

And the worst we have—the ideological scum of American society—were "put up" in Red Cuba with the Vietnamese Communists. It was their behavior and activities in the new left movement, supportive of victory for Hanoi, which contributed in no small way to making the "going rough" for our POW's, particularly our aviators. The Vee Bees in Cuba had characterized the Communists from North and South Vietnam as boy scouts, as eensy, weensy dudes, as comrades, as sisters, as friends, as allies, and attributed to them the following attitude: Incredibly humbly, warm, compassionate, understanding, gentle, little men with giant souls, and smiles warm like the sun.

Tell it to the POW's who survived, somehow, the tender mercies of the "eensy weensy dudes" in the hell-holes of their Asiatic concentration camps.

The House Internal Security Committee held hearings in May 1973 on legislation which would restrict the travel of new left collaborationists who had traveled to the Hanois and the Havanais for the purpose of making life more unbearable for our fighting men as well as to improve their propaganda techniques for putting down Uncle Sam. Testimony given by five POW witnesses, and documents produced for the hearing record, as well as press accounts, revealed that the American flyers were subjected to such inhuman treatment that it almost defies description.

The hearing record depicted the ordeal sustained by Col. James H. Kasler, USAF, a POW for 5 years:

My worse session of torture began in late June 1968. The Vietnamese were attempting to force me to meet a delegation and appear before TV cameras on the occasion of the supposed downing of the 3000th American airplane over North Vietnam. I couldn't say the things they were trying to force me to say. I was tortured for 6 weeks. I went through the ropes and irons 10 times. I was denied sleep for 5 days and during 3 of these days was beaten every hour on the hour with a fan belt. During the entire period I was on a starvation diet. I was very sick during this period. I had contacted osteomyelitis in the early 1967 and had a massive bone infection in my right leg.

They would wrap my leg before each torture session so I wouldn't get pus or blood all over the floor of the interrogation room. During this period they beat my face into a pulp. I couldn't get my teeth apart for 5 days. My ear drum was ruptured. One of my ribs broken and the pin in my right leg was broken loose and driven up into my hip. I lay in agony for 6 months until I was given an operation in January of 1969.

This was "compassionate" treatment? Lieutenant Commander Hall testified

that one of his POW prisonmates who, because he refused to meet with a pro-Hanoi American delegation and who was considered to have had a "bad attitude," was put in solitary confinement for a year and a half and was constantly beaten. This was "understanding" treatment?

Navy Capt. James A. Mulligan told the committee that the Communists manacled him in stocks in such a fashion that he was forced into a painful position which was "semistanding-kneeling." He remained in this torturous posture from 5 a.m. until 6 to 7 p.m. for a period of 3 days in spite of the fact that he had a broken shoulder and cracked ribs. Mulligan was kept in solitary confinement for 42 months often without food, water or medical care. This was "gentle" treatment?

Lt. Comdr. David W. Hoffman, who was in a body cast from waist to shoulder, was given what the POW's called the rope treatment. In his case this involved the placing of a chair upon a table, and sitting the victim in the chair. Next, one end of a rope was placed under the POW's armpit while the other end was fastened to a hook which had been fixed to the ceiling above the chair. The table was then kicked out from beneath the "wayward" aviator who would descend abruptly and be jarred to a halt in mid-air. Hoffman also had refused to visit with the touring Americans "antiwar" types. This was treatment by "humble" men?

Lt. Comdr. John S. McCain III, broke a leg and both arms when his aircraft was shot down. When the North Vietnamese soldiers located him they thrust a bayonet into his foot and slammed a rifle butt against this shoulder which broke. McCain, whose weight had dropped from 155 to 100 pounds, was fed only three or four spoonfuls of soup a day by the Communists. Of his 5½ years of confinement the Navy pilot spent 2 in solitary.

When, during one interrogation, McCain was asked why he was disrespectful to his guards, he responded by saying that they had treated him like an animal. The 10 guards who were present thereupon pounced on the prisoner beating and kicking him every 2 to 3 hours for 4 days during which time his left arm was broken again and his ribs cracked. Ironically, one of the incidents which had precipitated the beatings was McCain's refusal to sign a statement expressing his gratitude for the "humane treatment" which he had allegedly received as a POW. Was this the type of first aid rendered by little "boy scouts"?

The courageous commander stated that many POW's had been similarly brutalized following their refusal to acknowledge the "treatment" accorded them. McCain recalled that Navy Capt. Richard Stratton had been given "the business" perhaps more than most POW's. The Communists burned him with cigarettes and tore his thumbnails backward. His "huge rope scars" bear evidence to his treatment. Was this the treatment offered by "warm" hearted men?

Air Force Capt. Robinson Risner made

the statement after his release that the Communist would tie a POW's wrists behind his back in such a fashion as to force his head downward until his toes or feet were in his mouth. Was this what little men "with giant souls" had to offer?

Army Maj. F. Harold Kushner, a doctor, who was incarcerated in a South Vietnamese prison camp told the press that he was the only man captured prior to 1968 who had survived the treatment in the Communist camp at Quang-nom. He said that the overall death rate of American prisoners in South Vietnam was 45 percent, higher than that of any camp maintained by the Japanese in World War II.

Dr. Kushner revealed that the inhumane conditions caused mental regression among some of the POW's. For example, one man sat on his bed with a blanket over his head for 2 years. Others were reduced to childlike behavior, sucking their thumbs and calling out "mama." Could "eensy, weensy dudes," with beautiful smiles "warm like the sun," possibly resort to this?

Mr. Speaker, the Communist Vietnamese, both North and South, who practiced the abominable, subhuman treatment against the American prisoners were colleagues in arms and ideology of those who fraternized with hundreds of other so-called Americans in Cuba. The basic character of this miserable collection of young men and women, who marched proudly behind the Vietcong flag, who chanted to Ho Chi Min for an NLF victory, whose nauseating affection for North Vietnam soldiers and Vietcong militia bordered on near-worship, stands out in sharp relief to the American heroes of the seventies—the POW's. Their broken bodies painfully testified to the price they so willingly paid for their patriotism.

IRVIN BROWN: ENTERTAINMENT WITH A VIRGIN ISLANDS MESSAGE

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, as one who began his career in radio, I am acutely aware of the fact that mass entertainment, made possible by 20th century communications, has become one of the most powerful influences upon our culture. The impact of radio, linking many individuals to the artistic expression of one, can hardly be over appreciated. Entertainment features, as much as any other programming daily alter our cultural mores.

Each weekday, many residents of both St. Thomas and St. John, V.I., enjoy visits in their homes, cars, offices, and at public places by a distinctive Virgin Islands entertainer, Irvin Brown. Professionally and affectionately known as "Brownie," he is a member of a popular and excellent band "Milo and the Kings."

Brownie reaches most Virgin Islanders, however, through "The Five Sides of Brownie," broadcast by WSTA radio in Charlotte Amalie. This is a 1/2-hour experience that is sometimes outrageous, often humorous, and always enjoyable.

In between the extemporaneous comments, amusing stories, and personable phone calls, Brownie touches many of the musical preferences of the Virgin Islands character. Calypso, Latin soul, and reggae music are all played enthusiastically. The fifth side of Brownie is the Comedy Corner spot which has become a regular midafternoon break for thousands of busy islanders.

Through the entertainment of his program, Brownie broadcasts a message of appreciation of our Virgin Islands culture. As best evidenced by his use of our local dialect, rather than formal English, the orientation of this program is to revel in and preserve the unique qualities of Virgin Islands culture in the face of outside influences.

On July 19, 1973, the Weekly Journal, a Virgin Islands newspaper published in Charlotte Amalie, carried a profile of Brownie written by its talented feature writer, Sylvia Stipe. I am proud, as a former WSTA program director, to commend this article on a WSTA staff member to the attention of this House:

BROWNIE: "I JUST HAVE FUN BEING ME"—
WSTA'S BROWNIE MARKS 8 YEARS IN RADIO
(By Sylvia Stipe)

Many, many Virgin Islanders spend their afternoons with Brownie, most of them tuned in to 1340 on their radio dial, WSTA, but quite a few also drop into the Frenchtown studios.

An afternoon spent in Brownie's studio is equivalent to five and one-half hours in a madhouse. But Brownie, one of the most popular entertainment personalities in the territory, dexterously handles the many buttons and knobs on the "board" around incredible numbers of comings and goings, phone calls, and even inter-office musical requests. And he never seems to miss a beat.

But perhaps that is due to the fact that Brownie has been on the air and operating said control board for some eight years, all at WSTA. In fact, he celebrated his eighth anniversary with the station on May 9.

"HE BORN HERE"

Irvin Brown was born in St. Thomas 38 years ago. He grew up in Savan, went to Dober School and then Charlotte Amalie High School, but he quit after seventh grade. "So I was a dropout, but I ain't been in jail" he commented.

Show business has always been his thing. He says "I can play any type of drum, even those Turkish ones for those belly dancers. Boy, I didn't know until I played for one of those shows that a woman could move around like that."

Brownie went to Miami with a group of Virgin Islands musicians in his pre-radio days for a six-week club engagement that lasted for two years. Then the band toured clubs in all of the big mainland cities.

But ten years ago, Brownie got homesick for the islands, and called his good friend Milo the bandleader and asked him if he had an opening for him with the group, that he wanted to come home. Milo did and Brownie came back to St. Thomas swearing he'll never leave "the rock" again.

While in the states, Brownie was a versatile performer, not only playing instruments but singing calypso and dancing the limbo. He said he could go under the bar 14 inches

from the floor, "but that was too low," he said "because one night something snapped in my knee. I was lucky there was a doctor in the audience and he snapped it back, but that ended the limbo."

NO INTEREST IN RADIO

He used to sing with Milo's group as well as play, but now he just sticks to drumming. When he first came back, in addition to playing with the band, he drove a taxi, and he still does in the mornings before he goes into the station. He also conducted driving tours, and that indirectly led to his job with WSTA.

He had been emceeing stage shows, but said he's never been interested in radio until one year during carnival when "I hung around the WSTA booth, just sort of helping out."

Shortly after that, when he was taxi driving for Len Stein, then manager of the station, Stein asked him if he'd be interested in doing a one-hour daily show. Brownie accepted, and that was the beginning of "Brownie's Calypso Bacchanal."

Brownie says he had a week to learn how to operate the myriad of controls, but he simplified it for himself by just learning which ones he really needed to begin with, then gradually learning the others.

TIME EXTENDED

Brownie took a giant leap in his radio career when his show was suddenly extended from the original hour to the current five and one-half hour slot. At this point he began interjecting the various "sides of Brownie" spots. Now there are five "side of Brownie" segments—the spooze or reggae, soul, calypso, Latin, and the extremely popular "Comedy Corner."

Brownie said that when his show was lengthened, he continued with the bacchanal theme until one day a little girl called and frankly told him that she didn't like the title. When he asked her, in typical Brownie fashion, what she would suggest in place of the theme her choice was the "side of Brownie."

Although Brownie latched onto the idea, to this day he still doesn't know who the youngster was who started it all. But he laughs as he says "I'll bet I'm the only man in radio with so many different shows in only five and a half hours."

NEVER PLANS

Brownie says he never plans a show ahead of time. "If I do, something is sure to happen to mess up the plans. I just think about what kind of music I want to play, grab the records and begin."

It's an approach that works, and after an afternoon of watching Brownie's show in his studio, it's the only way to operate. During his weekday afternoon shows between 12:15 and 5:30 p.m. for instance, he gets continuous phone calls.

On the day I was there, one lady called to complain that the telephone company wouldn't cash her Social Security check to pay her bill. Brownie told her that it was his understanding that Vitelco had a policy about cashing checks in payment of bills.

When another lady called asking what happened to the water in Tutu, Brownie suggested that a call to WAPA would help clear up the mystery. Then he swiveled around in his chair and said "I'm also the information bureau."

Brownie also reads commercials, public service announcements, and . . . the hourly news.

About his news broadcasts, he states flatly, "Anytime I come across a word in the news that is three or more syllables I know I'm straight—but more than that, I know I'll get messed up." And he's true to his word. He's been known more than once to tell his listening audience to figure out a long or garbled word in a news broadcast because he's not going to read it.

WEATHER AT LEO'S

The weather report at the end of the news usually comes out like "he weather for St. Thomas, St. John and St. Croix, and Cockroach Island and around Leo Moron's house too . . ." or some variation like that. Never just straight, though.

Which brings up a question people often ask of him: "Brownie, why don't you learn to speak right?"

He does speak in the heavy local dialect which is often called creole (but he insists that's a misnomer, explaining "We speak English with a local dialect, that's all.")

But would he change? Not Brownie. He doesn't really want to "be a big shot." When one of his visitors asks if he has been named station manager yet, he answers "I'm the chief toilet-door opener here."

"JUST ME"

"I just have fun being me—people are too smart about things like that and they'll know right away if you're not being what you are," Brownie says simply.

He's proud of the fact that he knows his audience and where he stands with them. But he also works in knowing his audience. He says that he strolls down Main Street and asks the shopkeepers and taxi drivers and anyone he finds tuned into a radio what they think of the show. And he says he takes any criticism into consideration.

One time he discovered that most of the taxi drivers in the afternoons were tuned into a Puerto Rican station that played nothing but music with the Latin beat, which prompted the "Latin side of Brownie" segment.

With each variation in his show, Brownie seems to slip on a different personality. He doesn't talk as much during the Latin segment, saying "the Latin speaks for itself, but for the soul segment, they want action." And action they get. Brownie becomes animated when he introduces the soul numbers, bouncing on the chair with the rhythms, drumming on the desk.

After playing the current hit "There No Me Without You" Brownie mused, "If somebody felt that way about me I'd feel good. But what am I talking about? I feel that way about me and I'm somebody!"

Brownie really likes what he's doing, all phases of the local entertainment world he's involved with, and he won't hesitate to tell you so emphatically.

He says it's crazy at times, like at the station where they've had everything from children who have been found wandering at the airport when their planes haven't been met by parents or relatives, and they're brought to WSTA for an over the air appeal to find their guardians, to lost turtles and even one squirrel that a child had brought down from the states.

KNOWS HIS AUDIENCE

He'll watch the big studio clock and say "the kids are coming home now, it's time to play the up stuff" or "the girls at the offices are in the ladies' rooms fixing their faces or whatever they do before they go home—guess I'll give them something sweet."

Brownie's favorite music personally? "I like classical and mood music. I could listen to Dionne Warwick for hours, or Nancy Wilson, but that's stuff for a late-night show. Today the kids' heads are into African rhythms and that's what we give them, along with the top 40."

ON STAGE

Brownie is equally at home on stage doing the master of ceremonies bit. He says that he has learned that the things that "have people hanging from the rafters" humor-wise in the states leave audience cold here.

Islanders appreciate an entirely different type of humor, "more direct," he says. And of all the audiences he works with, he loves elderly people the best.

"They're my folk" he insists, and he never turns down a request to entertain them. Often he baits an oldster with a remark like "you're over 100 years aren't you?" and knows that the person will rise to the bait with an argument. He often records these bits with the seniors and plays them over the air. "They love it," he declares.

HONORS TO BROWNIE

Last Sunday at the dedication of the new downtown senior citizens center, Brownie was surprised to find that he wasn't just the emcee but the guest of honor and recipient of a plaque "for outstanding contributions to the senior citizens of the Virgin Islands."

There's no question that Brownie enjoys wide popularity with Virgin Islanders of all types and ages. Every afternoon there is a group of kids in St. Croix who call him and ask him how he is, what he's playing and just generally converse. See, it so happens that they live out of the range of the station's signal and can't get Brownie over the radio. So, they call and rap to him "just to hear my voice."

RECOMPUTATION OF RETIRED MILITARY PAY

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, today it is common to find that the Government is paying out vast sums to one cause or another, while largely ignoring the legitimate needs of another deserving group of Americans. Often, this kind of discrimination hits hardest at those who have given much of themselves over the years to their country. One such illustration of an unfair double Government standard concerns part of our retired military community; those members of the armed services retired for permanent disability sustained in the line of duty.

These people have performed lengthy, satisfactory service to the Nation, asking for the minimum while serving, and usually getting just that. Only in the past years have we even begun to redress that imbalance. In the process, these people are being left in the lurch, even though the Government has a significant moral obligation to them.

The CPI—Consumer Price Index—system, which is supposed to keep retired pay up with the cost of living, has not fulfilled its task as it was intended to. However, such raises as were instituted on that basis were better than nothing at all.

Since the early years of this century, recomputation had been a fact of life that the average military retiree could count on for at least some minimal assistance. But in 1958 and 1963, Congress changed the time-honored system. Since that time, inflation has played havoc with the fixed retirement incomes of all retired people, including all military retirees.

All military people in actual fact have contributed to their retirement by accepting, over the years until quite recently, considerably lower pay scales than those available in civilian life. Congress has never seen fit, regretfully, to

fund a military retirement system, setting the stage for today's difficulties. The recommendations of the President's Interagency Committee include legislation giving a one-time recomputation to non-disability retirees reflecting the January 1, 1971, pay rates, and denying such recomputation to pre-1958 disability retirees unless first, they waive the statutory vested recomputation rights they were granted when they retired; and second, they agree to receive retired pay under the Career Compensation Act, under which many disability retirees would receive less pay than they do now.

Congress should and must enact a recomputation act for military retirees. It should not contain any provision discriminating against those who were retired before June 1, 1958, by reason of a permanent, service-connected disability.

All retirees, disabled and nondisabled, should have the same recomputation rights, so their retired pay shall be more, not less, than what they presently receive. Such a guarantee was included in H.R. 4917, which I introduced in the 92d Congress. In this Congress, I have introduced H.R. 3928, which covers military people who retired with service-connected disabilities on or before October 1, 1949. Under that measure, his retired pay would be based on the January 1, 1971, active duty basic pay to which he would have been entitled if he were on active duty in his retired grade.

In the past, Congress has substantially increased a number of Federal programs. Among them have been social security, aid to education and housing. All these have been necessary increases. Precedents for such action, are, therefore, numerous. Further increases in each of these and other areas are also certain to be enacted. I see no reason, in light of the present situation, for not applying the same rule in this present case.

NONRETURNABLE BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "Nonreturnable Beverage Container Act," which is identical to legislation sponsored by our distinguished colleagues in the Senate, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. CASE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. PACKWOOD.

In brief, this legislation would ban the shipment and sale of nonreturnable beverage containers in interstate commerce and ban all "flip top" cans. The law would be administered by the Environmental Protection Agency which would directly certify acceptable containers.

The bill is patterned after legislation enacted last October by the State of Oregon, which has been closely followed by environmental and consumer groups, as well as Government agencies and State legislatures. Reports thus far in-

dicating that the program is successful not only in improving the environment, but also in lowering the cost to consumers of bottled beverages.

It is interesting to note that both the Pennsylvania State Legislature and the Montgomery County, Md., Board of Supervisors are considering similar steps.

I feel that ecologically and economically we can no longer afford the "luxury" of disposable containers, and I urge my colleagues to study carefully the provisions of this proposed legislation.

MANY WHEAT FARMERS ARE WITHHOLDING THEIR CROP

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last year the sale of enormous quantities of wheat to the Soviet Union, some covertly, hurt rather than helped the majority of America's wheat farmers. The agribusinessmen who concluded the agreement not only misled the farmers but ultimately prevented them from cashing in on the benefits of the sale.

On July 25, 1973, the Wall Street Journal carried a news item which disturbed me very much. These farmers are, perhaps justifiably, unwilling to be given the short end of the stick again. Although repetition of such an illicit and inequitable export agreement is unlikely this summer, the farmers are planning to withhold their crop to watch the Government's export policies with a keener eye and to boost their prices.

Given the current economic situation, such an action on the part of the wheat farmers could be disastrous. The consumer, already overburdened by the inflated price of food cannot withstand an artificial price push on wheat products. As the Wall Street Journal story notes, the effects of boosting the price of wheat by temporarily withholding the crop from the market will further inflate the price of all flour and bakery products. More significantly, holding back the wheat crop may signal producers of other raw agricultural foodstuffs to follow suit. The implications of such a trend are, indeed, alarming.

I think it worthwhile to call my colleagues' attention to this article, Mr. Speaker, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 25, 1973]
MANY WHEAT FARMERS ARE WITHHOLDING CROP; BREAD, FLOUR PRICES WON'T DROP IN SUMMER

(By Gene Meyer)

Some day, there will be some good news to report about food prices.

But not today.

Today's news is about prices of flour and bread and other bakery products—about how these prices won't be going into their normal summer downturn this year.

Usually, wheat farmers sell their crop as they harvest it, and this causes a summer glut of wheat. The glut leads to lower

prices—prices that this year would have to be passed on to consumers under the rules set forth for Phase 4.

Last year at this time, farmers had sold 75% of their crop. But this year, they have sold less than 20%. So there is no glut. So prices won't be going down.

It isn't that the farmers are out to make the housewives cry. Rather, it's that the farmers remember how they sold their crops last year, and then how they got jabbed when it became known how much grain the U.S. had agreed to sell to Russia. When the size of the sale became known, the price of wheat jumped—but the farmers didn't have much left and so couldn't cash in. So this year, they're taking no chances—even though it's unlikely the Russians this year will buy as much U.S. wheat as they bought last year.

"A lot of people feel they were taken last year, that they sold too soon and didn't get a good price," says Leonard Weddle, a Mineola, Kans., wheat farmer and vice president of the state's farm bureau. "We're watching the government thinking on exports," he says, adding that the fast climb in wheat prices last year still heats tempers around Mineola. "Everybody remembers last year," says LaVern Becker, who grows wheat on some 1,600 acres near Russell, Kans.

NO SHORTAGE EXPECTED

There is no danger of the country running short of wheat to grind into flour or ship overseas. "Remember that 20% of the Kansas crop amounts to nearly 77 million bushels," says Roderick Turnbull, a spokesman for the Kansas City Board of Trade. Kansas, the top wheat-growing state, has just finished harvesting an estimated 381 million bushels of winter wheat; the total U.S. winter wheat crop is predicted to reach 1.32 billion bushels, up 11% from last year.

"We've been buying enough to keep going, but we aren't stockpiling, that's for sure," says William Bates, an executive of Con-Agra Inc. an Omaha-based milling concern. "There are farmers willing to sell enough to keep the milling industry going."

The price of wheat in Kansas City shot up to \$3.12 a bushel yesterday—the highest price this year and \$1.52 above a year ago. By contrast, wheat prices usually hit their lowest points of the year in June and July. Last year, the wheat price first topped \$2 a bushel in September—after farmers sold all or most of their crop.

The price is already higher than it ever was last year, but that still isn't causing the farmers to budge. For one thing, they're bitter. For another, they think the price will go still higher. And for another, they say their costs have risen so much that even at the current high prices they would not make as much money as they'd like. "Higher operating costs during the last year made farmers take a good hard look at what it costs to produce a bushel of wheat, and they are going to be reluctant to sell until they make money," says Don Crane, president of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers. Mr. Crane grows more than 700 acres of wheat near Dodge City.

A FALL RUSH?

Another factor encouraging the holdback was the government's decision earlier this year to terminate the loans made on previous year's crops, which required stored wheat as collateral. Farmers bought back the stored wheat for about \$1.25 a bushel, plus loan interest, and resold the old grain for as much as \$3 a bushel. This extra income may prompt many farmers to hold this year's harvest until after Jan. 1 to avoid heavy income taxes.

But others in the grain trade think that eventually farmers will sell in a rush. "Farmers have to sell sometime, and when prices do begin to go down, they'll be falling all over each other trying to sell," says Fred-

erick G. Uhlmann, chairman of the Chicago Board of Trade.

And that, ironically, could cause more problems than the holdback. For one thing, railroads probably wouldn't be able to handle the glut—especially if it comes in the fall when other farmers are trying to move big harvests of corn, soybeans and other crops.

"We're accustomed to millions of bushels, and we're dealing with billions," says Joseph Marren, a spokesman for the Chicago & North Western Railway. The railroads, in fact, are still moving last year's crop and are having trouble coping with the relatively small amount of wheat being sold now.

Another problem: Increasing farm operating costs and other factors have sharply boosted loan demand at country banks, and many of them have little money left to loan. Elevators usually borrow cash to tide them over from the time they buy grain from farmers to when they ship it to processors, exporters and other customers.

"Credit with which elevators can buy harvested crops could become very difficult to get, depending on how the grain moves," forecasts Roby Sloan of the Federal Reserve Bank in Chicago. The credit crunch could further delay the movement of grain, which would add to speculative pressure on prices.

Farmers are getting ready to out-wait such problems by putting up more storage facilities. Applications for government-subsidized storage-facility loans are up 25% from normal, says Frank Mosher, director of the Kansas Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service.

Larry Prager, market research manager for Butler Manufacturing, a Kansas City grain-bin builder, says his company has sold out of some large-sized bins for the first time in its 60-year history. Construction crews are busy filling orders made last winter and spring, he adds.

"While the level of farm construction in the Wheat Belt seems unprecedented, many of the extra bins are going into the corn and soybean producing areas of the Midwest," Mr. Prager says.

During the Iowa corn and soybean harvest last year, many country elevators took crops only during shortened hours on certain days of the week. Farmers waited in miles-long lines to unload their crops at the overflowing elevators, which are still trying to move that grain.

"Farmers found out that if they can't store their crop and if the elevators can't take it, they can't harvest," says Robert Walters, a vice president of Hertz Farm Management Service in Nevada, Iowa. "Many of them began ordering more bins before March and April."

Some observers fear that this bin-building in the Corn Belt will help set the stage for holdbacks of the harvests of corn, soybeans and other crops later this year. Like the wheat farmers, many corn and soybean producers saw prices for their crops rise dramatically late last year and this year—after many of them had sold. Some corn farmers also have money from selling government-loan grain to help finance a fall holdback.

The implications of such a holdback are enormous—no relief from higher prices for meat, milk, eggs, margarine and a host of other important products. Also, if adequate supplies of these crops don't move to market—because of a holdback, inadequate rail transportation, a credit crunch, or all three—the government may have to continue restricting exports, which would hurt international trade and the stability of the dollar.

Some experts think the holdback by wheat farmers will influence others to follow suit. Harvest-time wheat sales are "the key to the markets," says Mr. Uhlmann of the Chicago Board of Trade. "They set patterns for other grains, soybeans and animals in the coming season."

SEEKS AUTHORITY FOR FHA

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced an emergency resolution which would enable the Federal Housing Administration to resume its operation and insure home mortgages.

As of today, it has been 32 days since FHA last had authority to insure a loan and allow moderate income families to purchase a home. This is not the subsidized market that I speak of, but the basic FHA home mortgage insurance program.

The House passed House Joint Resolution 512, to extend the authority of FHA and enable the FHA and VA to establish market interest rates, back on May 21. This was over a month before the June 30 expiration date.

Until last week, the resolution was bogged down in the other body by controversial provisions totally unrelated to the necessity for an extension of authority. Since that time a conference committee has tried to reach agreement on complex provisions which sorely need review and public hearings.

Monday afternoon, the conferees reached agreement on a resolution which is totally unrealistic in light of the upcoming recess. The conference report will contain two major provisions added by the other body which will assure a veto. These provisions mandate an end to the moratorium on subsidized housing and put FHA in the business of providing compensation for structural defects found by purchasers of homes over 1 year old.

I am sure you are all mindful that a pocket veto, exercised with respect to House Joint Resolution 512, would likely negate any chance to override and mean a continued lack of FHA insured mortgages until well after Labor Day.

To show our understanding of this problem and concern for prospective moderate income home purchasers, I ask each Member of the House to seek, with me, immediate action on my proposed emergency extension of FHA insurance authority.

You will all remember that a similar effort was made recently on behalf of the Veterans' Administration. It succeeded in separating VA's interest rate authority from FHA and allowed VA to resume operations. All I ask, is that we do the same for those noncontroversial aspects of FHA. If such legislation is not passed by the close of business Friday, we will do a great disservice to thousands of families throughout the country.

I have been informed that a similar resolution has already been introduced in the other body for reasons not unlike those I have stated. As practical politicians and public servants I hope we can secure passage of legislation which would become law, and not just a political football at the expense of those trying to buy a home and plan for their future.

EIGHTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS RESPOND TO BIESTER QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, the results of my seventh annual questionnaire of constituent opinion have just been tabulated, and I would like to submit them for the information of my colleagues in the Congress.

I have used questionnaires each year since I began my service in the House in 1967. They have been of significant assistance to me in my approach to my congressional responsibilities, and the results serve as an excellent contribution

to my understanding of the district. The increasing response to the questionnaire each year indicates to me that it has become very popular and well-received among my constituents.

This year over 175,000 questionnaires were distributed postal patron to every residence in the district early in June. By late July when the tabulation was made, almost 25,000 persons had responded.

This year the questionnaire offered flexibility by providing spaces in which to indicate intensity of feelings. Questions could be answered: strong no; no; uncertain; yes; strong yes. Responses to questions asking amounts of money to be appropriated in various categories could be answered: much less; less; as now; more; much more. This change in format did not appear to cause any real confusion or inconvenience; rather, it

seemed to encourage an even greater response.

In order to facilitate tabulation, the questions must, of necessity, be kept clear and concise, yet a frequent observation made regarding previous questionnaires is that they were difficult to answer with simple yes-or-no responses. Although Members of Congress are regularly confronted with a similar problem in being required to vote yes-or-no on complex legislation, I think we all appreciate the opportunity to convey the degree of our feelings. The intensity factor on the questionnaire helped accomplish this, and I commend such a format to my colleagues for possible use on their questionnaires.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert the results of this year's survey of opinion in the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

RESULTS OF THE 1973 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE—8TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR., MC

[In percent]

What action should Congress take in the following Areas?	Strong No	No	Uncertain	Yes	Strong Yes
CRIME					
1. Provide reimbursement for the innocent victims of violent crime?	7	10	14	37	32
2. Restore the death penalty for the most severe crime?	9	4	5	15	67
3. Reform the penal system with emphasis on rehabilitation?	10	10	14	35	31
4. Legislate the control of handguns?	18	11	7	20	44
INFLATION					
5. Enforce firm wage and price controls across the board?	9	12	14	24	41
6. Place selective controls on food and rent?	9	10	11	33	37
7. Limit Federal spending?	2	3	9	29	57
8. Increase Federal taxes?	64	20	10	4	2
MARIHUANA					
9. Legalize its possession and personal use?	50	14	11	13	12
10. Distinguish between penalties imposed on private users and sellers of marihuana?	14	6	4	32	44
PRESIDENTIAL POWERS					
11. Limit the President's power to commit troops in an undeclared war?	11	10	7	22	50
12. Allow the President to withhold the spending of funds which have been appropriated by Congress?	33	20	14	19	14
TAX REFORM					
13. Reduce the oil depletion allowance?		11	27	20	33
14. Equalize the taxes for single and married taxpayers?	19	18	11	24	28
15. Increase corporate taxes?	12	16	15	24	33
16. Increase taxes on long-term capital gains?	21	16	16	23	24
TRADE					
17. Limit or restrict imports by quotas or increased tariffs?	15	16	14	28	27
AMNESTY					
18. Under what conditions should we grant amnesty to those who left the country during the course of the Vietnam War?					
No amnesty under any circumstances				44	
Amnesty if the draft resister completes a period of alternate service				44	
Unconditional amnesty for all				12	
ABORTION					
19. The Supreme Court recently handed down a decision liberalizing abortion. What is your opinion regarding that decision and future policy?					
Agree with the Supreme Court decision					59
Favor a constitutional amendment banning abortions					14
Favor a constitutional amendment giving the States the power to decide under what circumstances an abortion may be performed					27
HEALTH					
20. In your view, which of the following health care concerns is most important?					
Increasing the availability of doctors					11
Improving the quality of health care					13
Reducing the cost of health care					47
Establishing affordable health insurance					29
HOW MUCH SHOULD CONGRESS APPROPRIATE FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING PURPOSES?					
	Much less	Less	As now	More	Much more
21. Aid to the elderly	1	2	22	44	31
22. Crime prevention	2	2	19	37	40
23. Defense	18	24	42	11	5
24. Education	5	8	34	32	21
25. Foreign economic aid (excluding Indochina)	43	38	15	3	1
26. Foreign military aid	55	32	11	1	1
27. Health	2	4	24	44	26
28. Highways	9	14	46	23	8
29. Housing	8	15	40	27	10
30. Mass transportation	4	5	17	34	40
31. Pollution control	4	4	23	33	36
32. Social services for the poor	10	14	37	25	14
33. Space	26	23	35	10	6
34. Veterans	4	6	55	23	12
35. Other [28 percent of respondents specified "other" purposes]	24	3	4	14	55
36. Age: 18 to 25—12 percent; 26 to 35—26 percent; 36 to 45—19 percent; 46 to 55—22 percent; 56 to 65—15 percent; 66 plus—6 percent.					
37. Sex: Male—52 percent; female—48 percent.					

CONGRESSMAN NICK BEGICH

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, because of the lateness of the hour last night, I did not have an opportunity to pay a tribute to our very be-

loved late colleague, Nick Begich of Alaska. Nick became a particular friend of mine, because of the close association of the State of Washington, and Alaska. He was not only a delightful friend and a charming person, but he was also an extremely capable and brilliant legislator.

It was with deep sadness that all of us read of the death of Congressman Begich and the disappearance of the air-

plane in his native State. The House has missed him, and I know that his State has missed him.

His activities on behalf of the people of Alaska were so tremendous that I am sure his memory will remain everlasting in that State as his memory will remain with those of us who had the joy of knowing him.

My sympathy to his charming wife and her family.

ONLY TYRANNY FEARS DISSENT

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the much-abused concept of national security has been drawn like a shroud over our once near-sacred liberties. As the Watergate scandal grows ever more encompassing, and inquiries mount in scope and intensity, the all-purpose response is that national defense was the excusable rationale for calculated abrogation of the rights of every American.

When specifics are probed for by a duly constituted committee plus a special prosecutor, the tinfoil shield of national security is interposed between the evil frantically seeking to remain in hiding and growing national demands to know what was perpetrated in the name of the people and at their expense.

Sunlight is the best disinfectant. As the chorus demanding revelation grows, so do constitutional arguments on behalf of the right to know of the people and their elected representatives.

The fearful have no faith in the Nation, reposing their confidence in the blessings of ignorance and the sanctity of institutions, no matter how they may have been abused.

Others seek a guarantee of free institutions, punishment of the guilty, restoration of governmental balance and an end to pernicious doctrines that have been used to garner and abuse power belonging to the people.

I doubt if those with so much to hide will be long able to bring into doubt the character and motives of those searching for truth. This is still, I believe, a free society, and we need have no fear of revelation. Only tyranny fears dissent and exposure.

No better exposition of the argument against abuse of Government power has been made than that used by Jeremiah Black in the *ex parte* Milligan case, which was reprinted in last Sunday's Washington Post. I include it here for the enlightenment of those who may have missed it.

THIS PRETENSE OF STATE NECESSITY

(NOTE.—Last week, when Sen. Sam Ervin challenged John Ehrlichman's contention that the burglary of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist was legal and necessary for national security purposes, the senator cited an 1866 argument before the Supreme Court by Jeremiah Black. The following is excerpted from Black's defense of a civilian sentenced to death by a military commission, which Ervin termed "one of the greatest arguments of all time.")

Our fathers were not absurd enough to put unlimited power in the hands of the ruler and take away the protection of law from the rights of individuals. It was not thus that they meant "to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity." They determined that not one drop of the blood which had been shed on the other side of the Atlantic, during seven centuries of contest with arbitrary power,

should sink into the ground; but the fruits of every popular victory should be garnered up in this new government. Of all the great rights already won they threw not an atom away. They went over Magna Charta, the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights, and the rules of the common law, and whatever was found there to favor individual liberty they carefully inserted in their own system, improved by clearer expression, strengthened by heavier sanctions, and extended by a more universal application. They put all those provisions into the organic law, so that neither tyranny in the executive, nor party rage in the legislature, could change them without destroying the government itself.

Special regulations were required for treason—the one great political charge under which more innocent men have fallen than any other. A tyrannical government calls everybody a traitor who shows the least unwillingness to be a slave. In the absence of a constitutional provision it was justly feared that statutes might be passed which would put the lives of the most patriotic citizens at the mercy of minions that skulk about under the pay of an executive. Therefore a definition of treason was given in the fundamental law, and the legislative authority could not enlarge it to serve the purpose of partisan malice.

I admit that the merits or demerits of any particular act, whether it involve a violation of the Constitution or not, depend upon the motives that prompted it, the time, the occasion, and all the attending circumstances. When the people of this country come to decide upon the acts of their rulers, they will take all these things into consideration. But that presents the political aspect of the case, with which we have nothing to do here. I would only say, in order to prevent misapprehension, that I think it is precisely in a time of war and civil commotion that we should double the guards upon the Constitution. In peaceable and quiet times, our legal rights are in little danger of being overborne; but when the power lashes itself into violence and rage, and goes surging up against the barriers which were made to confine it, then we need the whole strength of an unbroken Constitution to save us from destruction.

There has been and will be another quasi-political argument—necessity. If the law was violated because it could not be obeyed, that might be an excuse. But no absolute compulsion is pretended here. These commissioners acted, at most, under what they regarded as a moral necessity. The choice was left them to obey the law or disobey it. The disobedience was only necessary as means to an end which they thought desirable; and now they assert that though these means are unlawful and wrong, they are made right, because without them the object could not be accomplished; in other words, the end justifies the means. There you have a rule of conduct denounced by all law, human and divine, as being pernicious in policy and false in morals.

Nothing that the worst men ever produced has produced so much oppression, misgovernment, and suffering as this pretense of state necessity. A great authority calls it the tyrant's plea; and the common honesty of all mankind has branded it with infamy.

That a necessity for violating the law is nothing more than a mere excuse to the perpetrator, and does not in any legal sense change the quality of the act itself in its operation upon other parties, is a proposition too plain on original principles to need the aid of authority. I do not see how any man is to stand up and dispute it.

You have heard much, and you will hear more, concerning the natural and inherent right of the government to defend itself with-

out regard to law. This is fallacious. In a despotism the autocrat is unrestricted in the means he may use for the defense of his authority against the opposition of his own subjects or others; and that is what makes him a despot. But in a limited monarchy the prince must confine himself to a legal defense of his government. If he goes beyond that, and commits aggressions on the rights of the people, he breaks the social compact, releases his subjects from all their obligations to him, renders himself liable to be dragged to the block or driven into exile. A violation of law on pretense of saving such a government as ours is not self-preservation, but suicide.

Salus populi suprema lex. This is true; but it is the safety of the people, not the safety of the ruler, which is the supreme law. The maxim is revolutionary and expresses simply the right to resist tyranny without regard to prescribed forms. It can never be used to stretch the powers of government against the people.

IN MEMORY OF KEN HURLEY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, some of my constituents recently joined together to form a housing coalition which will work for an end to racial and economic segregation in housing. These concerned citizens met earlier this month in San Bernardino, and I would like to call our colleagues' attention to a letter read at that meeting.

We all, I am sure, at one time or another have experienced the frustrations of attempting to cut through bureaucratic redtape. This letter describes the hardship and frustration encountered by one gallant individual, Ken Hurley, who died trying to make real the dream of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.

The letter, written by Mrs. Sue Bertel, reads as follows:

JULY 3, 1973.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSING COALITION

After having just viewed an outstanding performance by many Americans in celebration of the 4th of July, I felt this letter was of utmost importance to propose questions and compare statements.

The songs were sung with great feeling of patriotism, pride and allegiance to our great country; but how many of us can honestly admit to full truth in each and every line of those songs? We can sing along with most of them, but could we publicly stand behind each and every word? For instance, "land of the free"—are we completely free or partially manipulated? Another one, "home sweet home"—is it? Patriotism became somewhat of a dirty word to so many—is it to you? I love my country and my fellow man, but I cannot stand seeing them destroyed. It was difficult to relate my tears of pride to the tears shed earlier in the day over the death of a close friend and fellow member of the coalition, but there is a definite relation.

The sorrow felt was not because of his death totally or because of loss, but because of a feeling of failure. Total apathy was generated towards this man by so very

many. Ken Hurley was a fighter for truth, respect and sincere love and concern for his fellow man. He had experienced the normal everyday battles of life plus medical problems. He was a rich man in spirit and a big man overflowing with faith, love and kindness. His biggest aim in life was to be a good father to his motherless children and to provide them with a good home. He was torn apart by the problems facing himself and his neighbors caused by the shoddily constructed houses they had purchased.

He started his battle in February of 1972 and to the day he died, he had not received any sign of restitution. His letters were unanswered, his complaints were ignored and his heart was heavy to think that he had failed his family and friends. The bureaucratic run-around generated to this man took its toll. He had faith in so many. He knew there had to be an honest answer somewhere and with each new day he set out to find that answer.

Ken Hurley died on July the first, still unanswered. He left his family and friends very little in material items, but he left all of us who knew him a spirit of gallantry and concern.

He was buried today, July 3rd. Nothing more than a particle board casket was he laid to rest in, but on top were the many flowers from friends and loved ones paying their final tribute to a brave, patriotic loving soul who is now in the happiest home ever. His problems are over, but how many more like him are there? How many more must be left unanswered?

I leave you with one last thought. Ken was laid to rest in a casket that was much better constructed than the home he spent the final two years of his life in. Our esteemed president will not be buried in such a manner, but of course he owns a mansion which was recently refurbished at the taxpayers' cost totalling over two million dollars.

The housing coalition can help solve and prevent these problems facing so many only with *your help*. Support it and work with it.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that Mr. Hurley did not die in vain. Let us hope that we in Congress will provide the support that concerned citizens need in their efforts to improve this country at the local level.

I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that the San Bernardino Sun, a newspaper in my district, has seen fit to praise the housing coalition in an editorial which they printed on July 13. Without objection, I will place that editorial in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this time:

[From the San Bernardino Sun, July 13, 1973]

CITIZENS DO GET INVOLVED

Citizens of communities regularly come in for criticism for not getting "involved." Here is an exception.

A new "housing coalition" has agreed to sponsor a seminar on housing problems which federal, state and city officials will be asked to attend next fall.

To be explored are activities of real estate operators and blockbusters, deterioration and need for re-integration of inner cities and the effect of transportation on housing.

Preliminary task forces will look into these fields as well as gather information on complaints about poorly constructed housing tracts.

The coalition has resulted from a series of meetings of the San Bernardino West Side Community Development Corp. and Inland Neighbors, Inc. Members are directing their

efforts toward maintaining ethnically and economically balanced neighborhoods.

Citizens of communities do get involved. More power to these.

FEDERALLY INSURED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, some people are recommending that the federally insured student loan program be modified by eliminating the needs analysis on applications submitted by students from families with income levels under \$15,000.

A change was made in the Education Amendments of 1972 requiring a needs analysis for all borrowers. Figures indicate that the number of applications are down this year from last year and this is used as one argument in favor of the change back to the old system.

The United Student Aid Funds Corporation has taken a position against the proposed change and I am submitting the text of its bulletin for printing in the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to consider the arguments presented therein:

BULLETIN FROM THE UNITED STUDENT AID FUNDS

Until last year, guaranteed loans were regarded as loans of convenience. Any student whose adjusted family income was less than \$15,000 a year would have his loan interest paid by the government while he was in school.

United Student Aid Funds had insisted that proof of need was both a moral and a practical necessity for any effective student aid plan. Without such proof, we said, many loans would be used for non-educational purposes. The program, uncontrolled, would grow to a point where it was more a boondoggle than a public service. In such a climate, defaults would be bound to rise, and with them the cost of the program to the taxpayer. Eventually the lenders would either put their own restriction on guaranteed loans, or stop making the loans altogether.

These predictions for a time met considerable skepticism, but by 1972 they had proved only too accurate. Congress at that time reversed course, and provided that a student who wishes to take out a guaranteed loan must show that he really needs the money for educational costs if he is to receive a Federal interest subsidy.

Though the needs test has been in effect only since March 1—surely an inadequate trial period—some are exerting intense pressure on Congress to roll it back before recessing next month. They are arguing vigorously that a needs test inhibits applications for loans, slows down processing, and reduces loan volume.

It is true that the new regulations require a more careful examination of applications, and that applications take longer to go through the pipeline. This is undoubtedly one reason for a drop in loan volume from March through June. In addition, there were delays in making funds for other Federal aid programs available. As a result of this uncertainty, many students postponed applying for loans.

There is no evidence, however, that stu-

dents who truly need the money for college are being deterred from applying for it simply because they have to spell out the need. Nor has it been shown that even the higher-income students are not applying. Indeed, our spot check of representative schools throughout the country shows only 20.8% with any drop at all in loan volume over the past four months, while in 79.2% the volume is unchanged or rising. Our own experience from March 1 through June 30 indicates about a 23% drop in volume. Could this drop mean that some of these loans are simply not needed? A former President of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators estimates that about 15% of the borrowers have been taking the program for a ride.

In the past year Congress has made basic changes in the guaranteed loan program three times. Each change has brought its own confusion and delay. To change again now would not simplify matters—it would bring them close to chaos. If there are inequities in the current needs test, then they should be corrected in due course, through regulations. To discard a needed reform after only four months, in favor of an arrangement that had proved impractical over a period of seven years, would, we believe, be a blunder for which the guaranteed loan program would pay dearly in the years ahead. Officials from a number of states—Nevada, Delaware, Alaska, Maryland, Maine, South Carolina, and Virginia among them—have informed us that they too oppose any legislative change at this time.

THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK INTERNS CAUCUS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, there is a new group on Capitol Hill this summer. They call themselves the Congressional Black Interns Caucus. The organization is composed of about 40 black students from across the country.

The Black Interns Caucus was organized to provide social and political interaction for students who found themselves a small, distinct minority of the 1,200 to 1,500 other interns who have converged on the Hill this summer. In seeking a more relevant alternative to the regular intern functions, the Black Interns Caucus has developed an agenda of objectives which they feel relate more meaningfully to them as blacks and to the black community. Included in this agenda is the development of a communications network whereby more black and Spanish-speaking students will learn and possibly take advantage of the summer internships offered on Capitol Hill and throughout Federal agencies.

One of the activities of the Interns Black Caucus was the cosponsorship of today's conference and luncheon on the drought and famine in the West African area known as the Sahel. This emergency conference and luncheon featured such prominent speakers as the Reverend Jesse Jackson of PUSH, Dr. Hershelle Challenor of the Ford Foundation, F.

Bradford Morse, Undersecretary-General of the United States, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

I commend these young men and women for the initiative they have taken in the formation of the Congressional Black Interns Caucus and in their cosponsorship of the conference which served as a tool for the dissemination of information on the critical situation in the Sahel region of Africa.

I offer my best wishes to the Interns Black Caucus in their efforts to bring more black students to Washington.

PROFIT INCREASES YOU WOULD NOT BELIEVE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the opportunity to insert in the RECORD several articles on the problems and prospects of the recently announced phase IV economic stabilization program. I have also inserted an article describing the profit increases of several major corporations. Again, I would like to point out that a wage and price control policy that holds down the wages of working men and women, but that fails to control prices and lets the profits of giant corporations fly through the roof, is not only unfair, but cannot succeed in the long run.

The Wall Street Journal carried a summary of the profit reports of major American corporations on July 31. Those reports show that the second quarter profits of these companies were 31.6 percent above their level in the same quarter last year, and that in many industries, including food retailing, profits had soared at truly unbelievable rates. I would like to insert that article in the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues. I would again call on the administration to effectively restrain profit increases at reasonable levels, even if this requires the serious consideration of an excess profits tax.

The text follows:

CLOSING THE BOOKS—U.S. INDUSTRY PROFITS IN THE SECOND QUARTER REGISTERED 31.6 PERCENT GAIN

One month into this year's second quarter, a conflict—muted, but nonetheless real—began to take shape in the American business community. First quarter results were largely in and were almost uniformly favorable, leading many executives and securities analysts to venture optimistic forecasts for the months ahead. But on the other side of the fence sat business economists, who, advising caution, predicted that year-to-year gains would become progressively smaller throughout 1973.

On the surface, it appears that the executives and analysts were correct. A tabulation by this newspaper of the second quarter earnings of U.S. corporations reveals that after-tax profits of 601 companies rose 31.6% from the like period last year—good news in itself, but even more heartening when compared with a similar first quarter survey in which the percentage gain was 27.8%.

But appearances can often be deceiving, and surveys can be read from several stand-

points. True, 31.6% is higher than 27.8%, but consider the following: Among the individual categories of the survey, the Nation's two largest industries—autos and steel—showed smaller gains than were registered in the first quarter. The same was true of the rubber-company category (a gain of 12% in the second quarter, compared with 25.6% in the first quarter), electrical equipment (30.8% in the second quarter; 47% in the first quarter) and several other important sectors of the economy.

If it is the classic case of the same statistical evidence being used to prove everyone's point, the third quarter will probably provide similar grist for the statisticians' mills. However, this time around Phase 4 has entered the picture and is serving to temper optimism in some areas. The best that can be said is that the outlook for the economy as a whole is mixed; and interviews with executives and analysts throughout the country show that ups and downs in the coming months will probably be far more common in many industries than any clearcut trend in either direction.

DECLARATION IN DETROIT

Perhaps the biggest case in point is the nation's auto industry. Despite record profits for the second quarter, the Big Three experienced a deceleration in terms of smaller percentage gains than were registered in the last quarter. General Motors Corp., for example, posted a 10% gain in second quarter earnings, less than half its 25.5% first quarter increase. Ford's profits, although 39% above the comparable quarter last year, nevertheless didn't match the 42.9% first quarter increase. And Chrysler's second quarter earnings gain of 59% was a dramatic change from its 151% spurt in the first quarter.

Underlying this deceleration is the fact that auto production is starting to show smaller gains. First quarter output in U.S. plants, for example, was up almost 20% from a year earlier for the industry; however, second quarter output was up only 11.5%. Indeed, Wall Street's auto analysts say that the auto sales boom of recent months, when measured on a seasonally adjusted basis, has already peaked.

To be sure, it is too soon to be entirely pessimistic. In the current quarter, for example, renewed higher production is expected to lead to healthy profits for the Big Three. In fact, some analysts are saying that GM—and perhaps Ford—will reverse the second quarter deceleration of quarter-by-quarter gains. The main reason behind the higher production is simple: The auto makers want to build as many 1974 models as possible before Sept. 14, when existing labor contracts expire.

As for fourth quarter profits, it is expected that Phase 4 rules will be a shot in the arm—apparently paving the way for initial price increases of about 4% on 1974 models and subsequent hikes to cover the wage increases of new contracts. But the outlook for the more distant future is considerably less attractive for the industry. By most counts, auto profits are expected to tumble sharply next year. The industry is bracing for a modest decline in 1974 auto sales to somewhat more than 11 million foreign and domestic cars—from this year's anticipated record of close to 12 million—but some Wall Street analysts believe sales will be battered by a mild recession and will total only about 10 million to 10.5 million cars.

THE STEEL SITUATION

A decelerating trend is also apparent in the nation's steel industry. In the first quarter, this newspaper's tabulation for 23 steel manufacturers showed a 78.3% gain over the first quarter of 1972. In the second quarter, however, the results of the 19 manufacturers included in this article's accompanying tabulation were up only 42.2% over the second quarter of 1972.

(This year's second quarter results don't include U.S. Steel Corp. which is expected to report its earnings today. However, John P. Ingersol Jr., an analyst with A. G. Becker & Co., is forecasting earnings of "around \$1.45 a share" for the U.S. Steel—some 49% more than last year's second quarter figure of 97 cents a share. In the first quarter, by comparison, the company's earnings were up 157.5% over the year-earlier period.)

Furthermore, it seems likely that second half earnings will be less than those in the first six months. For one thing, the industry has been experiencing meager profit margins, which are hampering expansion plans. "If we can't generate capital to meet the oncoming demands facing us from our customers for more steel, and from the public for environmental improvement, at a time when we are operating at capacity in an unusually strong market, then we shall be greatly hampered in providing for capital needs in the future," says George Stinson, chairman of National Steel Corp.

Then, there is the related problem of government price controls. Phase 4, steelmakers say, is going to give the industry far less relief than would have been allowed under the old Phase 2 rules. "I figure steel will be able to get about half of what it can justify on a cost basis," A. G. Becker's Mr. Ingersoll says. What's more, any price increase allowed by Phase 4 probably won't take effect until, at the earliest, late in the current quarter—while a 7% wage increase goes into effect tomorrow. Finally, months of capacity-straining operations have begun to lead to absenteeism and equipment breakdowns.

But even with all these minuses to contend with, the picture isn't entirely gloomy. "Everything you read seems to indicate a slowdown in the growth of the economy, but not a cessation of growth," says Stewart S. Cort, Bethlehem Steel's chairman. "So I'd say we're looking at a very strong (steel) market through the first half of 1974."

A summary of the outlook for some other major industries follows:

Rubber: Demand for the industry's products continues at record levels. Nevertheless, rubber companies are currently in the throes of a cost-price squeeze that will undoubtedly affect the current quarter's results and will very likely have lingering repercussions in the fourth quarter. Practically all major producers have recently granted wage increases and have experienced rising costs in the areas of raw materials, distribution and energy. On the other hand, planned price increases of 5% to 5.5% on most tires were deferred by the government's freeze, and it currently appears highly unlikely that such increases will go into effect before the last few days of this quarter.

Rubber companies may well get some price increases in the fourth quarter, but they probably won't be as large as the 5.5% that the companies figured on under Phase 3 rules. Furthermore, both the third and fourth quarters will be weighed against strong comparable periods last year. And, finally, the tire companies realize that any projections could be thrown badly askew if there should be a strike in the auto industry this fall.

Machine tools: As with the rubber companies, the machine-tool industry could be badly hurt by an automotive strike. However, barring such a strike, the industry's earnings in the third and fourth quarters are expected to surpass those of the comparable periods last year. This is largely because shipments in the two quarters will be much higher this year than in 1972. (The industry's backlog rose about 50% during the first half and currently amounts to about a year's production.)

The industry's pricing situation in the immediate future is less favorable and will keep earnings lower than they would be without restraints. Under Phase 4, price-increase applications will be permitted only where justified by cost increases since the beginning of

this year—meaning that any cost increases incurred prior to 1973 that haven't already been reflected in prices will have to be absorbed by the producers until the end of Phase 4. Machine-tool makers say this rule especially hurts them.

Aluminum: While industry profits in the third and fourth quarters are expected to be significantly higher than in the comparable periods last year, aluminum companies are greatly worried about Phase 4 and are pleading hardship in seeking exceptions from its price-rise limits. True, prices are currently well above those that prevailed a year ago; but the companies say that without even higher prices they won't be able to expand capacity to meet the nation's demand.

Adding to their argument, aluminum companies say that output will be cut even further if the industry is forced, as a result of Phase 4, to close inefficient operations.

Electrical equipment: Electrical and electronics companies expect earnings growth to continue in the third and fourth quarters. For example, General Electric Co., which reported record second quarter earnings, expects continued increases for the duration of the year. RCA Corp., which also reported record results in the second quarter, is hopeful of record earnings for the year. And even Westinghouse Electric Corp., which atypically registered only a small (1.4%) earnings gain in the second quarter, says that new orders are up substantially and that it is "encouraged" about results for the remainder of the year.

Railroads: Executives in the industry are largely optimistic about the third quarter. Traffic levels remain strong, and a previously approved 5% freight-rate increase will go into effect Aug. 13 when the freeze expires. For Western railroads, grain traffic continues at record levels, with a record harvest coming on the heels of the massive Russian grain exports. Coal traffic is also growing rapidly, as utilities' demands expand.

Everyone isn't entirely happy, however. Louis W. Menk, chairman of Burlington Northern Inc., is highly critical of the Interstate Commerce Commission for what he sees as unnecessary delays in acting on rate boosts. "Our disappointing second quarter results underscore the critical need of the entire railroad industry for adequate rate increases and for the Interstate Commerce Commission to act more promptly in granting increases, especially in the face of continually spiraling wage costs," Mr. Menk says.

Chemicals: The industry has one thing on its collective mind at the moment: Phase 4. For while demand is high and many analysts are predicting that the current momentum will continue throughout the remainder of the year, chemical companies and the analysts who follow the companies' fortunes are extremely pessimistic about the effect of the latest regulations on the industry's activities. The reason is that under proposed Phase 4 regulations, chemical concerns can't raise prices even on a cost-justified basis if limits on profit margins have been reached. And these margin limits are especially low for the chemical companies.

"In our opinion, the proposed Phase 4 regulations are absolutely inequitable," says William S. Sneath, president of Union Carbide Corp. He adds: "Our comments on the proposed regulations, which we are filing with the Cost of Living Council, will, among other things, ask that this inequity be eliminated in the regulations rather than by exception." Says Aris P. Christodoulou, an analyst at Blyth Eastman Dillon & Co.: "If a freeze continues into Phase 4, we will recommend getting out of chemicals altogether . . . a freeze will prevent the industry from finishing its recovery from the depressed period of a few years ago."

Nonferrous metals: The outlook is mixed. Almost all companies in the industry believe that demand is expected to exceed supply in coming months; indeed, copper processors are already announcing cutbacks due to a shortage of scrap supplies. "If export controls on scrap come within the next two or three weeks, I see strong gains in the third quarter over the year-earlier quarter for most (copper) companies," says one securities analyst.

Pulp and paper: The industry, facing shortages in almost every product area, says it needs to boost prices to afford expansion. "The paper industry must have price relief to offset cost increases," says George J. Kneeland, chairman of St. Regis Paper Co. And Paul A. Gorman, chairman and president of International Paper Co., says, "We hope that the Cost of Living Council recognizes the gravity of the supply-demand situation and the need to restore a free competitive market."

The industry's chief complaint about Phase 4 is that it may tend to keep prices below their natural market levels. Nevertheless, even with pricing uncertainties, it is expected that paper companies will continue to reg-

ister significant earnings increases for the remainder of the year.

Oil: After a spectacular surge in the second quarter, the industry's profits are likely to level somewhat in the third and fourth periods. True, most oil companies look for further earnings increases in the second half. But the rates of gain are expected to shrink from the vigorous advances of the first six months.

The expected decelerating rate of increase will be brought about by several factors. For one thing, this year's last half will be compared with a last half in 1972 that was considerably stronger than the depressed first half of that year. But there are also some negatives in the outlook for the rest of this year, including the possible impact of oil negotiations in Libya and the possible expanded role of the federal government in the industry's operations in the U.S.

On the brighter side, some industry observers suggest that a leveling in earnings could be a welcome breather for oil companies. The reason: The industry's critics, who maintain that major oil companies created fuel shortages to drive up prices and drive out smaller competitors, have been using the companies' soaring profits in the first half as ammunition for their accusations.

Airlines: The industry is largely apprehensive about declining profits in the coming months. Officials at Trans World Airlines, for example, last week described the economic condition of TWA and the entire industry as "rapidly deteriorating." And such concern is shared by Morton Ehrlich, vice president of marketing research and planning for Eastern Airlines. "The travel outlook for the next 18 months isn't encouraging," Mr. Ehrlich says. An industry move for a substantial general fare increase is under way; but even if Civil Aeronautics Board approval is obtained with unusual speed, it isn't likely that profits will benefit from any fare increases before, at the earliest, the fourth quarter.

SECOND QUARTER PROFITS OF 601 CONCERNS ROSE 31.6% FROM LEVEL OF LIKE '72 PERIOD

The columns below show by industries earnings reported for the second quarter of 1973 and those for the like quarter of 1972 with percentage changes. Where individual company reports cover three-month periods other than calendar quarters, the nearest comparable periods have been used.

	2d quarter 1973	2d quarter 1972	Percent change		2d quarter 1973	2d quarter 1972	Percent change
10 Aircraft makers	\$104,056,000	\$81,486,000	+27.7	24 Mining and metals	\$319,142,000	\$202,768,000	+57.4
14 Airlines	80,421,000	73,919,000	+8.8	6 Aluminum companies	79,005,000	53,656,000	+47.2
17 Autos and equipment	1,399,778,000	1,151,671,000	+21.5	18 Copper and other metals	240,137,000	149,102,000	+61.1
8 Broadcasting companies	57,293,000	48,013,000	+19.3	10 Office equipment	481,613,000	409,408,000	+17.6
24 Building materials	236,271,000	150,515,000	+57.0	24 Petroleum products	1,982,291,000	1,322,657,000	+49.9
13 Building supplies	200,197,000	121,883,000	+64.3	11 Publishing companies	41,232,000	30,846,000	+33.7
11 Cement companies	36,074,000	28,632,000	+26.0	18 Pulp and paper products	316,794,000	159,606,000	+98.5
29 Chainstores	86,662,000	54,304,000	+59.6	13 Railway equipment	56,342,000	39,209,000	+43.7
13 Chain grocers	38,676,000	15,663,000	+134.2	9 Rubber companies	147,941,000	132,129,000	+12.0
16 Drug and variety	49,986,000	38,641,000	+29.4	19 Steel manufacturers	236,664,000	166,431,000	+42.2
22 Chemicals	577,943,000	399,742,000	+44.6	10 Textiles	54,372,000	32,603,000	+66.8
20 Department stores	188,414,000	145,404,000	+29.6	6 Tobaccos	143,918,000	130,192,000	+10.5
4 Distillers	41,890,000	34,031,000	+23.1	31 Tools and machinery	125,990,000	95,789,000	+31.5
16 Drug manufacturers	321,268,000	260,502,000	+23.3	139 Other industrials	1,236,748,000	1,002,093,000	+23.4
33 Electrical equip.-electronics	447,234,000	341,935,000	+30.8	Total 550 industrial companies	9,058,229,000	6,770,087,000	+33.8
17 Broad-line companies	372,356,000	300,525,000	+23.9	15 Railroads	160,296,000	155,215,000	+3.3
16 Specialty companies	74,878,000	41,410,000	+80.8	36 Utilities	503,943,000	462,932,000	+8.9
4 Farm equipment	107,543,000	75,462,000	+42.5	Total 601 concerns	9,722,468,000	7,388,234,000	+31.6
35 Food products	266,409,000	229,372,000	+16.2				

THE FORGOTTEN ELDERLY

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars are spent annually on programs

intended to help the elderly. It is my belief, however, that while considerable amounts are allocated for worthwhile programs, much of the money is misdirected. Indeed, we could provide more personal care in some programs for much less money, while at the same time bringing comfort to some of the most helpless people in our society—the forgotten elderly.

Old age often goes hand in hand with desperate loneliness and it is to this that the Congress should address itself. There is an enormous need to provide suitable housing accommodations for the elderly which would run the gamut from average apartments with homemaker services to nursing homes for the chronically ill.

A splendid article on this subject which I urge our colleagues to read, was written

by Howard Blum of the Village Voice. Through his visits to nursing homes and his conversations with the residents and their caseworkers, a tale of blank walls, listless people and utter despondency is revealed as the author relates the often anguishing indignities experienced by the aged.

The article follows:

NURSING HOME PATIENTS: "A SIMILARITY TO POW'S"

(By Howard Blum)

Four men sit in a basement room. One's eyes are closed. Another rests his head on a cane. Two just look straight at the wall and the machine. The wall is a dull, bleached green. A soda machine is flat against the wall. That is all there is to stare at in this tight, hot room. The four men sit in the room, silent, never talking. Two watch the machine. Two no longer even care that much.

It is a summer afternoon in a city nursing home. These men pay over \$1000 a month to sit and watch a soda machine, the money coming from Medicare. Once they have been admitted to the nursing home, they know they will never be released. There is no escape, but to die. All they can do is watch the soda machine and wonder how much longer, how much longer before they die.

There are almost one million elderly in New York City, a population that is expected to rise to 1.2 million by 1980. About half of the elderly in this city have incomes under \$3,000; one-third of the population has incomes under \$2,000. Four per cent or approximately 38,056 of New York's elderly are currently living in institutional care facilities. It is estimated that 18,000 elderly are in nursing homes. And it is also estimated that nearly 40 per cent of those people in nursing homes, 7200 people, simply do not belong there.

New York City's Human Resources Administration has a tacit policy of trying to dump whomever they can into nursing homes. A Project Management consultant study of 552 nursing home placements made exclusively available to The Voice revealed the following: "Out of the 552, 40 per cent or 221 persons were appropriately placed in nursing homes; 18 per cent or 97 persons would have been more appropriately placed in chronic care facilities; 13 per cent or 73 persons should have been placed at home with their family; 12 per cent or 68 persons should be in home health care; nine per cent or 46 persons in foster homes; five per cent or 29 persons in extended care; two per cent or 12 persons in terminal care; and one per cent or six persons in rehabilitation."

Welfare caseworkers stated that it is a common practice to put the sick of all ages in nursing homes. There have been numerous attempts to put wounded Vietnam veterans in nursing homes. And all the paper work was completed to admit a two-year-old mentally retarded girl to a nursing home before a social worker protested.

New York City has this blanket policy of sending people off to nursing homes, forgetting them until they die, a bed is emptied, and the cycle can be repeated, for one simple reason: there are just not sufficient alternative services. City health services are arranged so that it is more convenient to send the patient to the services, rather than the services to the patient. This is not only a cruel, but a costly policy. If a patient does not require constant geriatric medical treatment, he should not be placed in a nursing home.

The present city policy of nursing home placement is not only socially malignant, but also unnecessarily costly. Consider the comparative costs: Nursing homes cost at least \$1,000 a month. Proprietary homes cost \$366 a month. Foster homes cost \$247 a month. For eight hours of homemaker services, five days a week, the cost is \$665 a month. A home

attendant for the same time period costs \$360 a month. A single room efficiency apartment in a congregate living facility such as Kitzay House in the Bronx rents for \$307.50 a month. A cost/benefit analysis merely in terms of dollars spent makes nursing homes a rather unattractive investment for federal dollars.

But worse than the dollars spent are the lives spent, wasted in nursing homes, wasted waiting to die. A study of 75 nursing homes by the United Hospital Fund found the major characteristics of the patients to be "apathy; withdrawal; isolation; loss of motivation; confusion and disorientation; depression and regression." The report continues: "We found a striking similarity in the behavior of prisoners of war and nursing home patients, both of which groups were aware of their own helplessness, progressive decline, and possible death."

After touring nursing homes in this city and talking with many caseworkers, I find this comparison to prisoners of war more than just metaphorical. Once a doctor has admitted a patient to a nursing home, there is virtually no way out. Patients interviewed said they had never been outside, just outside sitting in the street, for as long as two or three years. There is no permanent release from a nursing home except death. Only a doctor can discharge a patient, and this is rarely done.

A patient cannot leave on his volition. And, as social workers suggest, why should a doctor release a patient if he is receiving Medicare payments for "examining" this patient. One caseworker cited a doctor who had not visited a patient with a heart condition for over a year, all the time collecting Medicare fees. Another mentioned the common practice of a doctor running through a nursing home, seeing 20 patients in 20 minutes, and then collecting 20 full Medicare fees from the government. Part of the problem occurs because many doctors own nursing homes and it is in their economic interest to keep their beds filled. Also, doctors evaluate the standards of nursing homes, sometimes motivated more by professional friendships than the Hippocratic Oath.

Caseworker after caseworker interviewed invariably described the attendants in nursing homes as "Gestapo guards." A few of the incidents related: a 67-year-old woman, who while taking a bath accidentally splashed an aide, was beaten black and blue; a 65-year-old woman was lifted from her wheel chair by an angered aide and thrown against a wall; a 67-year-old man, strapped to his wheel chair, the wheel chair shoved against a burning radiator for punishment (the patient suffered third-degree burns; the aide was dismissed).

Caseworkers also insist that nursing homes frequently steal personal funds from the patients. Medicare gives each patient \$24.50 a month for personal expenses. In many nursing homes, however, this money is automatically deposited into "a personal account" in the patient's name. The money can only be withdrawn if the patient approaches the bookkeeper and signs a withdrawal slip. Often, the patient is never informed of these deposits and the money "disappears." Or when the patient tries to make a withdrawal, he is told the money has been spent.

A caseworker tells of a 70-year-old man in tears, literally crying for a cigarette. An attendant informed the caseworker the patient could not smoke because "he couldn't afford it. He can cry all he want, but he can't afford to buy cigarettes." The caseworker, however, questioned the nursing home's bookkeeper. After a little questioning, the bookkeeper "discovered" eight months of personal Medicare payments on deposit. A 70-year-old man was finally allowed to buy a carton of cigarettes.

By dumping people in nursing homes, by allowing nursing homes to be run without

constant supervision and medical standards, this city has done worse than simply killing thousands of its elderly: it has forced them to experience death, to experience and anticipate death day after day. For these elderly there is no escape, but to die.

AMNESTY—THE PEOPLE SPEAK WITH MANY VOICES

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, as the war in Indochina winds down, with the end to bombing in Cambodia hopefully no more than 2 weeks away, there is an issue of intensely emotional content which will remain with us for some time. I refer to the question of amnesty for the young men who, in one way or another, avoided military service during the Vietnam conflict, and who left or stayed away from the United States to avoid prosecution.

Like all my colleagues, I have received a great deal of mail from my constituents on this issue. They express themselves strongly, and show the deepest moral convictions concerning amnesty. And they represent every shade of opinion, from those who believe the conflict was so morally wrong that those who refused to participate should be honored, to those who believe no duty is higher than following the orders of the commander in chief in time of war, and that this duty must be reinforced by the punishment of those who evade it.

I would like to give you some examples from my file of these letters:

From Orleans, on Cape Cod, came the following:

No amnesty for deserters. Please do not support general amnesty for deserters, draft-dodgers and cowards or pseudo conscientious objectors. Let each case be decided on the facts of the case, as some individuals may deserve amnesty. Do not dishonor the veterans who were brave enough to fight, and who were wounded or killed in battle. Those who evaded their lawful responsibilities should face trial and judgment according to law.

A couple in New Bedford wrote:

We are in favor of total amnesty for all American boys who refused to take any part of the Viet Nam undeclared war. We want you to do everything in your power to bring about this total amnesty as soon as possible. We object to Nixon's and Agnew's bitterness on this issue.

A woman in Hingham objected to amnesty for "deserters and conscientious objectors" on the grounds that we have gone too far in the direction of a permissive society. She wrote:

It would be a further lowering of America's standards to grant amnesty to avowed objectors to the activities of the United States when we expected everyone of the young men to accept some responsibility, regardless of their personal feelings. We have made it too easy to get out of all responsibility. In a country which should have been instilling pride and love of the things for which this country was founded, we have fostered self-interpretation with little or no deep guidance, seemingly taking pride in seeing how

different our children could be. . . I know the young people have the wrong pattern set, but granting amnesty is compounding such wrong patterns and practices. Why should my son have been expected to help and someone else's son be free to say, I ran and sat it out—you were dumb to have shells zooming around you?"

A woman in Centerville, on Cape Cod, wrote me that:

The accusation that these young men have broken a law, therefore they must be punished eternally, is not convincing. Break what law? They have chosen to fulfill the higher moral and spiritual laws that undergird any society, though it means unpopularity in breaking a military man-made law that requires men to break all of God's laws. Their punishment has been rejection, banishment, condemnation, separation, job and financial insecurity. . . . Let's bring them home—those who still have enough faith in America to want to come home. We need them to show us the way back to new dedications and old foundations. To talk of forcing them to give alternate service is to put on an unacceptable condition. For they have given major service to all of us in daring to do what they have done. It is tragic beyond description that we let military service be the ultimate in patriotism. Patriotism has many ways of being revealed. Let us honor all of them. It's time for rejoicing—that the POW's are home—even though tragically late. Let us now seek amnesty for all the Prisoners of Peace—with honor and appreciation and distinction.

A woman in Chatham who had watched the presentation of the amnesty issue on the television program, "The Advocates," wrote me:

I feel strongly against admitting these deserters back into our country without having to serve their country in some capacity. Why not make it an obligation to them to serve as an orderly in a Veterans Hospital to help the sick and wounded? Let them see what it's like to be wounded or maimed for life. . . . In other words, I believe they should be allowed to return, but not without some penalty. I hope and pray you will see it as I do. I'm a woman 76 years old, and have had men in my family serve in both World Wars I and II and am proud that they served their country.

From nearby North Chatham I received the following comments:

My husband and I are very much opposed to granting amnesty to this country's draft dodgers and deserters from military service. Granting amnesty at this time would be grossly unfair to the persons who served as their country needed them. In any event, these cases should be judged on individual cases, not with blanket decisions.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women of my district have not made amnesty an easy subject for me to address, because their feelings run so high and are so diverse. After wrestling with the problem for some time, I have come to the conclusion that a qualified form of amnesty, with close attention to the facts of each individual case, would in due course be the best solution. As I have been telling my constituents who express their concern:

I believe that we must not, as a nation, do anything that would imply that all the hundreds of thousands who served their country, and the millions more who suffered personal anxiety and loss at home, were wrong. Whatever we, as individuals, may

think of the national policy which got us into and kept us in the war so long, we must honor those who fought in our services, and especially those who died or were disabled under orders.

Those who chose not to serve are entitled to have their cases reviewed on an individual basis and to be given, in the words of the Catholic bishops of the United States, "an opportunity to . . . show their responsibility for their conduct and to be ready to serve in other ways to show that they are sincere objectors." I believe it would be reasonable in most cases to require that they fulfill their service obligations—either in active military duty or, as our law currently provides for conscientious objectors, in alternative civilian service.

This is, as you know, an extremely emotional issue, as was American involvement in the war itself. Our country badly needs reuniting and healing—not further divisiveness. This approach represents, I believe, our best chance.

INTERVIEW WITH GUY NICHOLS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat ironic that, after many years of strongly voiced opposition to the activities and conduct of the private utility industry, I should be inserting an article about the president of the largest private utility in Massachusetts, Guy Nichols. However, during the course of our adversary relationship, I have developed a healthy respect for his intelligence and executive capabilities.

At the risk of undermining Guy's credibility with some of his colleagues in the industry, I am going to insert in the RECORD a Boston Globe article on Guy's views and typical working day. The article will make clear why New England Electric, under Guy's leadership, is currently the smooth-running and finally secure institution that it is.

The Boston Globe article follows:

[From the Boston Globe, July 8, 1973]

NEW ENGLAND ELECTRIC HEAD WORRIED ABOUT
NEW PUSH FOR COAL

(By Laurence Collins)

In recent months Guy W. Nichols, president of New England Electric System, has seen one-fifth of his working time evolve into what he calls his "fuel day."

"We have three big areas of expense—people, the cost of money and fuel—and the one that has been having the most dramatic swings of late is fuel. It's the one area where I take the most direct interest," Nichols said in a Globe interview.

An hour before, Nichols had arrived at Logan Airport after a two-day business trip to Washington, D.C. where, as he put it, he had received "a bit of a scare," while attending a conference of the National Coal Assn.

"One of the speakers was Interior Sec. Rogers Morton. He's a native of Kentucky, so obviously he has a very soft spot in his heart for coal. During his talk he raised the possibility of legislation that would require the use of coals by utilities," said Nichols.

Since all of New England Electric System's fossil-fueled generating plants are now fueled by imported residual oil, the passage of such

legislation would have a significant impact on the operations of the Westboro-based utility.

The specter of such a law, however remote the implementation, was enough to prompt Nichols to call a meeting of his "fuel committee" on the afternoon he arrived back in Boston.

Seated around a 20-foot long conference table, six executives, pads and pencils before them, were almost abruptly informed by Nichols of his latest concern regarding fuel.

"We run the risk of being forced back into the use of coal. It's not an overnight likelihood, of course, but it's something to think about," Nichols declared.

Nichols then directed one of the executives to prepare a report based on the assumption that such legislation would be passed.

"Find out where we would get the coal, what the transportation situation would be, and how much would it cost the customer," said Nichols.

"Wait a minute," another executive interjected. "What about the environmental situation: Did Morton consider this?"

Another executive looked up from his pad and said: "According to the Environmental Protection Agency, there are sulphur cleaning devices right now. . . ."

Another committee member: "I've been looking at this availability of coal issue, but only in the case of a national crisis. I can't conceive of any legislation that would require us to burn coal in light of the environmental situation."

Nichols: "I'm impressed with the bandwagon already moving to do something for the coal industry. . . . In any event, we should develop a company position on the matter, look into the New England position. . . ."

There was no small talk. Once the business of the meeting had been concluded—it took no more than 15 minutes—Nichols thanked the committee and immediately headed down the hall of the starkly modern headquarters building to the office of the chairman of the board, Robert F. Krause.

The head of a local educational institution had dropped by to talk about a company contribution. That meeting lasted another 15 minutes and Nichols was again on his way.

It had been like that since his arrival at Logan. A few days before, he had consented to an all-day interview by this reporter, a follow-the-leader act that revealed conclusively that a corporate chief executive's work is not all done by a battery of computers.

Nichols starts each work day at 7:30 a.m. when he is picked up at his Needham home by Walter LaShoto, a New England Electric chauffeur who drives both Nichols and Krause on their appointed rounds in a 1972 gray Lincoln Continental sedan.

Although the car is impressive enough to a Volkswagen driver, LaShoto, a Massachusetts state trooper for years, observed:

"The company used to have a big Caddie limo, but Mr. Nichols preferred something a bit less pretentious."

For Nichols the car is as much an office as it is a means of transportation. No sooner does he hop into the rear seat than he pops open his briefcase and begins reviewing company reports and memos, making a note here or there, and discarding needless papers by casually dropping them on the floor.

"Everytime Walter takes me somewhere there'll be a pile of papers left on the floor. He gets rid of them. Pretty fancy wastebasket," says Nichols.

While driving from Logan to Westboro Nichols ruminated on his stay in Washington:

"Very interesting place with Brezhnev there. Hammer and sickle flags all over the

place. Fascinating. Gives them a breather from the other thing."

The other thing is, of course, Watergate. "Watergate is affecting everything, politics, economy, business, every aspect of American life. It's foolish to say that it isn't."

The international scene, economic controls, subjects that need "a lot of skill and attention," don't seem to be getting it, Nichols asserts.

"Overall, I don't think the economy is faring too well. Controls may have done more harm than good. It seems to me that if you're going to have controls you either have to make them total or else leave them alone, leave it all up to supply and demand. I recall Paul McCracken, who used to be head of the Council of Economic Advisers, saying that controls were initiated because the public almost expected something to be done. The Administration was forced to do something."

Nichols, a trim, compact man with a graying crewcut, speaks quietly, in a near monotone, occasionally glancing at his papers, still taking notes, circling, underscoring, or dropping a paper on the floor.

"I have to admit, our company fared pretty badly in Phase 1. We had rate hikes scheduled for Aug. 15. On Aug. 14 (the day President Nixon announced the initial 90-day freeze), we realized we'd been hit.

"We got through that one all right. But now, in this 60-day freeze, the three biggest factors on our balance sheet—wages, interest and oil import costs—are not controlled."

New England Electric System is a utility holding company serving more than 3 million customers in three states—Massachusetts, Rhode Island and New Hampshire. The company's subsidiaries include Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric and Granite State Electric and the New England Power Co., a wholesale power distribution outfit. The company also operated several gas firms in the New England area but was ordered to divest them by the Federal government. New England Electric employs some 8,000 persons. And Nichols is the boss.

Born in Mallet's Bay, Vt., Nichols attended high school in Burlington and in 1942 enrolled in the University of Vermont. In June of 1944, he joined the US Army where for two years he served in the Corps of Engineers. Within a week after his discharge he was back at the university where he received his BS degree in civil engineering in 1947. He joined New England Electric System that same year, rising through a variety of positions until he became president in 1970. Last year he was named chief executive officer.

His formal education continued, however, with a number of courses in industrial relations at Holy Cross in Worcester, and industrial management studies at the Worcester Polytechnical Institute. In 1960, he took a year's leave of absence from the company to obtain a master's degree in business administration at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

"That MIT experience was valuable in many ways," Nichols said. "It was the Sloan program and I really had my doubts whether I could get back into the classroom grind after being away from it for so long. But you learn to adapt. You're in trouble if you don't."

Nichols had an even more critical experience of adapting. That was the year a devastating tornado struck Worcester, killing 90 persons and causing some \$60 million worth of damage.

"That was really an education," says Nichols, "because in any disaster you're immediately required to change, your whole organization, your entire way of doing things. For example on the morning of June 9, we had four line crews out. On June 11, there were 61 of them."

Aside from the horror of that event, Nichols recalls most vividly the co-operation which it spawned.

"We got fantastic help from everybody, just everybody. It was really an inspiring thing to see."

Talk leisure time to Nichols and you have to talk sailboats. Growing up on Vermont's Lake Champlain he learned to sail early and today it is his chief diversion. He maintains a 35-foot Pearson sloop in Wickford, R.I.

"It's close to being the only outside activity I have," he says. "I did ski quite a lot at one time, but lately I get up there only a few days a winter. Up until eight years ago we had a place in Vermont, just below Sugar Bush."

Aside from newspapers and magazines, Nichols' reading is pretty much restricted to business-oriented materials these days, although his conversation is not without its literary allusions (On the state of government in Washington: "Remember Kafka? That's the way it is in that town these days.")

Nichols and his wife, Shirley, have three daughters: Pamela, 25, a graduate of the University of Vermont and Georgetown University and now a teacher; Gail, a graduate of the University of Colorado, who is now working for the Needham Parks and Recreation Department; and Sally, 19, who just completed her freshman year at Boston's Garland Junior College.

"After many years I think I've learned the art of living in an all-women household," says Nichols. "Actually I've enjoyed it. My only regret is with my traveling or theirs we're seldom all together these days."

Virtually all of Nichols' traveling these days is connected with what he calls his "search for oil," a search that has taken him to the Mideast and South America. On two of these trips he has been in London when the full force of the expression "energy crisis" was impressed upon him.

"I must be a jinx or something. On one trip they were having a nationwide coal strike and electricity was being rationed. The last time I was there it was gas.

"Now no system is perfect. A lot of people have a lot of legitimate complaints to make about our system. But I think it's safe to say that overall this country's system provides the best power network in the world."

STRIPPING DOWN THE STRIPED PANTS SET

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, last week the House decided, wisely, in my view, to retain a law for penalizing foreign nations that molest our fishing fleet.

In taking this action, the House rejected arguments that tough provisions for dealing with high seas piracy might somehow hamper our normal diplomatic efforts in those parts of the world most immediately concerned.

The logic of these arguments escapes me, as it did a very substantial majority of our colleagues. I do not see how we can score diplomatic points by being wishy-washy.

This afternoon, the San Diego Evening Tribune commented on the House action in an editorial entitled "Protecting the Tuna Fleet."

The editorial is so timely that I am taking this means to share it with our colleagues:

PROTECTING THE TUNA FLEET

The House of Representatives has wisely decided to retain provisions in federal law for cutoff of military arms sales and reduction of U.S. foreign aid to nations that seize and fine U.S. tunaboats.

Moves to scrap the Fisherman's Protective Act were premature to say the least.

The drive to repeal the penalty provisions came from the House Foreign Affairs Committee which said they offend the feelings of the affected foreign nations.

The owners and crews of the seized tuna clippers are offended whenever a foreign gunboat starts firing shots across their bows and then escorts them into foreign ports to pay exorbitant "fines" in return for their freedom.

The tuna have been staying farther offshore this year for some reason with the result that fewer American boats have been seized by the South American nations which claim a 200-mile limit.

But the seizures may resume at any time as long as the dispute over the limit is unsettled. It may be settled next year at the world conference on the law of the seas.

Until then, the tuna men need every protection they can get from the American flag.

THE ATHLETIC ESTABLISHMENT BATTLES TO PRESERVE THE STATUS QUO

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months many of us have received communications from a variety of athletic organizations regarding legislation dealing with amateur athletics which is currently pending in both Houses of the Congress. Almost all of these letters and telegrams express either the ill-founded fear that the Congress seeks to impose its will over the governance of amateur athletics in this country or the misbegotten notion that some type of vast Federal bureaucracy will be superimposed on sports in the United States. It is rather curious to note that very little, if any, mention is made of the role of the amateur athlete himself. It seems clear that what these various governing bodies are most concerned about is their own skin and the fear that, at long last, they may be subject to close, public scrutiny.

This issue was the subject of a very perceptive and timely article in this morning's New York Times by that paper's distinguished sports columnist, Red Smith. I assume that both bodies will be acting upon legislation dealing with amateur athletics when we return from the August recess and I commend Mr. Smith's article to our colleagues' attention:

PLAYGROUND DIRECTORS AT BAY

(By Red Smith)

Scholars versed in the folkways of the common American playground director (homo infantum) have been fascinated by the reaction of the Amateur Athletic Union, the National

Collegiate Athletic Association, the United States Olympic Committee and the National Rifle Association of America to a bill called the Amateur Athletic Act of 1973 that has been introduced by Senator John V. Tunney of California. Frightened lest they lose their right to measure the crossbar in the pole vault, the A.A.U., N.C.A.A., U.S.O.C. and N.R.A. are all lobbying against the bill that Philip O. Krumm of Kenosha, Wis., president of Olympic Committee, calls "the most dangerous legislation ever put forward for passage in the history of our country." We have it on the word of Charles Dudley Warner that politics makes strange bedfellows and Mr. W. Shakespeare has advised us that misery acquaints a man with strange bedfellows, but surely neither authority could have foreseen such a motley crew as this sharing a single kip.

The bill has been approved by the Senate Commerce Committee and is expected to come up for a vote in the first week of September when Congress returns from its August recess. The bill intends: (1) to create a five-member board to be appointed by the President that would charter groups to administer individual sports in international competition; (2) to review the past performance charts of our Olympic brass; (3) to set up a national foundation with as much as \$50-million a year for sports development.

THE LION AND THE LAMB

"The Amateur Athletic Act of 1973," says Philip Krumm, "is a most dictatorial assault on the freedom and civil rights of the American people." Mr. Krumm, whose special field is speed skating, was elevated rather recently to the U.S.O.C. presidential chair. The rarefied air at that height tends to make a new-comer's head swim.

The Tunney bill is an amalgam of legislation earlier by Marlow Cook of Kentucky, James Pearson of Kansas, Mike Gravel of Alaska and Strom Thurmond of South Carolina. It has the support of these senators and others exasperated by the interminable power struggle between the A.A.U. and N.C.A.A., disgusted by the bungling of the Olympic leadership, and angered by the mutton-headed pertinacity of a bureaucracy that threatens a champion swimmer like Micki King with suspension for joining a State Department tour of China.

Lions lie down with lambs oftener than the A.A.U. and N.C.A.A. crawl between the sheets together, but all those lobbying against the bill have their own reasons.

Under the proposed legislation, no organization could govern international competition in more than three sports. The A.A.U. administers eight—track and field, swimming, boxing, wrestling, weight lifting, judo, bobsledding and luge (that's sliding downhill on a sort of Flexible Flyer).

The proposal to review United States participation in the Olympics and scrutinize the structure of the U.S.O.C. is welcomed as warmly as a narc at a pot party. The men who administer the American Olympic movement are honorable, God fearing, upright citizens distinguished for integrity and incompetence. Possibly because practice makes perfect, they managed to botch things up rather more untidily in Munich last summer than in any other venue within memory. A study of their operation would inevitably bring a demand for housecleaning.

IN A BROAD SENSE

The N.C.A.A.'s position on the matter is hazy because the bill specifically exempts intercollegiate sport from its jurisdiction, and the N.C.A.A. no longer has any connection with the Olympic movement. Walter Byers, the N.C.A.A. galeiter, pulled his mob out of the U.S.O.C. after the Munich games. However, Walter has a sharp ear for the "ping" of a cash register; the thought of some other sports organization having a \$50-million budget offends him to the soul.

In a resolution opposing the bill, the executive committee of the National Rifle Association points out that it has "ably represented this nation" in shooting events at the Olympics, the Pan-American Games and other international competition. Chances are it could continue in that role under the proposed law, so the reason for opposition isn't clear. Probably the N.R.A. has to make work for the huge lobby it maintains to fight gun control legislation.

Concerning the federations now in control of individual sports, Philip Krumm says "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 years. . . ."

That depends, of course, on how broad one's sense is.

THE POOR AND THE WORK ETHIC

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely unfortunate, but true, that there exists in America an abundance of falsities and myths concerning welfare.

A recent New York Times column, entitled, "The Poor and the Work Ethic," by Tom Wicker makes an important and meaningful contribution to a clearing away of these American misconceptions.

The column is now submitted for the attention of my colleagues:

THE POOR AND THE WORK ETHIC

(By Tom Wicker)

What is the difference between the "working poor," who are not despised in America, and the "welfare poor," who are? Is it that the working poor have jobs? Or that those jobs will lead them inevitably out of poverty? Or that they are motivated by the "work ethic" while the welfare poor take handouts?

Well, the working poor do have jobs, but so do many of the welfare poor. But in neither case is there much chance that work will lead the worker out of poverty. As for the work ethic, both the working poor and the welfare poor usually have it in about the same degree, but it doesn't do them much good because the only jobs available are low-paid and lead nowhere.

If a working-poor person or a welfare-poor person also happens to be a woman, she's even worse off; because even within the desperate world of the low-wage earner, sexism is rampant and women are given the least desirable jobs and paid the smallest wages.

These are some of the major conclusions in an important study of a random sample of more than a thousand low-wage earners and welfare recipients in Detroit. Commissioned by the Department of Labor, the study was made by Louis A. Ferman, research director of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations at the University of Michigan, and Joe A. Miller, now of the Pennsylvania State University faculty.

Mr. Ferman and Mr. Miller have found, to put it simply, that most of what the public thinks about welfare recipients is a stereotype with little basis in fact; and that since much Congressional and administrative policymaking is based on the same stereotype, most programs to "get people off welfare" let alone what is left of those to "get people out of poverty"—are going nowhere.

Their study found, perhaps most importantly, that among the Detroit poor (who were nearly 85 per cent women) "there were

few differences between the working welfare recipients and nonrecipient low-wage workers with respect to personal characteristics or background." And for either category, "work did not appreciably alter the economic resources or life situation."

In fact, "if the nonrecipient low-wage workers were a standard, then getting off welfare completely would not really improve" life for the so-called welfare poor. Besides, a surprising number of them are working—94 per cent of the male welfare recipients studied had worked more than 50 per cent of the time covered by the study as against only 90 per cent of male non-recipients. Among women, a majority of both recipients and nonrecipients had worked at least half the time. Moreover, the jobs held by low-wage workers were mostly full time—but so poorly paid and dead-end as to leave the workers still in poverty, often earning less than the "combined value of services and cash from welfare."

The Ferman-Miller study isolated a set of characteristics that tend to keep too many Americans in poverty, whether of the working or welfare variety—rural origins with poor educational opportunity; migration to the city or elsewhere; lack of skills and training. These problems are compounded for racial minorities and for women. For these people good jobs are usually not available, no matter how much they want to work; for them, too, welfare can be of substantial assistance, and many take advantage of it without losing their desire to work and rise.

The study notes a substantial difference in the problems of male and female welfare recipients. Contrary to stereotype, the women do not have large numbers of children, but they do tend to be the only workers in their families and they work for the lowest of wages. The men, on the other hand, usually make much better wages and sometimes are helped by a working wife or older child, but have such large families that they cannot adequately support them. In that situation, increased earnings for a female recipient is a possible solution; but it is not a likely solution for the male recipient, who probably needs—as Mr. Ferman and Mr. Miller argue—a family allowance plan.

They conclude that in any sensible approach to the poverty problem, "The emphasis should not be on welfare recipient versus nonrecipient meaningless categories—but rather on male workers versus female workers. Second, the emphasis should be shifted from the concept of a welfare problem to that of a labor market problem."

Obviously, if far more women than men are in the poverty class, whether welfare or working, any effective program will have to "result in well-paying, prestigious careers for women as well as men." Just as obviously, if there are no real differences between the working and the welfare poor, the problem is not to get some people off welfare but to get far more people out of an economic dead end. Mr. Ferman and Mr. Miller favor "restructuring the low-wage market," through unionization; surely their study also points straight to the need for an income assistance and maintenance plan.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 9130

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, during the proceedings under the 5-minute rule in the House's consideration later

this week of H.R. 9130 I plan to introduce the following proposed amendment:

AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED BY MR.
DELLENBACK TO H.R. 9130

Page 22, line 21. Following line 21, insert a section 211 to read as follows: "Sec. 211 If any provision of this title or Title I of this Act or the applicability thereof is held invalid the remainder of such title shall not be affected thereby."

This supersedes previous similar amendments placed in today.

PHASE IV MAY COST YOU YOUR JOB

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the recently announced phase IV economic stabilization program has already run into widespread criticism and considerable popular doubts as to whether it will succeed or fail. In fact, some aspects of the policy may already be foundering, especially as the White House itself finds that it cannot purchase high quality steaks for the President.

More serious doubts, however, are beginning to arise. Bruce Davidson wrote an article for the July 30 Boston Globe, "Phase IV May Cut Jobs, Not Prices," which pointed out the distinct possibility that phase IV may not only fail to stem inflation, but may also mean a significant increase in unemployment, and a serious recession. That is a result we cannot, of course, tolerate just as we are recovering from the 1970-71 recession. I would like to insert that article in the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues:

PHASE IV MAY CUT JOBS, NOT PRICES

President Nixon's announcement of Phase 4 price and wage controls has already been met with fairly widespread hostility and expressions of doubt that it will succeed in fighting inflation. On the food front, which is most dramatic for the consumer, it has started with the assumption, conceded from the outset by the administration, that prices will indeed rise.

As troublesome as inflation has been and probably will be, it may not be the worst evil facing our economy. The greater danger, telegraphed by the Commerce Department of markedly slower growth during the second quarter of this year, is that we are possibly on the verge of a new bout with unemployment. Administration policy, abetted by a perplexed Congress, threatens to foster joblessness without succeeding in its other purpose of curbing price increases.

We may lose twice rather than just once—inflation and a stagnant economy—stagnation for short.

The Commerce Department figures show that the nation's total production of goods and service rose during the second quarter at an annual rate of 2.6 percent compared with 8.7 percent for the first quarter of the year.

There has been some propensity to cheer about the decline, which was partially expected by economists around the country. These cheers were based on the reasonable opinion that the very fast rate of growth in the first quarter was unsustainable without even worse inflation than we had been ex-

periencing and that it would be far better to drop back toward the 4 percent rate widely seen as possible without unacceptable price rises. Furthermore, some work done by Carol Greenwald, an economist with the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, suggests that our sense of the direction in which the economy is headed may be influenced by faulty signs.

She targets the Commerce Department's index of leading indicators, widely used by economists as a tool for evaluating the nation's near-term prospects, charging that over the past year the index has "overstated the economy's strength because much of the recent rise in that index reflects inflation."

She has constructed a new series like that used by the Commerce Department but accounting for price increases in such areas as industrial materials, corporate profits, manufacturers' new orders, plant and equipment contracts, changes in consumer installment credit, and changes in book value of inventories.

She presents figures showing that the index peaked in March—the undeflated index peaked in May—and argues that "The slowing rate of advance in the deflated index since the fourth quarter of 1972 presages a decline in the growth rate of real GNP."

But the Phase 4 message carries with it a call for balancing the Federal budget during the current fiscal year, which started July 1. The budget, which the Administration and Congress have agreed should not be larger than \$268 billion, is the amount that would be financed by our existing tax structure with normal growth and an economy functioning at "full employment." Since the economy has been operating at less than full employment, the Administration had been prepared to accept a deficit which last January it estimated would be about \$12 billion and more recently, because of the pickup in Federal revenues, something more like \$3 billion.

Since the Administration has so far ruled out a tax increase, the decision to eliminate even the \$3 billion deficit means cuts in Federal spending unless there are unexpected additional increases in revenue within the present tax structure. These cuts will presumably be made with or without the cooperation of Congress. And they will almost inevitably mean less employment somewhere in the economy.

The \$3 billion may in itself seem small and is in relation to a total budget of \$268 billion and a gross national product of nearly \$1.3 billion. But the Administration has often stressed its belief that even small deficits were unacceptably inflationary. The corollary of that belief is the assumption that even small surpluses in the budget while the economy is working below capacity are unacceptably restrictive.

So this move toward spending restraint comes at just the moment when the economy looks as though it may already be cooling off by itself. It comes, too at a significant budgetary surplus—running at a rate of about \$15 billion annually, an unprecedented figure.

This will not necessarily produce a no-growth situation much less a decline in overall output but the economy must expand rapidly enough to absorb new entrants to the job market. The addition of more than 2 million jobs in the past year has barely kept ahead of increases in the numbers of those working or seeking work.

The Administration has shown some capacity for flexibility in its various attempts to manage the economy but the current zig in attempting to impose the absolute restraint on spending looks to us like one that will see us all back in the tough job of maximizing employment. Treasury Secretary George Shultz has called the balanced budget "old-time religion," appealing to someone's sense of nostalgia. To us it sounds like old-time unemployment, and that we don't need.

OBTAINING THE WHITE HOUSE TAPES

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, in recent days there has been considerable debate over the constitutional problems and ramifications of the attempt by the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities to obtain tapes from Mr. Nixon. Following is a letter I received from Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr., a noted constitutional scholar on the Yale Law School faculty, commenting on the situation. I think my colleagues will find Professor Black's comments extremely interesting and useful.

Prof. Black's comments follow:

YALE LAW SCHOOL,

New Haven, Conn., July 30, 1973.

HON. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: I want to communicate to you some of my thoughts on the deadlock now developing with respect to the President's amenability to the subpoena duces tecum served on him by Senator Ervin's Select Committee of the Senate.

I think I ought to say, first, what an enormous peril I see in what is going on. Without anyone's really wanting it to happen, we are in danger of degrading or even destroying the Presidency as we have known it. You know, from our many past conversations and from some public writings of mine, that I think the aggrandizement of the Presidency has in some respects gone too far, and that some of the mystique surrounding the office ought to be dissolved. But it would be extremely foolish for us to go too far in the other direction, for the Presidency is the one wholly national elective office we have, and the degradation of that office—even of its symbolism, wherein lies a great deal of its demonstrated power for good—would be a most unfortunate development, disturbing in the most dangerous way the balance of the best government yet devised on earth. We should be especially careful not to do this through dislike or disapproval of any incumbent. Presidents come and go; any incumbent's powers can be checked in the desired degree by Congress. The office must be valued and protected above all for what it can be in the hands of a Franklin Roosevelt laying the foundations of modern social justice, of a Harry Truman establishing civilian control of the military, of a Lyndon Johnson putting through the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is against this background of fear for the indispensable dignity of this office that I make my technical points.

I think, first and most crucially, that the activation of this Select Committee of the Senate was wrong—constitutionally wrong. I heard Senator Ervin say, on a broadcast on Sunday morning, July 29, 1973, that at least one of the principal aims of his Committee was the finding of facts regarding Presidential involvement in the Watergate affair and its cover-up. But even if he had not said that, or even if I perchance misheard him, it is perfectly plain that at least one of the missions of the Committee is the ascertainment of these facts.

Now this sounds innocuous enough, until one reads the Constitution. When one does that, one finds that the sole power of impeachment is in the House of Representatives, and, far more importantly, that if that House votes impeachment, the Senate including all the members of this Select Com-

mittee, will have to sit as a *judicial* body, presided over by the Chief Justice, with the responsibility of finding the President guilty or not guilty of the charges brought. How in the world can these Senators sit as judges, or jurors, or a little of both, in a case with which they have been so closely engaged? Any judge thus involved in the background of a criminal matter coming before him would unhesitatingly recuse himself. Any juror with the same background of involvement would automatically be excused for cause.

What this Committee has done and is doing (and I speak here with great respect, for I impute no improper motive or wrongful intent to these Senators) is so to act as to disqualify a part of the Senate from performing its constitutional duty in the event of an impeachment's being voted by the House of Representatives. Indeed, it may be questioned whether the whole Senate is not to some extent disqualified, for this Committee is the agent of the Senate, empowered by that body and reporting to that body. With the deepest respect, I must say that what the whole Senate, each of its members, and all of its committees ought to have done was to abstain most scrupulously from any involvement in a matter which, as possible judges-to-be, they might later have to pronounce upon judicially. It cannot be constitutionally right for any Senators so to act as to disable themselves from the totally uncommitted performance of their judicial duty in case of impeachment.

Now I do not for a moment think that any court ought to try to stop this investigation. But when a court is appealed to for aid in the carrying on of the work of the Committee, whether by way of enforcement of its subpoenas, or of issuance of a declaratory judgment, that court is, I submit, duty bound to consider whether the Committee has constitutional warrant for its proceedings, or whether, on the other hand, its creation, empowerment and actions are profoundly unconstitutional, for the reasons I have given. If the latter judgment is correct, then of course no court ought to assist.

I must repeat that although I have spoken plainly, for the occasion is one for plain speaking, I utterly disclaim any imputation of wrongful intent on the part of any of the members of the Committee. I think only that they, and the Senate, have made a great mistake, and that no court ought to allow that mistake to spread to the judicial branch.

My next point would be that, although this subpoena situation has been treated as a "confrontation" between Congress and the President, it is by no means that. Directly and literally, it is a "confrontation" between the President and a Select Committee of the Senate. *Congress* has in no way—whether informally by concurrent resolution or in the formal manner mandated by the Constitution—committed itself to this "confrontation". The question, then, is not whether Congress might, by clear and specific indication of its will, have access to Presidential documents; I think, as I shall later make clear, that there ought to be wide limits even on that power, but that is not the present question. At the very most, this is a "confrontation" between the President and the Senate.

But I doubt that even that is an accurate characterization. The very Resolution (S. Res. 60, 93d Congress, 1st Session) establishing this Select Committee does confer a general subpoena power, and the words used might literally, if fed into a computer, cover the President, though, as I will soon show, even that is doubtful. But I submit that a court ought to adopt it as a rule of construction—aimed at the avoidance where possible of this highly undesirable confrontation, and at the protection of the judiciary from unnecessary involvement—that, if this most crucial and

sensitive crisis is to arise in court, the President must be *named*, so that the court may be sure that this undesirable situation is one to which the legislative authority has consciously committed itself. This rule of construction seems to me psychologically sound; who, in regarding general language about the subpoena power, and voting its adoption, thinks of the President, and of this ultimate confrontation?

I doubt, however, that the language of S. Res. 60 covers the President at all, even by generality. The subpoena duces tecum authorization reads as follows:

"(5) to require by subpoena or order any department, agency, officer, or employee of the executive branch of the United States Government, or any private person, firm, or corporation, or any officer or former officer or employee of any political committee or organization to produce for its consideration or for use as evidence in its investigation and study any books, checks, canceled checks, correspondence, communications, document, papers, physical evidence, records, recordings, tapes, or materials relating to any matters or questions it is authorized to investigate and study which they or any of them may have in their custody or under their control."

Perhaps a lexicographically programmed computer might print out the judgment that the President is an "officer" or "employee" of the executive branch. But that is not the way we construe statutes. Is it not perfectly plain that such language is entirely inapt, as a matter of usage, to designate the President of the United States? If I am right here, then even the Senate is not in "confrontation" with the President, not having authorized his being subpoenaed.

S. Res. 60, moreover, contains the usual provision for report back to the Senate:

"(6) to make to the Senate any recommendations it deems appropriate in respect to the willful failure or refusal of any person to appear before it in obedience to a subpoena or order, or in respect to the willful questions or refusal of any person to answer questions or give testimony in his character as a witness during his appearance before it, or in respect to the willful failure or refusal of any officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States Government or any person, firm, or corporation, or any officer or former officer or employee of any political committee or organization to produce before the committee any books, checks, canceled checks, correspondence, communications, document, financial records, papers, physical evidence, records, recordings, tapes, or materials in obedience to any subpoena or order;"

Does not this language (at the very least when applied to such an utterly unique and politically charged question as a "willful failure or refusal" of the President himself) designate the *exclusive* procedure to be followed by the Committee? Is it not reasonable to infer from it a *direction* by the Senate that the matter of possible contempt be brought back to the whole Senate, for resolution upon action? Is the expressed power to "make recommendations" not an implied exclusion of independent action by the Committee?

Of course, even if authorized by the Senate, any court action would have to fall within the judicial jurisdiction. I understand from published reports (and it is implied in the Committee's own resolution) that reliance may be placed on the Declaratory Judgment Act, passed some forty years ago. The operative part of that Act now reads:

"In a case of actual controversy within its jurisdiction, except with respect to Federal taxes, any court of the United States, upon the filing of an appropriate pleading, may declare the rights and other legal relations of any interested party seeking such declaration, whether or not further relief is or could be sought. Any such declaration shall

have the force and effect of a final judgment or decree and shall be reviewable as such."

I cannot think of a clearer instance than this of the mechanical application of general language to a unique and unforeseen situation quite obviously not within the contemplation of those who put the general language in place. Here again, it seems to me not only reasonable but wise for a court to require that, if Congress wishes to create the mechanism for inter-branch confrontation, it do so expressly and clearly.

Many more technical issues could be explored. These issues, though technical, are important, for correct procedure is requisite above all with respect to great constitutional crises. But I will pass on to the main question on the merits, that of the "inherent" Presidential right of privacy.

"Inherent" is a frightening word. All it ought to suggest in this context is the question, "What does it take for the President to perform his sensitive duties with the highest effectiveness and in an air of dignity?" It seems to me quite clear that the Presidency could not be carried on, with dignity or with efficacy, if the President himself and every participant in consultations and discussions with him had to fear the forcible verbatim disclosure, under subpoena issued by any grand jury, or any court, of the tenor and content of such consultation. Call to mind some of our former Presidents. How would Lincoln have operated under this regime? Try to imagine what Franklin Roosevelt (or his cousin Theodore) would have thought of it. How would we have liked for Senator Joseph McCarthy to have the power to subpoena every record of every discussion held by President Eisenhower on the subject of subversion in government?

What is really happening is that an absolutely unworkable rule threatens to be put in place, simply because there is great dislike and suspicion of the present incumbent.

It is apparently the theory of the Committee that the President ought to be just as amenable to subpoenaing of his records as any mortal, so long as those records are relevant to some congressional, prosecutorial or judicial concern. I should think anyone could see, first, that such a rule would generate its own abuses, for any official controlling the subpoena power (and there are very many who do) would know that the surest way to conspicuousness would be to turn that power on the President. On what theory would we exclude state prosecutors, grand juries and legislative committees? I cannot think it would be possible for the President to take or receive frank counsel on these terms, and without utterly frank counsel any such great officer is lost.

In some recent comments by academic experts, it is tacitly conceded that executive privilege must exist in some large degree, but the present case is sought to be distinguished. Little mousetraps of "waiver" are sprung; concessions, perhaps unwisely made under pressure of time and emotion, are seized upon as just exactly what it happens to take to make this case different. These comments have the flavor, to me, of highly special pleading. Their interest lies largely in their implied concession of the quite visible necessity of confidentiality in much of the President's consultation. Their attempts at distinction, to me, fail. It can hardly be that the solid grounds for presidential confidentiality are so easily, almost accidentally, to be undermined. Presidential confidentiality, to be effective or even to exist, must be wide, and must be very largely at the discretion of the President, for to force him to submit to any other tribunal the issue of the propriety of protecting any particular communication is to destroy, by that requirement itself, the very confidentiality at issue. The remedy for abuse (like the remedy for abuse of the pardon power, the veto power, or any other presidential power) is to elect good Presidents.

Indeed, I cannot see why we should be unwilling to cover the Presidency with the same confidentiality as that with which the Framers of the Constitution covered their deliberations. They saw clearly that nothing but ill could come of their consulting under constant threat of disclosure of every word tentatively uttered. They wanted to go to the country with a result and not with a record of the to-and-fro movement toward that result, of all the foolish things said and retracted. Similarly, the Supreme Court (like all our plural-member courts) consults in secrecy, and presents the public with a result and with finally agreed-upon reasons. There is absolutely nothing that jars with the spirit of our institutions in our judging the President on the record of things visibly done and of words spoken in public. That is enough for judgment, as it always has been, and to insist on more is to seek to strip the office of dignity and of the support of truly candid consultation. I have no doubt that that is what some now want, but if they get it I think we all shall at last be sorry.

For the foregoing reasons, I think President Nixon is right in resisting the Committee's subpoena, and I hope his position will be upheld by the courts.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES L. BLACK, JR.,
Luce Professor of Jurisprudence.

WHY TEXANS SAID NO TO THE TRINITY RIVER CANAL

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the environment page of the July 25, 1973, Christian Science Monitor included an article entitled "Why Texans Said No to Trinity River Canal":

WHY TEXANS SAID NO TO TRINITY RIVER CANAL
(By Cele Berkman)

Even back in the 1930's, when legendary Mayor Bob Thornton Sr. goaded the growth of Dallas with his cry of "Keep the dirt flyin'," there was always talk around Dallas and Fort Worth that "someday" the muddy, meandering Trinity River would be cleaned up, and its intermittent and devastating floods contained.

Big dreamers even hoped that it would be "canalized" to bring cheap barge shipping to the landlocked area. In those days, this would have been a boon to farmers struggling to move their cotton and wheat over the old two-lane highways and dependent on the all-powerful railroads.

But since then the picture has changed dramatically. Today the dynamic cities of Dallas and Fort Worth cup between their 30 miles separation the Southwest Metroplex with its new giant airport. Barge transportation would not be much help to the average person.

And so last March the plan of canalizing the Trinity for the two-hundred mile stretch from Fort Worth to the Gulf of Mexico at Galveston became a hotly contested issue between many industrialists and most elected officials, who were "for" the Trinity River Authority (TRA), and vehemently "agin" the taxpayers and environmentalists.

What had brought the 17 Texas counties involved to a feud was the availability of \$1.6 billion in federal funds for water projects. The kicker, however, was the requirement that local money be put up on a 10-to-1 ratio.

To raise the \$150 million required the

Trinity River Development Committee asked the voters to approve a bond issue authorizing a 15 cents per \$100 tax assessment. In a \$400,000 ad campaign they offered "consideration and conservation of wildlife, flood control, water supply, enhanced recreational facilities, pollution abatement, thousands of new jobs, and 'low-cost water transportation,' i.e. barges on the canal.

But the opposing Citizens for a Sound Trinity Organization (COST), a coalition of businessmen, private citizens, the Sierra Club, and the Audubon Society, seized on the "low-cost water transportation." They branded it as unnecessary, a "colossal boondoggle," a scheme of Trinity land-owning "fat cats" to cash in at the people's expense. Working with a \$15,000 ad budget, they sent out the message that one-third of the TRA directors own or control 51,000 acres along the river.

The bond issue was defeated in 9 of the 17 counties by a 54 percent margin.

One of the people who fought the hardest against the "fat cats" was COST chairman Dr. James White, a theologian from Southern Methodist University. He had become angry with the "pork barrel" aspects of the Trinity Canal while working on his last income tax.

Another anti-canal campaigner was a big businessman—COST vice-chairman Henry C. Fulcher Jr., whose Sitco Lumber Company ships 25,000 tons annually. "Slow barging savings on a Trinity canal is a myth," he said, stating it was cheaper to move lumber by rail from existing barge terminals than to have to truck it from a Trinity dock to warehouses, with all the transfers involved.

Dr. White and Mr. Fulcher, along with two other members of COST, accompanied freshman Rep. Alan Steelman (R) to Washington to speak before the appropriations subcommittee. Representative Steelman was the only elected official who was against the canal (while favoring water improvements).

Representing the other side at the May 23 meeting were two delegations of Texans consisting of 85 elected officials, businessmen, and TRA members, who had shown up to battle the still-viable issue.

The result of the meeting: Three weeks later the House Appropriations Committee approved \$1.3 billion for flood control, bridge construction, water quality, and recreation on the river, while bypassing the canalization of the Trinity.

So each side gained some, lost some. Most of the advantages of the program were welcomed by everyone: cleaner, more plentiful water, flood protection, and beautification of the river area.

However, some COST supporters are angry with the allowance of \$740,000 in federal funds for raising two bridges. According to Colonel Boone of the Dallas-based Corps of Engineers, the state had requested the widening of one bridge from two to six lanes, and replacement of another "old, dilapidated one." COST leaders Dr. White and Mr. Fulcher say the money for raising the bridges will be wasted, as there will be no barges to go under them and thus no need for greater height. But Colonel Boone says Congress has declared the Trinity to be navigable; hence the new high bridge construction.

The other side has some grievances, too. During the Trinity bond issue contest, TRA's general manager David Brune was particularly chagrined at the injunction granted by U.S. District Judge Carl O. Bue to stop construction at the Wallisville dam at the mouth of the Trinity until an "adequate" environmental impact statement from the Corps of Engineers was submitted and approved.

"The City of Houston had already invested \$125 million to take water from the Wallisville reservoir," he noted. "I think stopping that and enjoining the Trinity projects in the design phase that had no reference to navigation was the most ridiculous decision

handed down by any court in interpreting the National Environment Act."

But manager Brune's assistant, George Jannings, sees healing of wounds between both sides now. "If we have to disassociate the canal from other water resource projects, we will work with the opposition to salvage the generally accepted benefits."

Perhaps for the future the answer lies in a report issued by the National Water Commission. That report amounted to a major overhaul of the nation's water policies and programs, some causing controversial reaction.

In essence, it would put the costs of flood protection and transportation facilities on the users: property owners, local and regional governments, and commercial recreation users of a channel and its locks.

KU ADAPTS FACILITIES TO HELP HANDICAPPED

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following article from the official publication of the University of Kansas Alumni Association, "Kansas Alumni," which I feel raises an important point. All too often in planning buildings, we neglect the special needs of the handicapped. Bit by bit, however, we are gradually adapting our facilities, and I am proud of the role my alma mater has taken in this direction.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I direct the attention of my colleagues to this article:

KU ADAPTS FACILITIES TO HELP HANDICAPPED

No building on the University of Kansas campus is totally accessible to and usable by handicapped persons, according to a survey finished early last month by the occupational department in conjunction with the University Committee for the Architecturally Handicapped.

In fact, since the committee was organized in January of this year it has discovered "architectural barriers being created at KU," Roger Williams, g'65, 1'73, an editorial assistant in the geology department and chairman of the committee, said.

"There are a great many potential students that Kansas is doing a disservice to," he said. "The state considers it a University problem, not a state problem."

According to Williams, most Kansas handicapped persons who go to college go to Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia. Beginning in the 1950s Emporia removed its architectural barriers.

But if a person wants to be a lawyer, engineer, architect, pharmacist, or journalist or go into one of the medical professions he can't get the training he needs at Emporia.

"Missouri University remedied its architectural barrier problem about a decade ago. As a result the number of wheelchair students there has risen from none to approximately 90—some of whom have been Kansans," he said.

KU has a head start over Mizzou, with several handicapped persons already on Mt. Oread as students, faculty or staff members. No one seems to know exactly how many. ("What type handicap are you referring to?" Williams asked in return to the question.) They, including Williams, have with difficulty and determination navigated the Hill in pursuit of their careers.

Hundreds of details that most people take for granted go into making a building usable

by the disabled. If a door pulls open or takes considerable pressure to push open, someone on crutches or in a wheelchair may have difficulty getting through it.

Worse yet are doors that are too narrow for a wheelchair. Because of the narrowness of stall doors only one restroom on the entire campus has been usable by persons confined to wheelchairs—and it's only there because it was built specially for an aging faculty member in 1970. It's in a quonset hut behind Marvin Hall.

Drinking fountains and wall telephones are other problems. So are room numbers in classroom buildings. If a blind person manages to find the right building on campus, he can't be sure he's found the right room without asking someone in the room, perhaps disturbing a class in the process. If rooms were labeled with raised numbers at the side of each doorway instead of above the doorway, the blind could avoid this problem.

"These are people problems, not necessarily just problems of the handicapped," Williams said. Using as an example curb cuts put in campus sidewalks last summer, he said that bike riders and service personnel "find these are a tremendous aid and they forget that they were initially put in for the handicapped. They make it easier and safer for everybody."

The University Committee for the Architecturally Handicapped has been using KU's educational and research facilities to find and remedy these and other problems. Occupational therapy students surveyed all campus buildings as a practical classroom project, using guidelines set by federal and state building laws.

An industrial design student is currently creating a model restroom stall for the disabled. The Committee hopes to involve the School of Engineering in designing and building ramps to make more buildings on campus accessible.

Plans have recently been made to redesign two residence hall shower stalls, one in Joseph R. Pearson Hall and one in Oliver Hall. A Braille map of the campus should be completed soon.

A number of changes have already been planned for or made in the Kansas Union. Because a non-profit private corporation owns the building, it can make the changes independent of official University funding. And, the cost of changes for even as large a building as the Union is dwarfed when compared to the cost of making the changes in a whole University.

"Our one discouraging factor has been that it's going to take a great deal of money to remedy some of the major problems and,

because of cutbacks in federal funds, the outlook is not auspicious," Williams said.

It's illegal to build any new facility with tax monies that's not fully useable by the disabled, according to Williams. The committee examined plans for the new student health center and for Wescoe Hall. They discovered that in the new student hospital there was no public restroom that could be used with a wheelchair. A long ramp to make Wescoe Hall accessible had no level resting areas on it.

"We've saved a great deal of money when we have been able to get at these building problems when they're still on paper," Williams said.

"MURDER BY HANDGUN: A CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 11

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the facts about gun violence that should be emphasized is that the majority of murders committed with handguns are not premeditated acts and are not associated with robberies or other criminal activities.

In Washington, D.C., 81 percent of all homicides involve a suspect and a victim who were either husbands and wives, relatives, friends or acquaintances, and 86 percent of those murders stem from an argument, a fight or a lovers' quarrel.

Today's edition of the Washington Post describes such a murder, a common occurrence in this city and nearly every other city. Two men were arguing. During the argument, one man reached for his pistol and shot the other. Oliver M. Pettaway, age 25, is dead. Clarence T. Alexander, age 27, has been charged with murder.

In his testimony before the House Judiciary Committee last year, Chicago Mayor Richard Daley spoke eloquently about the impulsive nature of violence. He said:

There is one case that I know intimately because I was there. What do you do with a boy 5 or 6 years of age who fires a gun and kills his companion and his mother and fa-

ther are standing there, with the kid on the ground? Both families are all crying. What do you do with a neighbor who has an argument over a guy doing something to his fence or maybe parking his car in front of his house and one runs in and grabs a gun and comes out and shoots?

I have seen situations like that. You are called to the scene and you see the man has committed a murder. But, after all, if he did not have the gun, he would not have been able to kill this man.

You see people crying. You see the families and everyone else and the man does not know what happened. He got angry and had a little high blood pressure and ran in and grabbed the gun and ran out and shot before he thought what he was doing. And his neighbor, a good friend, was dead alongside of him and his family, and both families had known one another for years and they are all in tears.

A judge has that before him and what is he going to do? It was not premeditated murder.

Opponents of gun control legislation seem to ignore the fact that so much of violence is impulsive, and that violent action can often be stimulated by the mere sight of a gun. Opponents argue that stronger penalties for people who use guns would be the solution to the rampant violence in this country. Yet it is clear that stronger jail sentences are no deterrent to the murders that are caused by rage, by anger, by frustration.

We must try to prevent murders, we must try to keep them from occurring. We must take out of circulation the guns which enable people to murder so impulsively.

An article from the August 1, Washington Post follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MAN SLAIN IN APARTMENT

A 25-year-old Washington man was shot to death last night during an argument with another man in an Oxon Hill apartment, Prince George's County police reported.

Police said the dead man, Oliver M. Pettaway, whose last known address was on Eastern Avenue NW, was shot four times with a handgun about 8 p.m. He was pronounced dead on the scene, a basement apartment at 5076 Livingston Ter., police said.

Shortly after the shooting, police arrested Clarence T. Alexander, 27, of the Oxon Hill address and charged him with murder. No bond had been set as of early this morning, police said.

SENATE—Thursday, August 2, 1973

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, a Senator from the State of Maine.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in whose providence this Nation was born and by whose spirit it has been guided, grant us now a constant awareness of Thy presence. Deliver us from all offenses against Thee and against one another. Above all suspicions, contentions, and indignations may we see lifted up the cross of forgiveness and reconciliation. Help us first to be our brother's brother before we attempt to be our brother's keeper.

"Reclothe us in our rightful mind,
In purer lives Thy service find,
In deeper reverence praise."

Bless all who serve in this place, granting us pure hearts and clear minds and sanctified motives, that we may be worthy partners with Thee in advancing Thy kingdom.

We pray in the Redeemer's name.
Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (MR. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HATHAWAY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 1, 1973, be dispensed with.