EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REVITALIZATION OF THE NEW YORK METROPOLITAN RAIL SYSTEM

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, in light of the national concern for the future of the Penn Central and the northeast corridor, the Greenwich Environmental Action Group has worked with Mr. Charles Masterton of the Northeast Transportation Coalition to publicize and disseminate his plan for the revitalization of the New York metropolitan rail system. Because the Greenwich Environmental Action Group believes the Masterton plan would aid in making possible a sound and effective northeast corridor rail system, they have sent the Masterton plan to Federal, State, and local officials, environmental groups, private railroad associations, and citizen action groups, requesting their comments. In September the group plans an initial regional meeting in Greenwich, Conn., to evaluate the Masterton plan.

As part of the continuing dialog on solutions to our rail crisis, I would like to share with my colleagues the Masterton plan for a feasible rail-freight system in the tri-State area of New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey, as well as recommendations of Mr. Masterton and the Greenwich Environmental Action Group regarding creation of a governmental organization to revitalize our Nation's rail system:

THE MASTERTON PLAN

This is a proposal for the development of a feasible rail-freight system in the Tri-State area of New York, Connecticut and New Jersey.

It is our belief that any major plan for the movement of goods and people into and through a metropolitan region must be viable for at least 50 years and must consider, on a long-term basis, the critical factors of energy, land-use and pollution. At no time are we suggesting that a rail system is the exclusive answer. We speak here to the fact that, in many instances, it will be ultimately more economical as well as more environmentally compatible to create a workable rail system to coordinate with highway freight movement, and, where necessary, auto transit.

While this plan is initially directed toward a rail-freight system, there are many areas where passenger service can be tremendously improved by using the tracks of the refurbished rail line. Where rail freight is now running, the right of way is often sufficiently wide that it can handle additional track for improved passenger service.

Where we have indicated freight movement through the Metropolitan area, it would be equally practical to implement a significant improvement in passenger travel (i.e. Bronx, Westchester, Southwestern Connecticut moving across the Hell Gate Bridge into Jamaica, and from there with a single change to virtually every point on Long Island including the airports).

It is certainly also conceivable, as these lines are re-established as a rail system, that with no great additional efforts, a coordinate scheme could be established to tie in with the entire MTA subway system network. With these additional procedures and connections, every place on Long Island can be reached, from Westchester and Connecticut.

FREIGHT RAIL TRANSIT

The prime facility required to establish a freight rail system in the *Northeast corridor* is the construction of a tunnel, in Upper New York Bay, running from St. George in Staten Island to Bay Bridge in Brooklyn as an alternative, from Greenville in New Jersey, to Bay Bridge, Brooklyn.

Connecting R.R.:

A. The Lackawana, through the tunnel can use existing L.I.R.R. tracks in Brooklyn of an existing rail freight line, and will connect to Fresh Pond Junction in Queens.

B. From Fresh Pond Junction, the Long Island Rail Road line moves to Jamaica via Richmond Hill, and then proceeds to every major point in Long Island.

C. From the same location, freight can move to the Long Island City area, covering factories and yards. From Long Island City, Penn Central lines already exist for movement over the Hell Gate Bridge to Connecticut and all New England.

D. Also from Fresh Pond Junction, the line already exists directly to the Hell Gate Bridge via Sunnyside Junction, to travel straight through the major freight yards in New Haven, Springfield and Boston areas.

On the other side of the tunnel, on the Jersey side, these would be the connections:

E. At Bayway, with the Shore Line Jersey Central Railroad.

F. At Linden Junction, with the Penn Central Main Line.

G. The Jersey Central Main Line at Cranford.

H. The Erie Lackawana coming from the North and Northwest, can feed through the Penn Central connection into the new tunnel.

Some of the suggested refurbishings of the rail line to accommodate this improved rail freight system would include:

1. New electrification overhead between Linden Junction and Fresh Pond Junction, thence to Long Island City on one line, and to Sunnyside Junction on the other.

2. Upgrading of tracks, rights of way, switches, and signals along the above mentioned routes.

3. Improvements to the existing rail bridge over the Arthur Kill to enable it to carry a tremendously increased traffic pattern.

4. Raising the clearances beyond Hell Gate to the North on the New Haven Line to permit the passage of Piggy-Back trailers on flat cars.

5. The construction of Piggy-Back terminals, and car loading terminals to serve rail freight forwarders and consolidators: One each for Brooklyn and for Queens, possibly in the Canarsie area, for Brooklyn; and in the coverage for Nassau and Suffolk, one in the East Farmingdale area.

6. An auto train terminal in Long Island, at a convenient and acceptable location.

PASSENGER RAIL TRANSIT

It is important to initially indicate the current traffic flow into the core of Manhattan as presently constituted, as quoted by Mayor Lindsay on Mass Transit, in the N.Y. Times on May 6th.

On the basis of a 24 hour typical business day, listed below are the statistics from all directions:

The North: From the Bronx, Westchester, New Jersey and Connecticut: approximately 74,000 people a day come in by commuter rail; and 400,000 people move into the core by automobile.

The East: From Queens and Long Island: 75,000 passengers a day by commuter railroad. 350,000 people a day by automobile.

West from New Jersey: 92,000 passengers a day by commuter railroad or comparable facility. 95,000 people a day by automobile.

On a daily basis, 85,000 people come into the New York "core" by automobile. It is imperative that this number be cut down dramatically and drastically.

It is a fact that a great majority of these people come into New York, Manhattan, the core, by themselves, in automobiles.

In the New York Times of May 11, 1973, Stewart L. Udall, the Former Secretary of the Interior, for President Kennedy, has written a letter regarding his reference to President Nixon's energy message.

Obviously, the number of automobiles using gasoline coming into New York has become a tremendous reason in this city as well as throughout the United States for some of the shortage problem of energy fuel (and air pollution)

Mr. Udall's concept of saving energy is the fact that we frequently squander much of our energy.

And to quote Mr. Udall, "Our one man, one car, transportation policy is an economic hemorrhage";

Presently, rail freight travels to or from Long Island by the following routes:

I. Penn Central: *From New England and Northeast Canada*—direct via Hell Gate Bridge. *From elsewhere*—via either of two ways:

Route A: Via Selkirk (near Albany), Hudson at Stuyvesant; thence Beacon, Hopewell Jct., Brewster, and Danbury to Stratford, Conn.; thence to L. I. via Stamford and Hell Gate Bridge.

Route B: Via Maybrook—freight must be routed via Lehigh and Hudson River RR or otherwise to Maybrook, N. Y., thence over the Hudson at Poughkeepsie, thence Hopewell Jct., Stratford, Hell Gate.

II. Erie Lackawana; Lehigh Valley: Via freight cars on barges across New York Harbor with all the delay caused by disasembly and reassembly of cars at each riverbank plus the possibility of fog closing down all barge movement in New York Harbor for a time.

1. The proposed tunnel would eliminate the colossal waster of time, money, and labor expended in above-described ways of getting rail freight to Long Island from all directions over than North. It would provide direct fast through service to all Long Island from New Jersey and beyond: South-South-west—and West.

2. It would provide fast through freight service by the shortest route to New England from New Jersey and points south and west thereof. At present such service must either cross the Hudson slowly over the rickety bridge at Poughkeepsie, or travel up the west bank of the Hudson to Selkirk yard near Albany.

3. The speed and facility of freight service to New England and Long Island from New Jersey and beyond would lower freight rates and at the same time increase the revenues of the bankrupt carriers.

4. This tunnel would make it unnecessary for freight to be trucked through the Bronx, Brooklyn, or Manhattan, to Queens, Nassau and Suffolk counties, as it could then go by rail via piggy-back or freight car instead. It would greatly reduce truck freight through

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

N.Y.C. and its suburbs, passing thru to New England and beyond.

5. It would take some autos off the road and convenience the owners of such cars by making possible an auto-train service from Long Island.

6. This reduction of trucking throughout New York would greatly improve the quality of the air in the city and its suburbs adjacent to any Thruway.

7. The tunnel and related installations can be self-financing in part, through user charges and rentals made possible by the following benefits or savings:

A. The elimination of car float yards, float bridges, float barges, and tugs, and sales or other utilization of all land used for such purposes.

B. The time (up to 24 hours), use of equipment, and manpower in presently moving New England freight via Poughkeepsie bridge and Selkirk saved through this proposed construction plus the upkeep of the bridge, rail lines, and facilities needed for servicing the Poughkeepsie Bridge Route.

C. The time, effort, and expense arising from the present carriage of rail freight to Long Island via car float or roundabout routing.

D. Service charges and/or rentals from the proposed Piggy-back, carloading (for rail freight forwarders) and auto-train terminals.

Once the rail system is re-established and refurbished for freight movement there would be no problem to tremendously improve the entire passenger rail transit system into the core of Manhattan.

With overhead electrification, installed additionally between Jamaica and Fresh Pond Junction, a passenger train could run from any point from Westchester and Connecticut, Southward over the Hell Gate Bridge into Jamaica where an across-the-platform change can be made to almost any point on Long Island via the L. I. R. R.

Obviously, with this kind of a situation existing, the need for any new bridge crossing like the possible Rye-Oyster Bay Bridge, becomes incredibly unnecessary.

A station, as an example could be built, at Maurice Avenue, Queens, where connections could be made between New Rochelle and New Haven with one change of trains.

One block from this station on Maurice Avenue A Station on the Port Washington line of the L.I.R.R. could be built to provide easy connections with the J.F.K. Airport line and the proposed Jamaica-Fresh Pond-New Haven line via Hell Gate (Station at Queens Blvd., Kneeland and Jacobus Sts.)

(Present plans for the J.F.K. line already provide for a transfer station at Woodhaven where it crosses the Jamaica-Brooklyn line of the L.I.R.R.)

If these three above-mentioned stations were built, then J.F.K., could be connected with all points on the L.I.R.R., plus all points on the New Haven Line beyond New Rochelle, as well as Penn Station in N.Y.C.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As suggested by our Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Claude Brinigar, to create a whole new workable concept of Rail System, a new organization must be established to implement, supervise, and control. The actual selection of this new group must be immediately determined by Congress.

We might suggest, however, such an organization, newly established to consolidate the existing rail track, and to refurbish where necessary, would be an "Instrumentality of Government" headed by a single person. The following are several suggested guidelines to this "Instrumentality of Government", created to regenerate rail freight transportation in the northeast: (referred to below as I.O.G.)

1. The I.C.C. shall not be given the responsibility for the operation of rail services in the Northeast, nor any increase in its present responsibilities. It was set up to enforce transportation regulations and settle transportation quarrels, and is incapable of crash program salvage operations or creative innovation. I.C.C. has done little to arrest, or even sound the alarm against the decline of rail.

2. This I.O.G. should be separate from, and independent of the department of transportation, which has now many responsibilities over both rail transportation (public) and highways (primarily used by private transportation).

The interests and outlook of the users and carriers of private transportation are at variance with the users and carriers of public transportation.

Since D.O.T. has heavy responsibilities toward both, it would have to devote so much effort reconciling the one with the other that it would have little energy for immediate revitalization of rail freight transportation in the Northeast.

Re-establishing a viable rail freight system in the Northeast, must not be undertaken by a "referee" organization like I.C.C.; or by a highway oriented organization like D.O.T., where its interests are so varied regarding transportation modes.

This must be undertaken by some new instrumentality, approaching the critical situation, as a task force.

3. This task shall be given to an Instrumentality of the Federal Government, created especially for this purpose, must be headed by one person, and highly responsive to both Congress and the Executive.

4. This commission shall be granted generous and ample power and money to reorganize, consolidate, abandon, maintain, and improve (within the limits of due process and sensible restraints) all rail lines and facilities North and East of Cape Charles, Washington, Cincinnati, and Chicago, and also over the same of bankrupt Northeastern carriers extending into other parts of the U.S. Whatever mixture of nationalization and private ownership Congress shall decide upon, whatever claims or interests Congress shall elect to protect, this arrangement must prevail, at least until rail transportation in the Northeast is set upon its feet again.

5. All revenues from rail-related operations of such lines and carriers must be put into a common kitty and expended where most needed for the general transportation good of the Northeast taken as a whole.

6. The financial position, well-being, and future prospects of AMTRAK and Northeastern Regional Transportation Authorities, must be protected and respected by this I.O.G.

7. Generous capitalization on easy terms, as requested in the Astro Plan, shall be provided this I.O.G. for new rolling stock, facilities and equipment and improved rights-of-way to serve this territory where most needed.

8. This I. O. G. shall erect in all metropolitan areas in the northeast new and/or vastly expanded yards, terminals, and other facilities for piggy back, flexi-van, and carloading freight forwarded services.

9. This I. O. G., being so empowered, shall revise all rules, fares, and practices within this territory, and between this and other parts of the U.S. to the end of making piggybacking, rail transport forwarding, at the very least, equally competitive with over-the-road trucking.

10. To make rail freight from South and West directions time-competitive to Long Island and New England vis-a-vis other modes, this I. O. G. shall immediately construct a rail freight tunnel under New York Harbor linking Jersey rail with Long Island R.R. and New England rail.

11. Consolidations shall be made liberally, and abandonments made only sparingly and under the most dire conditions, and be governed by these guides.

A. A master plan for consolidations shall be immediately drawn up with priorities of urgency defined and a stage-by-stage schedule formulated with time schedule.

B. The Northeastern rail network shall be considered as a web wherein the strands mutually support each other. No strand shall be severed until ample studies and hearings shall conclusively demonstrate that the proposed abandonment does not imperil any remaining strand in the web.

C. Judicial hearings must be abundantly, meticulously, and conveniently provided for consideration of and decisions on (1) The submitted master plan as a whole, (2) each stage as a whole, and (3) each particular abandonment or consolidation proposed. Provision must also be made to re-open or review decisions already made in the light of significant new developments that make Northeastern or local rail transportation a new concept of freight and passenger movement.

D. Environmental considerations, impact on community well-being, and hardships to consignees shall be given equal weight for consideration with hardships to shippers and possibilities of monetary loss to any person or corporation whose well-being this I. O. G. is mandated to look after.

12. The imbalance of rates must be corrected.

COMMUNIST SUBVERSION OF YOUTH: THE 10TH WORLD YOUTH FESTIVAL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, once again the Soviet-controlled international youth apparatus has organized what is euphemistically called a "World Youth Festival," but which is in reality a propaganda and agitation program designed to indoctrinate young people with Communist propaganda and, potentially, to recruit them into the ranks of the world Communist movement.

Literature disseminated by the U.S. Preparatory Committee for the 10th World Festival of Youth and Students—which is also known as the 10th World Youth Festival Preparatory Committee—demonstrates clearly that this project is wholly Communist in origin and that the organizing for U.S. representation at this alleged "youth" gathering, scheduled for July 28 through August 5 of this year in Communist East Berlin, is being carried out by the Communist Party, U.S.A., acting through its official youth front, the Young Workers Liberation League—YWLL.

For example, a leaflet entitled "Come to the 10th World Festival of Youth and Students for Anti-Imperialist Solidarity, Peace and Friendship" has recently come into my hands. Interestingly, this document bears the printing label "209," which is the label of the Prompt Press, characterized by the Attorney General of the United States as far back as 1942 as being an organization that—

Prints the bulk of the literature issued by the Communist Party and its affiliates and

[which] is reliably known to be owned by the Communist Party.

That this characterization is still applicable is clearly indicated by the fact that both Political Affairs, self-identified as the CPUSA's official theoretical organ, and Party Affairs, the official internal publication intended only for party members, are today printed by the Prompt Press, as is material issued by many of the party's numerous front groups.

This leaflet invites recipients to write for "a Festival application" and gives as the address the "U.S. Preparatory Committee for the 10th World Festival of Youth and Students, 29 West 15th Street, 7th floor, New York, N.Y. 10011." This is the address of the national headquarters of the YWLL, which, as I indicated above, functions as the official youth apparatus of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

The leaflet in my possession also bears a stamped alternative return address: "10th World Youth Festival Preparatory Committee, 537 South Dearborn—Room 804, Chicago, Ill. 60605." This, significantly, is precisely the same address as the headquarters of the Illinois section of the YWLL.

The partial list of sponsors as reflected by this leaflet further confirms the Communist-front nature of this enterprise. Of those listed, the following have been identified either as members of the Communist Party or as former members who have remained closely alined with the party and its aims:

Angela Y. Davis, member of the CPUSA Central Committee and, according to the sponsor list, "Honorary Chairwoman, U.S. Preparatory Committee, 10th World Festival of Youth & Students;

Patricia Bonner-Lyons, a candidate for presidential elector at large on the CPUSA ticket in Massachusetts in 1972 and an active member of the YWLL;

Lee D'Lugin, identified before the House Committee on Internal Security as a member of the New York State Committee of the CPUSA and described on the sponsor list as being affiliated with the New York Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy, which is an affiliate of the Communist Party-controlled National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy, the vehicle by which the party is currently trying to organize rank-and-file trade unionists;

Dr. Carlton Goodlett, former CPUSA member who has remained an active supporter of the party and who is identified on the leaflet as the secretary of the World Peace Council, the principal international Communist "peace" front controlled directly by the Soviet Communist Party;

John Line, State chairman of the Michigan Young Workers Liberation League who was described in the January 1973 issue of Party Affairs as "a member of our own party;"

John Lumpkin, a member of the Illinois State committee of the CPUSA who served as a candidate for presidential elector on the CPUSA ticket in Illinois in 1972;

Charlene Mitchell, a member of the Central Committee of the CPUSA and moving force in the development of the CPUSA-front National Organization Against Racist and Political Repression, formed at the CPUSA-initiated and controlled Founding Conference for a National Defense Organization Against Racist and Political Repression, held in Chicago, Ill., on May 11–13 of this year;

Mark Rogovin, another candidate for presidential elector on the Illinois CPUSA ticket in 1972;

Carlos E. Russell, billed as "Dean, School of Contemporary Studies, Brooklyn College," and identified as a member of the CPUSA in sworn testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1970;

Jarvis Tyner, member of the CPUSA Central Committee and National Chairman of the Young Workers Liberation League; and

Henry Winston, identified in the sponsor list as "National Chairman, Communist Party, U.S.A."

Besides Bonner-Lyons, Line, and Tyner, several other sponsors are also members of the CPUSA-controlled Young Workers Liberation League:

David Bailey, an active member of the YWLL's Harlem branch, Third World Affairs Coordinator for Vietnam Veterans Against the War, contributor of an article to the August 26, 1971, issue of World magazine—a supplement to the CPUSA's official newspaper, the Daily World—and 1970 campaign worker for CPUSA candidates in New York;

Richard Hoyen, who has served the YWLL as a member of its central committee, as its national peace director, and as national coordinator of the Nguyen Van Troi Hospital Committee, a Communist front run by the YWLL from YWLL national headquarters in New York City with the cooperation of the CPUSA-dominated Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice and the PCPJ-affiliated Vietnam Veterans Against the War and National Student Association as part of a worldwide campaign launched by the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students, both of which are Soviet-controlled international Communist youth fronts;

The above-mentioned John Lumpkin, educational director of the Illinois section of the YWLL who represented the YWLL at a conference of the International Union of Students in Communist Czechoslovakia early in 1971;

Juana Mangaoang, a Seattle, Wash., student who was an initiating sponsor of the CPUSA-controlled Emergency Conference to Defend the Right of the Black Panther Party To Exist, held in March 1970 in Chicago, and who is also a member of the CPUSA-controlled National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy;

Joseph Allen "Mongo" Smith, chairman of the Los Angeles branch of the YWLL; and

Tony Ulen, who has served the YWLL as its Pennsylvania State chairman.

Thus, of the 45 people listed as sponsors on the cited leaflet, there are no fewer than 11 who have been identified as members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and at least nine who have been identified as members of the CP's official youth apparatus, the Young Workers Liberation League. Further, it is most significant to note that these are not merely rank and file Communists. Rather, there are the CPUSA's national chairman and three members of the party's central committee; a member of the party's Illinois State committee; a member of the party's New York State committee; and six top-ranking officers from the party's YWLL: the national chairman, a member of the central committee, the educational director of the Illinois section, the Los Angeles chairman, and the Michigan and Pennsylvania State chairmen.

In addition to these 20 prominent Communist Party and/or YWLL members, others of the sponsors have significant interlocking relationships with a number of additional Communist fronts. For example, sponsor Ramon Arbona, the first secretary of the U.S. section of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, a Communist-oriented, violence-prone group, has supported activities of the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners, a front group of the Trotskyite Communist Socialist Workers Party, and of the Guardian, a Communist newsweekly. He has also participated in May Day activities organized by the CPUSA and was a scheduled speaker at a May 19, 1972, meeting of the Communist Party's West Side Marxist Forum in New York City.

More recently, Arbona served as a sponsor of the CPUSA-initiated Founding Conference for a National Defense Organization Against Racist and Political Repression, along with other World Youth Festival sponsors Rev. Ben Chavis, Angela Y. Davis, Puerto Rican terrorist Carlos Feliciano, Carlton Goodlett, John Line, Charlene Mitchell, Carlos Russell, Joseph "Mongo" Smith, Jarvis Tyner, Joseph Walker, and Henry Winston.

Another Youth Festival sponsor, John Lumpkin, was in attendance at the Founding Conference; and the following festival sponsors emerged from the conference as members of the National Executive Committee of the Communist Party-controlled defense group created as a result of its deliberations: Angela Davis, one of three "Co-Chairpersons"—all three of whom, significantly, are known CPUSA members; Rev. Ben Chavis and Maria Elena Gaitan, among the "Vice-Co-Chairpersons;" and Charlene Mitchell and Maria Gaitan, both of whom are among the "at large" members of the national executive committee.

Another festival sponsor, Tim Brick of the Student Union for Peace and Justice, was among U.S. delegates to the World Assembly for Peace and Independence of the Peoples of Indochina, organized by the Communist World Peace Council and held in Versailles, France, on February 11–13, 1972, after which he turned up as a scheduled speaker for a February 27, 1972, meeting in Los Angeles organized by the CPUSA-controlled Peace Action Council of Southern California, one of the primary affiliates of the CPUSA-dominated Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice.

Rev. Ben Chavis, referred to above, is also a member of the board of directors of the Southern Conference Educational

Fund, cited as "a CPUSA front group" in the 1972 annual report of the House Committee on Internal Security. He also played a continuing role in the evolution of the Angela Davis defense movement into the National Organization Against Racist and Political Repression and was reported in 1969 to be involved in activities of the Black Panther Party in North Carolina.

Festival sponsors Ossie Davis and Ruby Dee, the well-known actor and actress, have records of affiliation with fronts and causes of the Communist Party, U.S.A., matched by few people in this country. Both have, for example, been intimately involved in activities centering around the CPUSA's Negro quarterly publication Freedomways, and Davis has been a sponsor of such other Communist Party operations as the Emergency Conference To Defend the Right of the Black Panther Party To Exist, the American-Korean Friendship and Information Center, and the Freedom and Peace Party, as well as being on the national council of the CPUSA-controlled National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Eddie Demmings, another festival sponsor, is identified on the sponsor list as a member of the National Committee of the Venceremos Brigade, described by Hon. RICHARD H. ICHORD, chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security, as "a Cuban Communist propaganda and infiltration effort," and was in fact also a member of both the third and fifth contingents of the brigade working in Communist Cuba.

Helen Greever is identified on the sponsor list as executive director of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, one of the Communist Party's principal front organizations, while festival sponsor Leith Mullings has been a speaker at an August 1972 meeting of the Young Workers Liberation League and a teacher for a series of classes held beginning February 12, 1973, at the Harlem Institute for Marxist Studies, an operation of the Communist Party and YWLL.

Prof. Harold Rogers, a festival sponsor and editor of African Agenda, has spoken under the auspices of the Daily World, the YWLL, and the Harlem Institute for Marxist Studies and contributed a book review to the May 9, 1970, issue of the Daily World. He also was a financial contributor to the pro-Communist magazine, The Minority of One, in October 1966.

Joseph Walker is identified on the festival sponsor list as "president, U.S. Chapter, International Organization of Journalists." The IOJ has been officially cited numerous times as a Soviet-controlled international Communist front organization. Walker, who is also New York editor of Muhammad Speaks, official organ of the Black Muslims, serves as a vice chairman of the CPUSA-controlled American-Korean Friendship and Information Center, was a sponsor of a May 14, 1971, birthday tribute to CPUSA. National Chairman Henry Winston has written for the CPUSA publication New World Review, and has been an active participant in conferences organized by the World Peace Council, including one in Communist East Berlin on June 21–24, 1969, and another held in Budapest, Hungary, on May 12–16, 1971. He also sponsored a reception for CPUSA political committee member, Claude Lightfoot, on March 25, 1973.

Another Festival sponsor, Prof. Fred Whitehead, identified as "vice president, American Federation of Teachers, Local 2176, Carbondale, Ill.," was a speaker at an April 20, 1973, forum in Chicago conducted by the CPUSA's Daily World and has written an essay published as part of a series on "Marxism and Literary Criticism" by the CPUSA-front American Institute for Marxist Studies, whose director is Party Theoretician Herbert Aptheker; and still another festival sponsor, Tim Yeager, a member of local 238 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters in Iowa City, Iowa, was a contributor to a fund drive conducted by the Daily World as announced in the February 8, 1973, issue of that CPUSA newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, the degree to which the Communist Party, U.S.A., and its youth apparatus, the Young Workers Liberation League, are represented on the list of sponsors for the so-called U.S. Preparatory Committee, together with the significant pattern of interlocking relationships between the U.S. Preparatory Committee and other Communist fronts as outlined above, should convince even the most skeptical observer that the U.S. Preparatory Committee is nothing more than an operation of the CPUSA and YWLL designed to serve as an integral part of an international Communist campaign to win world youth to the Communist cause and to subvert them to Communist agitation and propaganda purposes.

ELECTION CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM PAST DUE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, recent events have more than amply demonstrated the need for reform of election campaign finance laws. Last year's blatant coercion of money from American Airlines by Herbert Kalmbach, then private attorney to President Nixon and leading fundraiser for the President's campaign, is exactly the kind of activity which has caused the vast majority of the American people to distrust our Government and all politicians.

Tom Wicker has detailed this coercion in an article which appeared in the San Bernardino Sun on July 11 of this year. Mr. Wicker aptly points out that the Nixon administration strong-armed corporations like American Airlines into giving contributions "not so much, probably, as a quid pro quo for any specific favor as 'in fear of what would happen if it were not given.'"

This class of incidents represents only one of a large number of abuses of the political process which were heaped on the American public by those who ran the Nixon campaign, and it will be particularly disappointing if Congress fails to take steps to prevent a recurrence of such events. I am currenly cosponsoring legislation, such as the Clean Elections Act of 1973, which would go a long way toward averting future fundraising abuses of the political process.

Major provisions of the act would limit contributions by individuals and committees during any 1 year; provide some public financing of campaigns and incentives for small contributors; provide blocks of publicly subsidized television time to Federal candidates in general elections; and, establish a Federal Elections Commission with powers to subpena witnesses, to compel evidence, and to initiate court actions against violators of the act.

An article such as Mr. Wicker's makes me even more determined to see enactment of reform of campaign finance practices. I would like to share the article with you at this time.

STRONG ARM AND A GREEDY HAND

(By Tom Wicker)

NEW YORK.—Chairman George A. Spater of American Airlines probably understated the case last week when he said that "a large part of the money raised from the business community for political purposes is given in fear of what would happen if it were not given."

Such money, in short, is largely pay-off money, even if nothing is specifically purchased; yet, even as the Watergate investigations are finally exposing the system, another Senate committee is trying to ease off on the stronger campaign financing law that went into effect in 1972.

Look at the position Spater was in last year when the mysterious Herbert Kalmbach put the bite on American Airlines for $100,000 for the Nixon reelection fund.

Corporate political contributions under old and new laws were illegal; but Spater did not have to be told that:

American Airlines' plan to merge with Western Air Lines, a bid to take over the promising western tourism routes, was just then pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Kalmbach, (who now apparently contends that, like John Dean, he saw little of President Nixon in recent years) was then billed as Nixon's private attorney and leading fundraiser.

Kalmbach was also an attorney for United Airlines, a competitor of American who had filed its opposition to the American-Western merger.

In all those circumstances, Spater could hardly help but conclude—Kalmbach would have had to make no representations—that if American did not wish an evil eye cast on the merger by the Nixon administration, it had better come through; and it did, with an illegal $75,000.

The fact that the merger later was disapproved anyway has little to do with the impropriety of American Airlines having been put in such a position by a representative of the President of the United States; and that Spater and his colleagues should have resisted rather than yielding suggests mostly that those who are without such sin are entitled to make the point.

Eastern Airlines, confronted with a similar request, refused—which was at least easier for it to do, because it was not in the same supplicant's position as American. It remains to be seen how many other corporations were strongarmed for contributions, and yielded—not so much, probably, as a quid pro quo for any specific favor as "in fear of what would happen if it were not given."

Special Prosecutor Cox and his staff are

going deeply into this pernicious practice apparently armed with a good list of the companies involved.

Despite such disclosures, despite the documented fact that the Nixon campaign collected huge sums of cash that were improperly reported or not reported at all, despite the fact that the Senate's own special committee investigating all aspects of 1972 campaign abuses does not plan to delve into the financing aspects until this fall, the Senate Rules Committee already has voted to weaken significantly the new campaign money rules put into effect last year.

One of the committee's revisions would repeal the provision banning companies and unions with government contracts from raising political funds through individual contributions; the other would permit political contributors to withhold their addresses and occupations.

By the real need is for Congress to make it impossible for companies like American Airlines to be put under the kind of pressures exerted on them last year; and, on the other hand, to make it impossible for companies or industries to grease government palms with political contributions (as the dairymen did in 1971 and 1972) in hopes of favorable political decisions.

The best way to do that is to provide an equitable means of federal financing for federal elections—perhaps, as the current Stevenson-Mathias bill would do, by a combination of government money and strictly limited individual contributions, pegged to sensible spending limits.

It is not clear whether the Nixon administration went further than have other administrations and candidates of either party in squeezing money out of people and organizations with good reasons to fear the government or court its favor; but it is clear that such practices have been all too possible to any group of men fleetingly in power.

To put a stop to that possibility is the one major need indisputably disclosed by the Watergate investigations.

Whatever its antecedents in other administrations, incidentally, the American Airlines episode rebukes those who have persisted in picturing the Watergate matter as limited essentially to the wiretapping and burglary at Democratic party headquarters in 1972, as well as those who have insisted that ordinary political corruption was not involved.

With every day that passes, every fresh disclosure, every stale denial that soon proves inoperative, it becomes more apparent that the Nixon administration has been as unsavory and unprincipled as any on record—more so than most—and has been caught red-handed to a degree unmatched in at least half a century.

THE NATIONAL AGENDA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech I gave on July 28, 1973, in Valparaiso, Ind., on the national agenda:

THE NATIONAL AGENDA

Not long ago, I was exercising my Constitutional prerogative of free speech and criticism before a group of bright young foreign students. With much heat, and I suspect every little light, I was blasting away at one policy after another which were aggravating the social ills of the day: inflation, food prices, taxes, Watergate, drugs, crime, the energy shortage and all the rest. Finally, a brash, young, and I happened to notice, extraordinarily attractive Australian girl put her graceful arm into the air and sweetly asked, "What would you do to change things for the better?"

It is a fair, even if tough, question, and under the circumstances, I had it coming to me. I did not give that memorable young lady a very good answer, but I'm coming back tonight for a second try.

We begin where we are: Vietnam, Watergate, inflation and all the rest have come crashing down upon us. Our traditional optimism as Americans about the future has slipped a notch or two. Our faith has faltered. The average citizens knows in his heart that all is not well with the ship of State and that government does not work as well as it should in solving the problem before us.

The polls tell us that at no time has public confidence in both public and private institutions been so low. Out of 16 institutions in America, from the news media to the churches to the Government, a majority of Americans could not say they had much confidence in the leaders of a single one. Not one of the 3 branches of the Federal Government could generate as much as 30% of the public to express a great deal of confidence in them.

The overriding question, then, is the same question the Australian girl asked, What should we do? What steps should we take to put this country on a steady course, to restore our confidence and our pride in our Nation?

Let me speak, then, tonight about "the big picture," the large canvas, and, by using broad strokes suggest the directions we must go, approaches we must take as a nation to set ourselves again upon a steady course, and to rekindle our confidence.

A SOUND ECONOMY

First, we need a sound economy.

There is a general feeling in America today that the economy just isn't working right. There is an underlying fear of inflation and unemployment, and a fervent hope for economic stability and growth. The average citizen is trying his level best to make some headway against taxes and rising prices. He feels he is losing the battle, and he is uneasy about his own and his country's well-being.

We seek economic goals;

Adequate growth;

High levels of production and employment;

And reasonable price stability.

It's easy to hit any one of those targets. It's hard to hit them all simultaneously—but not impossible. We did it before in the period from 1961 to 1965.

It can not be done, however, with an economic policy that

Controls and then decontrols;

Freezes and then unfreezes;

Swings widely from phase I to phase II to phase III to phase III½ to phase IV;

Cannot make up its mind between laissez-faire economics and strict controls.

Firm, steady national leadership is essential for a sound economic policy that generates confidence.

We need:

A tough and fair Phase IV which will concentrate on big business and big labor;

Improved manpower programs, especially in areas like health care, where manpower shortages create inflationary pressures;

The elimination of barriers to employment—sex, age and race—to increase the supply of trained labor;

Open and competitive international markets;

Strengthened competition, including vigorous enforcement of the anti-trust laws and less government protection of inefficient industries;

Fiscal and monetary policies marked by restraint, including a tight ceiling on government expenditures;

And finally, the encouragement of production, the best weapon against inflation, by government policy.

NEW PRIORITIES

Second, we must reorder the national priorities, to concentrate our resources on the needs of the country.

The most fundamental issue we face in the nation is to determine our national priorities.

The federal budget is where we confront the hard choices on priorities, objectives, strategies and size. The President has proposed his budget which embodies his priorities. The Congress must consider its merits and demerits.

Mr. colleagues and I in the Congress have concluded that the President was right about the size of the budget, and I do not believe the Congress will or should exceed the spending limitation he suggested.

But within that ceiling, I and many of my colleagues have sharp differences with the President.

The President's budget cuts civilian programs: manpower training, education, health care, housing, rural and urban development, environmental pollution, social services.

I have contended that efficiency-oriented reductions can be made in defense spending without diminishing our national security, and reasonable tax reforms can be achieved without disrupting our economy, which, together, will enable us to free resources to meet the truly human needs in this country.

In a nation which produces over ¼ of the world's goods and services, but has only 6 percent of its population, no one should go without the necessities of life. Our work is simply not done when:

5 million Americans are in substandard incomes;

4.2 million Americans are unemployed;

And 20 percent of the elderly live in poverty. The defense reductions could begin with these items;

Cost overruns of $31.5 billion;

Military servants for 970 top-ranking brass costing $21 million a year;

The Pentagon grade creep, with more 3 and 4 star generals and admirals with a 2.3 million man-armed force than at the height of World War II. Even though we have 900,000 fewer officers today than in 1945, there are 2,000 more colonels, Lt. colonels, navy captains and commanders at a cost of about $2 billion more than if the 1964 distribution were maintained.

The supplying of 45 limousines and 42 helicopters to transport the top brass in Washton;

Almost 30,000 officers collecting flight pay who hold non-flying positions;

131 defense contractors in 1972 made excessive profits, some of them as high as almost 2,000 percent of net worth.

The choices here are specific:

10 B–52 bombing sorties cost the same as a 22-bed nursing home.

We spend for the F–14, a sophisticated jet fighter, the same amount as for the control and prevention of health problems.

For 1 Vulcan cannon, we can build 13 2-bedroom low-cost housing units.

We spend as much on the Trident submarine as for all funds for higher education student assistance.

We spend for one aircraft carrier enough to pay $10,000 annual salary to 100,000 elementary teachers.

We have to ask ourselves if these expenditures truly reflect our own sense of priorities.

Defense spending accounts for 42 percent of the President's budget, human resources for 25 percent. Of the controllable funds, in his budget, the President proposes to spend 65 percent on defense, and 35 percent on all other items.

Choosing our national priorities is the most difficult task in government. I'm merely suggesting that to set this country on a steady course, it is time to shift our resources to meet the problems of the people here at home, and that this can be done without new taxes, without more inflation, and without weakening our national defense.

EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT

Third, we must make government effective and efficient.

A broad sentiment exists in this country for a prudent assessment of federal programs, including federal spending. We all know that government is not as efficient as it ought to be. We all want to reduce duplication, unnecessary bureaucracy, red tape and waste.

If you ask the man in the street a few questions about government, more likely than not, he'll tell you that government is too big, too expensive, too confusing and too inefficient. Many of us in government share his concerns and believe we simply have to find ways of making government work better.

In the past 40 years:

The number of civilian employees in the federal government has increased from 600,000 to 2.8 million;

The budget has grown from $4.6 billion to $270 billion;

And since 1963, the number of federal grant programs to state and local governments has grown from 160 to 1,000, which now channel $43 billion to these governments.

There are just too many separate programs for effective administration.

The domestic activities of the federal government will cost about $180 billion this year, and the heart of the problem is to use that money effectively.

The federal government makes this enormous sum available in several ways:

It dispenses cash (e.g. social security benefits).

It helps people buy essential goods and services (e.g. food stamps, college scholarships, Medicare).

It provides public services for specific purposes (e.g. categorical grants to states and cities for libraries and highways).

It shares revenues with state and local governments for broad purposes (general revenue sharing).

What is needed is not exclusive reliance on one approach or the other, on categorical grants or revenue sharing, but a better mix—the use of the technique of assistance best designed to meet specific needs:

Categorical grants for specific areas of national concern, like assistance to the handicapped;

Revenue sharing to allow consolidation of existing categorical grant programs to meet broad needs, for example, law enforcement, and to allow states and localities to devise their own priorities and programs.

Some problems can best be approached outside the Federal budget, for example, industrial pollution. Our main effort ought to be to strengthen market incentives by making it more expensive for polluters to pollute, using a system of taxes and effluent charges, which will make pollution costly and anti-pollution efforts profitable.

To make government more efficient, there is an urgent need to adopt a more systematic approach to identifying which Federal instrument is appropriate for carrying out different purposes.

We also need to ask some hard questions about the equity of Federal programs:

We pay out a lot of money to the elderly, but we don't assist young, struggling families or low wage earners.

We provide medical care coverage for ordinary medical expenses, but not for prolonged nursing home care.

Eligibility rules for Medicaid vary enormously from state to state.

Housing programs help a small minority of the poor families well, but the majority of the poor receive nothing.

The Federal Government pays for most of the cost of our highways, and airports are constructed with Federal assistance, but railroads operate their systems without subsidies for carriage of freight.

We provide heavy subsidies to cities for sewage treatment plants to reduce water pollution, but none for controlling air pollution from municipal incinerators.

We must take the time to rethink our Federal programs to make them more equitable.

I have concluded that high on the agenda of things we must do to set this country on a steady course is to focus more attention on the effectiveness, the efficiency and the equity of Federal programs.

TAX REFORM

Fourth, as part of this effort, special efforts must be made to bring greater equity and simplicity into our tax code.

In recent years Federal taxes have become more repressive:

We rely more on the payroll tax (1960, 16 percent of total tax revenues; 1974, 30 percent of total tax revenues);

We rely much less on the corporation tax (1960, 23 percent; 1974, 19 percent);

The tax burden has increased for low-income families;

Because of preferences, the very rich pay less than one-third of their income in taxes in spite of high top-bracket rates;

You are acquainted with the inequities of the tax structure:

One American with an income of $2.2 million paid taxes last year at a rate of only 5.7 percent, while an average working man, with a wife and two children to support, with a salary of $10,000, pays 9 percent in Federal income taxes.

In 1971, the major oil companies paid taxes at the rate of 6.7 percent.

276 taxpayers in 1971 with adjusted gross incomes of $100,000 or more paid no taxes.

The reasons for these gross disparities are preferences or loopholes. Through tax preferences and loopholes, the Government loses in all about $55 billion a year. That's over 20 percent of last year's entire budget.

Because these tax preferences are so very expensive, they should be continually balanced against our other national needs and altered as our priorities demand. The tax structure should not be reviewed every 20 years, as we have done in the past, but every year. Its size and complexity require a continuing, sustained examination to assure simplicity and equity.

Tax reform is an issue that generates strong feelings and raises serious economic questions. I do not wish to destroy incentives or investment or economic growth. We should proceed cautiously—but we should proceed.

It is possible to raise substantial money from tax reform by making our taxes fairer, and without eliminating personal exemptions, charitable deductions, deductions for mortgage interest and other provisions that benefit many middle income taxpayers.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Fifth, we need to provide all Americans with an equal opportunity to participate in American society.

As we survey the struggle for equality in America over the past decade, the progress we have made is undeniable and encouraging, but the distance we have yet to go is also impressive. For every gain for minority groups in the past decade, there has been a widening of the gap between the blacks and the whites in this country.

While it is true that the American black is more likely than ever before to be:

Earning a decent income;

Holding a good job;

Living in a better neighborhood;

And completing his education.

Each of these generalizations hides the barriers that the black still faces.

Compared to the white man, the black man is:

Twice as likely to be unemployed;

3 times as likely to be in poverty;

Much more often trapped in deadend jobs;

And paid the same with a college education as a white high school dropout.

Civil rights issues today are more complex than they were a decade ago. It's not hard to determine whether a black man is being denied his Constitutional right to vote by a bigoted registrar. It becomes very complicated to prove that a black man is being denied a job or a promotion because of racial bias or because of an aptitude test that was loaded against him.

I have the impression that the task in the 1970's is to implement the rights that blacks won in the 1960's.

The civil rights laws, the court decisions, and the executive orders of the 1960's form an impressive civil rights arsenal. What is lacking now is enforcement. Not half-hearted enforcement, which I see too much of today, but vigorous, extensive and sustained efforts, marked by an escalated commitment to secure equal opportunity for all Americans.

How America deals with blacks and their aspirations will define for decades to come what kind of country America really is. This country will either be selfish and oppressive, or it will be greatly troubled, but still pursuing its original moral purpose and promise.

America so far has failed to deliver to many minority citizens the full measure of equality that lies at the heart of the American idea. We have the ability to make that delivery. I hope we can generate the will.

SECRECY—MONEY—POWER

Finally, if we are to restore confidence in government, then we must deal with the 3 problems that are, in my mind, at the root of the lack of confidence in government today; Secrecy, money and the concentration of power.

SECRECY

One reason people do not have confidence in government today is because the government operates too secretly. Any reasonable person recognizes the necessity of secrecy in government in a number of situations, including:

Intelligence information,

Diplomatic negotiations,

Military plans,

And secret weapons.

But secrecy has become an accepted way of doing business in Washington, with a presumption of non-disclosure of government papers and an absurd classification system. The people don't like secrecy or a government that practices it. A government that prefers to do its business in secret will not have the public's confidence. The public's business ought to be done in public.

It now turns out that American B-52's bombed Cambodia secretly 3500 times over 14 months before the U.S. invaded that land in 1970 and while the President and Secretary of Defense Laird insisted we were neutral, and with the DOD later knowingly providing the Congress with false information.

This is only the latest in a long line of revelations which illustrate our government's addiction to secrecy.

Some reforms have occurred. The Congress is beginning to open up the Congressional appropriations process to public examination, and to record publicly more of our votes, but secrecy still cloaks the decision-making processes of the executive branch.

The distinctive marks of a democracy are its commitment to an open society and the assumptions that policy can be improved by

steady public examination and debate. At the very least, disclosure should be the rule, not the exception, and the burden should be placed on the federal government, not the party seeking disclosure, to justify denying information to the public.

MONEY

People will not have confidence in their legislature until they have confidence in the manner in which their legislators are chosen. The presence of mountains of cash, unreported, and spent with no accounting, was a common element in almost every element of Watergate.

The most important facts about campaigning today are that political campaigns are frightfully expensive and most expenditures go unreported.

The democratic process requires a system that is open and honest. The present system is neither.

Campaign costs have reached the stage where they threaten the lifeblood of the democratic system. They simply must be gotten under control.

In 1970, 15 candidates ran in Senate races in 7 large states. 11 of the 15 were millionaires and all of the 7 winners were millionaires.

Today 90% of the contributions made to political candidates come from only 1% of the population. This means, of course, that a small number of people have the potential to exert enormous influence beyond their numbers.

The new campaign finance reform law has helped, but a whole series of steps must be taken to protect the integrity of American elections, including:

Sharp limitations of the size of individual gifts,

Overall limits on expenditures for a given race,

Complete reporting of contributions and expenditures,

And the creation of a tough, independent enforcement agency to insure compliance.

POWER

Americans instinctively dislike placing all power in one person. They believe that governmental power should be jointly possessed. A mood of anxiety has gripped this country about the expansion of presidential power at the expense of the Congress.

When a President asserts that he has the right to spend or not to spend money that the Congress appropriates if he believes it is in the national interest . . .

When he asserts an executive privilege as a shield for information and uses the doctrine of executive privilege to save himself from political embarrassment . . .

When a President without consulting the Congress:

Can commit American troops to Korea, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Vietnam,

Can make commitments pledging the money and lives of Americans,

Can conclude a ten-year war by executive agreement,

Then the balance of power between the President and the Congress is out of joint.

Today, the constitutional power of the Congress to declare war is passed to the President. The constitutional power to ratify treaties has been nullified by the extensive use of executive agreement, and the constitutional power to advise and consent has been diminished and ignored.

This is not what the Founding Fathers intended. They intended for the Congress to play an important role in shaping the foreign policy of the nation. In the most important decisions of government, those involving war and peace, the Founding Fathers clearly indicated to deny the President unrestrained power.

The essential step is for us to support efforts in the Congress to regain its place as a co-equal branch of government and to stand against the concentration of power in the hands of one man—even the President. We stand for a government of shared power and responsibility.

WATERGATE MESS IS STALLING THE PROCESSES OF GOVERNMENT

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Watergate affair, as it has come to be called, has had effects attributed to it that I have frankly doubted. Column after column has presented the case that the sordid episode has brought the machinery of government to a grinding halt. Failure to address fundamental domestic, economic, and social issues has not stemmed from preoccupation with Watergate, but from the President's well-known overriding interest in foreign policy and indifference to domestic policy questions. This has been the case until recently.

Evidence is beginning to mount, however, that Watergate may be bringing Government decisionmaking to a halt; that even where the President is essentially disinterested, issues have been addressed in the past, that now go waiting for attention.

Hobart Rowen of the Washington Post wrote a column, "Watergate Mess Stalls Key Policy Decisions," on July 29 that persuasively argues that Watergate is decisively and destructively interfering with the processes of Government. This is a serious matter indeed, and I would like to insert the column at this point for the information of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1973]

WATERGATE MESS STALLS KEY POLICY DECISIONS

(By Hobart Rowen)

The Watergate mess, culminating now in President Nixon's refusal to turn over his tapes to the Ervin Committee or special prosecutor Archibald Cox, is still eroding public confidence in government.

Some argue that the day-by-day operations of the federal agencies continue unimpeded. That is only partially true: as many as 100 top policymaking federal jobs remain vacant as prominent business executives and professional men shun the invitation to join the Nixon administration.

An influential U.S. corporate leader told this correspondent the other day: "I am worried about what appears to be a near-cessation of government activity. There is no leadership, and something must be done to pull this country together."

But the specific problem of day-to-day governmental operations, as important as that is to people who need routine decisions, isn't the big one.

What troubles thoughtful people in the business community and elsewhere is that Presidential concentration on the Watergate problem has stalled policy decisions on the key issues of inflation, energy, food supplies and the U.S. role in a world in which it is no longer the dominant power.

The extravagant and dreadful misuse of American resources through the long years of war in Southeast Asia crippled the dollar, and forced Nixon into two devaluations which not only shattered faith in the U.S., but have enabled the rest of the world to compete more successfully for American farm products. A cheap dollar also leads to foreign takeover of some American enterprises.

The food problem well illustrates the absence of a strong hand at the helm.

Serious academic studies, notably one by Lester R. Brown of the Overseas Development Council, point to the fact that food shortages are going to be a worldwide problem for a long time to come, because of rising incomes coinciding with only limited possibilities for expanding food areas under cultivation. Meanwhile, a decline in the global fish catch threatens another major source of protein.

But so far as I know, no one in the Nixon administration in any policymaking capacity is giving serious thought to this problem, or considering any multilateral approach. No one is concerned with what might be called the world food economy.

In fact, our responses to the food problem have been uniquely selfish and inward-looking, Nixon having resorted to export controls on soybeans and related products even though that dealt a serious blow to Japan.

The energy problem, brought about in part by bad planning and greed on the part of the major oil producing companies was met initially with a degree of panic which inspired fear of immediate rationing.

But as a report by former Ambassador Peter G. Peterson to President Nixon spells out, there still is no international policy on energy, even though this nation "can not go it alone."

Peterson pointed out that failure to cooperate with Japan and Europe on the use of Mideast oil might result in "cannibalism," driving oil prices out of sight, adding some $5 billion annually to the U.S. import bill.

But Washington isn't concentrating on an international approach to the energy problem. It is doing nothing significant to stimulate the production of smaller cars. Peterson, the strongest advocate of an integrated international economic policy that ties together our trade, monetary, energy and security problems is now out of government, and no one in Washington has yet picked up the ball.

All of these problems, meanwhile, are worsened by the short-term outlook for the domestic economy. The most pressing worry at the moment is a tight money policy which threatens to produce a monetary "crunch" similar to that of 1969–70.

In the space of one month, average mortgage rates spurted an unprecedented 1 full percentage point to about 8.5 per cent. Responsible government and industry leaders predict that the rate in areas not controlled by usury laws will run to about 9.5 per cent shortly.

A top government money expert freely acknowledges that the prime lending rate of commercial banks, now 8.5 to 8.75 per cent, could hit 10 per cent. "I wouldn't be surprised by that," he says.

None of this leads to a conviction that the men at the top in Washington have things very well in hand. The administration appears to be playing everything by ear, on a day-to-day basis, with little thought for the future.

In 1972, the Federal Reserve Board pursued an easy money policy, and the Agriculture Department promoted a policy of scarcity on the farms by keeping acreage out of production. Both policies having contributed mightily to inflation (and both traceable in part to political considerations), we have now shifted to a tight money policy, and a program to stimulate the production of food.

The average citizen can be forgiven if he wonders how long today's policies will last, and snickers at official assurances that all is well. Can we go on this way for another 3½ years?

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DISASTER LOANS

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, over the past months, I have been stressing the need for the creation of a comprehensive national disaster insurance program, so that our citizens and the Federal Treasury can be protected against the economic disruption caused by natural disasters. In order to demonstrate the severity of the problem, I inserted in the April 30, 1973, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a summary of major natural disasters since 1964, commencing on page 13600.

Today, for the benefit of my colleagues, I am placing in the RECORD a summary of Small Business Administration disaster loans since 1958, broken down by State. These figures demonstrate that a great many States have had one or more disasters large enough to qualify for SBA assistance in almost every year since 1958. In addition, they demonstrate that no State has been free of disasters. The reader should keep in mind that SBA disaster loans are not available to the extent that the individual's loss was covered by insurance. Therefore, the following summary shows only those losses which were not covered by insurance, or those losses which exceeded the amount covered by insurance:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DISASTER LOANS APPROVED BY FISCAL YEAR, 1954–DECEMBER 1973

Fiscal year	Number of loans	Total amount	SBA share
Alabama:			
1954			
1955			
1956	31	$142,054	$142,054
1957	8	100,282	100,282
1958	36	594,971	582,471
1959	17	569,500	569,500
1960			
1961	88	380,701	369,601
1962	14	187,600	187,600
1963	17	170,750	170,750
1964	6	67,700	67,700
1965	25	70,800	70,800
1966	32	89,850	89,850
1967	4	17,700	17,700
1968	26	1,000,100	884,235
1969	7	336,100	347,600
1970	249	1,917,650	1,917,650
1971	79	247,700	247,700
1972	6	53,800	53,800
1973[1]	1	334,000	334,000
Total	646	6,281,258	6,153,293
Alaska:			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961	1	2,000	2,000
1962			
1963	2	61,000	61,000
1964	517	31,291,530	20,247,728
1965	850	45,048,561	43,353,100
1966	208	16,247,534	15,861,983
1967	107	7,270,874	6,866,764
1968	3,527	61,295,894	61,065,619
1969	165	5,051,994	5,027,878
1970	148	2,605,900	2,605,900
1971	105	1,703,050	1,703,050
1972	78	988,740	988,740
1973[1]	11	108,550	108,550
Total	5,719	171,675,627	167,892,312
Arizona:			
1954			
1955	8	$71,400	$71,400
1956		(3,500)	(3,500)
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962			
1963			
1964	21	41,009	41,009
1965	4	31,000	31,000
1966	10	850,000	850,000
1967	23	782,570	782,570
1968	14	626,400	626,400
1969	2	257,000	257,000
1970	2	7,600	7,600
1971	189	1,040,950	1,040,950
1972	1	90,000	90,000
1973[1]	2,362	8,255,428	8,255,428
Total	2,636	12,049,857	12,049,857
Arkansas:			
1954			
1955			
1956	21	80,039	77,515
1957			
1958	64	1,003,002	993,002
1959	23	586,361	564,993
1960	4	9,000	9,000
1961	98	1,057,250	1,507,250
1962	10	220,100	216,350
1963	2	85,000	85,000
1964	4	55,000	52,200
1965	9	51,330	51,330
1966	11	24,690	24,690
1967	1	42,000	42,000
1968	94	1,985,415	1,981,415
1969	35	691,900	674,400
1970	2	50,000	48,000
1971	11	559,600	559,600
1972	5	232,000	215,000
1973[1]			
Total	394	7,182,687	7,101,745
California:			
1954	6	49,030	49,030
1955	2	3,000	3,000
1956	635	5,317,681	5,123,106
1957	114	1,469,699	1,437,655
1958	64	367,145	365,855
1959	105	1,014,395	1,014,395
1960	54	517,541	517,541
1961	13	201,944	201,944
1962	213	2,437,225	2,437,225
1963	271	1,802,532	1,802,532
1964	187	2,050,550	1,919,864
1965	252	6,696,117	6,300,126
1966	175	9,347,647	8,707,738
1967	153	1,872,595	1,872,595
1968	88	1,371,853	1,371,853
1969	718	6,476,283	6,476,163
1970	496	5,280,514	5,276,964
1971	17,505	86,564,954	86,564,954
1972	44,227	146,161,070	146,038,300
1973 [2]	17,305	38,007,508	37,988,908
Total	82,583	317,009,283	315,469,748
Colorado:			
1954			
1955	13	27,200	27,200
1956	1	150,000	150,000
1957	25	121,360	116,610
1958	8	93,275	88,150
1959	1	2,900	2,900
1960			
1961	1	2,625	2,625
1962	4	7,500	7,500
1963			
1964	7	27,665	27,665
1965	5	930,000	930,000
1966	1,064	30,686,561	30,247,034
1967	14	244,500	244,500
1968	4	163,000	143,500
1969	1	73,000	73,000
1970	16	252,385	244,885
1971	10	317,820	304,220
1972	30	439,275	432,525
1973[1]	24	807,650	807,650
Total	1,228	34,346,716	33,849,964
Connecticut:			
1954			
1955	55	207,012	207,012
1956	1,063	20,526,005	19,047,392
1957	8	41,930	43,030
1958	1	3,800	3,800
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962	1	2,190	2,190
1963	7	327,600	251,600
1964	4	161,700	161,700
1965	1	$75,000	$75,000
1966			
1967			
1968			
1969			
1970			
1971	1	100,000	100,000
1972			
1973[1]	242	1,855,422	1,855,422
Total	1,383	23,300,659	21,747,146
Delaware:			
1954			
1955	1	6,000	6,000
1956			
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962	108	2,591,700	2,349,680
1963	20	454,200	425,935
1964			1,700
1965			
1966			
1967			
1968			
1969			
1970			
1971			
1972	1	5,000	5,000
1973[1]			
Total	130	3,056,900	2,788,315
Florida:			
1954			
1955			
1956	1	3,000	3,000
1957			
1958	65	889,060	889,060
1959	8	200,692	200,692
1960	22	107,121	107,121
1961	712	7,310,472	7,310,472
1962	67	1,960,930	1,960,930
1963	9	20,495	20,495
1964	6	48,600	48,600
1965	726	5,053,603	5,041,003
1966	1,034	7,924,230	7,897,830
1967	57	244,300	244,300
1968	38	273,300	273,300
1969	27	103,250	103,250
1970	9	159,600	159,600
1971	24	378,050	378,050
1972	4	501,100	498,420
1973[1]	977	5,967,245	5,967,245
Total	3,786	31,145,048	31,100,368
Georgia:			
1954	13	41,275	41,275
1955		750	750
1956	5	69,500	69,500
1957			
1958	5	32,025	32,025
1959			
1960	2	151,000	151,000
1961	9	72,800	72,800
1962			
1963	3	22,900	22,900
1964	3	11,900	11,900
1965	8	184,190	184,190
1966	16	130,150	130,150
1967	3	40,000	40,000
1968	1	900,000	900,000
1969			
1970	2	4,195	4,195
1971	2	6,000	6,000
1972	25	154,500	154,500
1973[1]	12	172,600	172,600
Total	119	1,993,785	1,993,785
Hawaii:			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957	19	129,215	117,587
1958	4	14,609	13,874
1959	2	20,667	20,667
1960	25	417,239	376,099
1961	177	9,967,744	8,981,994
1962	6	124,865	116,929
1963	4	28,000	27,000
1964	1	10,000	9,000
1965	5	37,700	37,700
1966	11	331,350	304,550
1967	1	7,140	7,140
1968	21	50,623	50,623
1969	5	151,955	138,455
1970	12	154,615	154,615
1971	3	10,200	10,200
1972	5	734,000	664,300
1973[1]	3	52,600	47,730
Total	304	12,242,522	11,078,463

See footnotes at end of table.

Fiscal year	Number of loans	Total amount	SBA share
Idaho:			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957	5	$59,250	$59,250
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962	69	272,550	272,550
1963	2	15,930	15,930
1964	1	4,173	4,173
1965	20	255,033	251,533
1966	4	21,960	21,960
1967			
1968			
1969			
1970			
1971	1	3,700	3,700
1972	2	7,373	7,373
1973 [1]	5	314,136	314,136
Total	109	954,105	950,605
Illinois:			
1954			
1955			
1956	4	34,300	34,300
1957	1	8,000	8,000
1958	89	487,001	487,001
1959	11	50,217	50,217
1960	13	33,971	33,971
1961	33	169,085	169,085
1962	5	70,300	70,300
1963			
1964			
1965	28	133,300	133,300
1966	85	536,178	536,178
1967	62	411,250	411,250
1968	153	1,793,895	1,793,895
1969	21	207,050	205,200
1970	13	103,950	103,950
1971	19	80,100	80,100
1972	9	927,300	927,300
1973 [1]	3,787	11,935,493	11,935,493
Total	4,333	16,981,390	16,979,540
Indiana:			
1954			
1955			
1956	23	138,050	138,050
1957	6	115,750	110,730
1958	20	184,805	184,805
1959	43	97,508	97,508
1960	4	12,500	12,500
1961	27	39,380	39,380
1962	3	8,708	8,708
1963			
1964	69	396,235	371,485
1965	65	454,622	443,312
1966	43	894,500	864,860
1967			
1968	3	130,000	130,000
1969	1	40,000	40,000
1970	24	171,500	171,500
1971			
1972	9	521,450	521,450
1973 [1]	100	222,554	222,554
Total	440	3,427,562	3,356,842
Iowa:			
1954	2	33,000	33,000
1955	7	92,873	92,873
1956			
1957			
1958			
1959	31	303,550	303,550
1960	7	18,520	18,520
1961	38	85,550	85,550
1962	16	149,840	149,840
1963	6	10,250	10,250
1964			
1965	145	1,152,195	1,121,289
1966	52	401,424	365,801
1967	49	692,900	633,905
1968	58	629,488	629,488
1969	148	1,520,058	1,518,558
1970	69	719,410	719,410
1971	23	868,300	848,300
1972	33	785,800	735,000
1973 [1]	473	1,139,338	1,133,588
Total	1,157	8,602,496	8,398,922
Kansas:			
1954			
1955	9	39,600	39,600
1956	37	190,314	190,314
1957	29	306,000	302,000
1958	42	284,880	284,880
1959	74	635,226	632,956
1960	34	225,795	225,795
1961	20	74,940	94,940
1962	16	75,902	74,402
1963	3	2,702	2,702
1964	7	11,570	11,570
1965	90	$473,636	$473,636
1966	483	3,078,473	3,078,473
1967	192	1,693,990	1,693,990
1968	8	22,500	22,500
1969	1	70,000	70,000
1970	4	17,380	17,380
1971	4	192,000	173,250
1972	15	1,958,900	1,813,260
1973 [1]	9	2,185,500	2,146,150
Total	1,077	11,539,308	11,327,798
Kentucky:			
1954			
1955			
1956	1	35,000	25,000
1957	753	5,510,714	4,911,174
1958	45	416,035	364,735
1959	1	120,000	108,000
1960	5	69,700	54,200
1961	54	522,201	522,201
1962	61	359,084	355,084
1963	595	4,058,494	3,737,459
1964	290	1,742,264	1,615,840
1965	4	26,300	26,300
1966	4	13,950	13,950
1967	21	144,310	144,310
1968	60	411,665	411,665
1969	18	195,300	195,300
1970	134	615,925	615,925
1971	49	156,945	156,945
1972	34	1,124,020	1,098,645
1973 [1]	45	273,729	273,729
Total	2,174	15,795,636	14,630,462
Louisiana:			
1954	1	2,000	2,000
1955			
1956	2	7,000	7,000
1957	48	336,960	336,960
1958	385	3,900,907	3,730,787
1959	34	939,798	933,798
1960	5	61,000	61,000
1961	2	130,000	130,000
1962	19	109,850	109,850
1963	3	11,500	11,500
1964	1	1,500	1,500
1965	93	805,804	805,804
1966	26,348	113,685,142	113,642,272
1967	824	6,610,950	6,610,950
1968	37	152,495	152,495
1969	1	12,000	12,000
1970	3,130	36,368,682	36,368,682
1971	213	3,646,824	3,646,824
1972	22	650,800	605,060
1973 [1]	2	432,000	374,800
Total	31,170	167,865,212	167,543,282
Maine:			
1954	27	10,775	10,775
1955	54	86,200	86,200
1956			
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961	6	9,930	9,930
1962			
1963			
1964	150	189,036	189,036
1965	2	1,750	1,750
1966			
1967	16	22,300	22,300
1968	8	18,735	18,735
1969			
1970	45	310,300	310,300
1971	40	134,355	134,355
1972	264	1,458,260	1,452,260
1973 [1]	199	1,079,446	1,042,946
Total	811	3,321,087	3,278,587
Maryland:			
1954			
1955	89	278,040	278,040
1956	5	21,525	21,525
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961	1	33,000	33,000
1962	79	1,928,775	1,783,775
1963	21	436,800	430,800
1964			
1965			
1966	1	94,000	94,000
1967	6	342,400	342,400
1968			
1969			
1970	5	489,900	489,900
1971	1	120,000	120,000
1972	850	4,571,599	4,571,599
1973 [1]	5,359	33,104,458	33,104,458
Total	6,417	41,420,497	41,269,224
Massachusetts:			
1954	21	$115,800	$115,800
1955	103	734,131	734,131
1956	356	6,208,450	6,193,450
1957	4	15,500	15,500
1958	2	8,500	8,500
1959			
1960	23	47,955	47,955
1961	5	33,940	33,940
1962	3	120,567	120,567
1963	1	12,250	12,250
1964	2	6,000	6,000
1965	6	71,500	71,500
1966	1	14,000	14,000
1967	60	99,500	99,500
1968	98	2,134,283	1,955,783
1969	18	266,835	266,835
1970	4	25,700	21,200
1971	8	143,650	143,650
1972	1,254	6,112,436	6,112,436
1973 [1]	735	3,979,473	3,979,473
Total	2,704	20,150,470	19,952,470
Michigan:			
1954			
1955	1	5,000	5,000
1956	114	766,486	747,465
1957	25	256,950	224,550
1958	3	14,000	14,000
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962			
1963	1	25,000	22,500
1964	22	395,350	383,150
1965	93	1,143,475	1,142,175
1966	26	524,640	524,640
1967	7	37,400	37,400
1968	306	4,213,050	4,213,050
1969	3	50,500	50,500
1970			
1971	1	175,000	175,000
1972	4	1,198,300	1,198,300
1973 [1]	584	2,094,271	2,094,271
Total	1,190	10,899,422	10,832,001
Minnesota:			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957			
1958	21	135,252	129,432
1959	17	32,500	32,500
1960	11	166,153	150,353
1961	5	14,400	13,650
1962	2	3,100	3,100
1963	7	18,600	18,600
1964	5	105,600	105,600
1965	251	2,361,325	2,246,096
1966	248	3,141,397	3,113,974
1967	15	98,550	98,550
1968	10	158,000	158,000
1969	61	595,500	565,500
1970	33	299,797	299,797
1971	11	45,200	45,200
1972	6	185,900	170,525
1973 [1]	4,257	8,413,850	8,413,850
Total	4,960	15,775,124	15,564,727
Mississippi:			
1954	26	175,691	175,691
1955	1	223,000	150,000
1956			
1957			
1958	111	1,548,709	1,536,059
1959	36	619,513	619,513
1960	4	414,000	410,000
1961	62	375,891	375,891
1962	15	238,044	238,044
1963	1	7,000	7,000
1964	2	4,000	4,000
1965			
1966	561	3,151,480	3,099,337
1967	14	416,650	416,650
1968	30	658,950	658,950
1969	5	127,600	127,600
1970	9,225	93,317,308	93,317,308
1971	3,242	27,506,351	27,506,351
1972	251	1,223,791	1,223,791
1973 [1]	2	957,300	957,300
Total	13,588	130,965,278	130,823,485
Missouri:			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957	14	188,751	188,751
1958	241	3,272,878	3,245,032
1959	69	883,465	883,465
1960	15	157,795	157,795
1961	6	13,400	13,400
1962	22	459,315	449,315
1963			
1964	4	8,500	8,500

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DISASTER LOANS APPROVED BY FISCAL YEAR, 1954–DECEMBER 1973—Con.

Fiscal year	Number of loans	Total amount	SBA share
Missouri—Cont.			
1965	19	$93,070	$93,070
1966	128	1,158,237	1,151,237
1967	15	133,950	133,950
1968	13	557,200	557,200
1969	3	390,650	390,650
1970	11	201,600	187,380
1971	39	581,600	581,600
1972	33	1,014,200	971,600
1973[1]	4	566,000	551,500
Total	636	9,680,611	9,564,445
Montana:			
1954	1	1,800	1,800
1955			
1956			
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960	21	130,450	115,450
1961	2	3,030	3,030
1962			
1963	1	5,400	5,400
1964	11	35,600	35,600
1965	416	2,746,468	2,560,352
1966	1	23,000	23,000
1967			
1968	9	31,890	31,890
1969	3	8,400	8,400
1970			
1971	2	49,000	44,100
1972	5	141,400	131,900
1973[1]	22	1,041,400	965,800
Total	494	4,217,838	3,926,722
Nebraska:			
1954			
1955			
1956	5	48,150	48,150
1957	5	34,285	34,285
1958	8	35,212	35,212
1959			
1960	60	264,750	264,750
1961	35	243,398	243,398
1962	9	12,500	12,500
1963	5	37,150	37,150
1964	24	151,220	148,520
1965	71	290,630	290,630
1966	20	133,827	133,827
1967	32	131,700	131,700
1968	314	715,400	715,400
1969			
1970			
1971	79	1,144,200	1,209,200
1972	31	303,350	303,350
1973[1]	15	423,150	423,150
Total	713	3,968,922	3,931,222
Nevada:			
1954			
1955	14	57,319	57,319
1956	32	240,390	240,390
1957	6	91,600	91,600
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962	8	20,800	20,800
1963	17	64,217	62,567
1964			
1965			
1966			
1967			
1968			
1969			
1970			
1971	1	178,000	178,000
1972	3	439,000	439,000
1973	1	125,000	125,000
Total	82	1,216,326	1,214,676
New Hampshire:			
1954	1	400	400
1955	9	24,700	24,700
1956			
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960	5	39,000	39,000
1961	2	161,999	161,999
1962			
1963			
1964			
1965	4	376,000	376,000
1966	2	96,300	87,670
1967			
1968	1	42,000	42,000
1969	3	141,100	141,100
1970	3	131,200	131,200
1971	5	140,200	140,200
1972	90	552,350	552,350
1973	58	617,803	617,803
Total	183	2,323,052	2,314,422
New Jersey:			
1954	35	$171,617	$171,617
1955	8	63,915	63,915
1956	96	1,151,456	1,146,456
1957	2	3,800	3,800
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961	115	513,839	513,839
1962	827	7,037,811	6,830,445
1963	192	2,766,500	2,766,500
1964	8	1,085,500	1,085,500
1965	1	15,000	15,000
1966	1	140,000	140,000
1967	48	253,550	253,550
1968	51	458,020	458,020
1969	192	1,334,805	1,334,805
1970	15	27,075	27,075
1971	3	3,090	3,090
1972	6,125	23,917,380	23,917,380
1973[1]	305	23,013,075	23,013,075
Total	8,024	61,956,433	61,741,067
New Mexico:			
1954			
1955	8	61,800	61,800
1956	18	53,300	53,300
1957	1	10,000	7,500
1958	2	13,800	13,800
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962	6	23,600	23,600
1963			
1964	17	91,575	91,575
1965	7	29,400	29,400
1966	4	40,600	40,600
1967	5	60,100	60,100
1968			
1969	13	106,000	106,000
1970	29	234,100	234,100
1971	3	17,900	17,900
1972			
1973[1]	330	2,329,100	2,329,100
Total	443	3,071,275	3,068,775
New York:			
1954	17	94,873	94873
1955	7	71,360	71,360
1956	80	1,273,150	1,270,150
1957		(7,000)	(7,000)
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961	422	1,564,693	1,564,693
1962	62	426,485	388,985
1963	21	294,215	294,215
1964	104	626,174	623,374
1965	3	127,500	125,000
1966	3	127,500	127,500
1967			
1968	13	95,000	90,000
1969	2	10,900	10,900
1970	31	232,109	232,109
1971	35	122,484	122,484
1972	15,452	32,955,035	32,955,035
1973[1]	30,662	180,879,843	180,834,708
Total	46,914	218,894,321	218,798,386
North Carolina:			
1954			
1955	210	1,419,705	1,419,705
1956	223	885,991	885,991
1957	3	9,500	9,500
1958			
1959	20	87,780	87,780
1960			
1961	91	494,240	494,240
1962	91	1,313,400	1,313,400
1963	16	135,010	135,010
1964			
1965	32	230,500	230,500
1966			
1967	2	30,600	30,600
1968	4	201,800	195,800
1969	3	34,900	34,900
1970			
1971	10	32,350	32,350
1972	14	59,180	59,180
1973[1]	24	681,570	681,570
Total	740	5,616,526	5,610,526
North Dakota:			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957			
1958	37	1,275,722	1,174,322
1959		2,000	2,000
1960	4	65,956	62,206
1961			
1962	12	116,000	113,250
1963			
1964	1	6,000	6,000
1965	5	51,000	51,000
1966	6	14,700	14,700
1967	12	$24,750	$24,750
1968	1	4,000	4,000
1969	215	800,150	795,350
1970	486	2,167,425	2,167,425
1971	112	367,700	367,700
1972	2	9,200	9,200
1973[1]	1	12,400	11,160
Total	894	4,917,003	4,803,063
Ohio:			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957			
1958			
1959	271	2,128,752	2,022,994
1960	24	171,400	152,350
1961	2	11,600	11,600
1962	2	2,000	2,000
1963	55	210,830	200,830
1964	169	1,178,775	1,178,775
1965	21	192,920	192,920
1966	6	250,300	250,300
1967	16	83,410	83,410
1968	25	242,600	242,600
1969	25	330,920	330,920
1970	215	2,703,574	2,690,674
1971	4	136,700	136,700
1972	4	252,800	252,800
1973[1]	483	2,286,594	2,286,594
Total	1,322	10,183,175	10,035,467
Oklahoma:			
1954	1	10,000	10,000
1955	17	197,470	197,470
1956	55	451,064	451,064
1957	26	385,902	349,152
1958	22	213,250	205,500
1959	2	12,000	10,500
1960	101	308,480	300,610
1961	36	286,325	285,325
1962	11	79,333	79,333
1963			
1964			
1965	1	1,500	1,500
1966	3	14,100	14,100
1967			
1968			
1969	3	5,500	5,500
1970	147	598,592	598,592
1971	77	1,150,100	1,150,100
1972	100	1,001,400	922,950
1973[1]			
Total	602	4,688,016	4,581,696
Oregon:			
1954	3	14,000	14,000
1955			
1956	65	848,860	848,360
1957	29	189,828	189,828
1958	2	7,500	7,500
1959			
1960	3	33,000	33,000
1961	2	22,000	22,000
1962			
1963	41	373,742	366,958
1964	16	133,450	133,450
1965	312	3,579,843	3,241,504
1966	43	1,136,182	1,090,252
1967	2	361,000	361,000
1968	7	90,350	90,350
1969	8	177,845	177,845
1970	10	251,750	251,750
1971	10	124,660	124,660
1972	42	1,278,130	1,270,630
1973[1]	17	422,119	422,119
Total	615	9,044,259	8,645,206
Pennsylvania:			
1954			
1955	5	12,500	12,500
1956	263	3,609,698	3,423,718
1957	33	594,800	594,800
1958			
1959	24	121,790	121,790
1960	1	19,500	19,500
1961			
1962			
1963	16	298,400	285,950
1964	30	297,100	290,100
1965	9	147,700	147,700
1966			
1967	16	138,200	138,200
1968	15	129,250	123,250
1969			
1970	25	240,150	240,150
1971	6	49,650	47,400
1972	1,630	9,452,935	9,310,235
1973[1]	79,602	649,342,694	649,342,694
Total	81,675	664,454,367	664,097,987
Rhode Island:			
1954			
1955	232	1,636,136	1,636,136
1956	67	609,000	609,000
1957	2	1,900	1,900

Fiscal year	Number of loans	Total amount	SBA share
1958	1	$3,000	$3,000
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962			
1963			
1964			
1965			
1966			
1967	1	10,000	10,000
1968	9	241,525	241,525
1969	31	48,000	48,000
1970	2	150,000	150,000
1971			
1972	7	219,100	219,100
1973 [1]	19	259,400	259,400
Total	371	3,178,061	3,178,061
South Carolina:			
1954			
1955	131	2,148,960	2,148,960
1956	6	75,394	72,594
1957	6	57,750	57,750
1958	1	(2,000)	(2,000)
1959			
1960	116	372,355	372,355
1961			
1962			
1963			
1964			
1965			
1966	1	4,000	4,000
1967			
1968	2	58,000	58,000
1969	10	182,300	182,300
1970	5	203,250	203,250
1971			
1972	1	230,000	230,000
1973 [1]	1	3,000	3,000
Total	280	3,333,009	3,330,209
South Dakota:			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957			
1958	10	91,099	85,099
1959	1	12,000	12,000
1960	13	389,335	377,960
1961	2	24,495	17,145
1962	3	42,700	42,700
1963	34	177,300	177,300
1964	1	2,000	2,000
1965	24	187,180	182,680
1966	43	287,800	287,800
1967	5	7,285	7,285
1968	4	12,500	12,500
1969	14	58,900	54,760
1970	4	62,450	62,450
1971	3	131,000	98,875
1972	349	2,073,200	2,045,800
1973 [1]	3,377	57,238,629	57,214,199
Total	3,887	60,797,873	60,680,553
Tennessee:			
1954			
1955			
1956	10	44,150	44,150
1957	2	10,450	10,450
1958	45	406,907	406,907
1959	8	95,446	90,946
1960			
1961			
1962			
1963	13	80,650	80,650
1964			
1965	8	60,180	60,180
1966	7	134,000	134,000
1967			
1968	24	460,100	451,200
1969	11	267,780	267,780
1970	10	100,150	100,150
1971	16	404,160	404,160
1972	15	300,050	300,050
1973 [1]	35	223,368	223,368
Total	204	2,587,391	2,573,991
Texas:			
1954	3	21,850	21,850
1955	80	315,716	315,716
1956	13	591,000	574,450
1957	173	2,051,144	2,003,951
1958	211	1,828,602	1,728,952
1959	77	452,054	425,554
1960	18	176,384	176,384
1961	83	492,920	489,420
1962	4,005	17,430,155	17,430,155
1963	73	600,510	600,510
1964	102	342,062	342,062
1965	39	258,060	258,060
1966	181	2,026,766	2,010,041
1967	134	475,747	470,867
1968	9,022	32,727,624	32,720,049
1969	367	1,992,500	1,992,500
1970	1,530	$11,714,917	$11,712,267
1971	27,920	149,157,855	149,141,390
1972	20,878	70,165,996	70,126,496
1973 [1]	2,305	10,614,325	10,614,325
Total	67,214	303,436,187	303,154,999
Utah:			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957	1	25,000	25,000
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962			
1963	17	99,600	99,600
1964			
1965			
1966	13	33,500	33,500
1967			
1968			
1969			
1970			
1971	11	404,300	404,300
1972	6	927,400	927,400
1973 [1]	3	364,000	364,000
Total	51	1,853,800	1,853,800
Vermont:			
1956	1	20,000	20,000
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962			
1963			
1964	13	167,300	167,300
1965	3	46,500	46,500
1966			
1967			
1968			
1969			
1970	5	378,600	378,600
1971	2	53,000	53,000
1972			
1973 [1]	5	417,400	377,320
Total	29	1,082,800	1,042,720
Virginia:			
1954			
1955	5	21,540	21,540
1956	23	378,900	378,000
1957	53	234,580	234,580
1958	2	29,000	29,000
1959			
1960			
1961	12	116,650	116,650
1962	138	1,133,050	1,133,050
1963	36	305,200	305,200
1964	58	298,950	298,950
1965	2	12,500	12,500
1966	1	12,000	12,000
1967	6	189,700	189,700
1968			
1969			
1970	713	12,421,389	12,328,393
1971	55	996,075	996,075
1972	9	846,450	846,450
1973 [1]	7,522	58,762,017	58,762,017
Total	8,635	75,758,001	75,664,105
Washington:			
1954			
1955			
1956	45	360,223	345,923
1957	11	43,839	43,839
1958	1	1,228	1,228
1959	2	18,000	18,000
1960	7	50,400	50,050
1961	4	41,100	41,100
1962			
1963	20	154,107	153,807
1964	9	1,804,300	1,804,300
1965	74	2,001,125	1,973,195
1966	49	2,142,525	2,142,525
1967	6	381,400	381,400
1968	1	1,000	1,000
1969	18	200,800	200,800
1970	1	1,000	1,000
1971	40	115,842	115,842
1972	166	1,505,111	1,484,736
1973 [1]	450	3,014,488	3,014,488
Total	904	11,836,488	11,773,583
West Virginia:			
1954			
1955	17	67,150	67,150
1956			
1957	48	252,050	252,050
1958			
1959	5	$33,350	$33,350
1960			
1961			
1962	104	584,250	584,250
1963	198	860,000	860,000
1964	72	274,950	247,950
1965	4	8,300	8,300
1966	1	30,000	30,000
1967	100	846,950	846,950
1968	4	61,800	61,800
1969			
1970	24	78,510	78,510
1971			
1972	582	3,103,300	3,050,800
1973 [1]	4,169	15,095,838	15,095,838
Total	5,328	21,269,448	21,216,948
Wisconsin:			
1954			
1955			
1956	7	65,632	56,632
1957		(1,500)	(1,500)
1958	9	120,800	98,500
1959	26	170,283	161,493
1960	2	23,400	21,060
1961	4	20,000	20,000
1962			
1963			
1964	8	118,400	95,900
1965	88	639,035	629,525
1966	19	256,200	249,700
1967	6	17,500	17,500
1968	2	7,000	7,000
1969			
1970	5	210,680	204,250
1971			
1972	7	1,165,750	1,099,750
1973 [1]	173	1,276,464	1,167,464
Total	356	4,089,644	3,819,274
Wyoming:			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957			
1958	2	11,500	11,500
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962	6	27,940	27,940
1963	2	4,137	4,137
1964	2	3,000	3,000
1965			
1966			
1967			
1968	21	49,933	49,933
1969			
1970			
1971			
1972	4	480,850	480,850
1973 [1]	2	180,500	180,500
Total	39	757,860	757,860
Guam:			
1963 [1]	570	6,192,389	5,881,882
1964	555	5,653,942	5,470,727
1965	69	142,100	142,100
1966			
1967			
1968			
1969			
1970			
1971			
1972			
1973 [1]			
Total	1,194	11,988,431	11,494,709
Puerto Rico:			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957	137	370,375	370,375
1958		19,353	19,353
1959		(8,000)	(8,000)
1960			
1961	606	770,100	770,100
1962	89	102,300	102,300
1963			
1964			
1965	7	161,100	159,100
1966	1	3,000	3,000
1967			
1968			
1969			
1970	118	121,300	121,300
1971	7,402	18,622,100	18,622,100
1972	637	1,399,800	1,399,800
1973 [1]	1	1,200	1,200
Total	8,998	21,562,628	21,560,628

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DISASTER LOANS APPROVED BY FISCAL YEAR, 1954–DECEMBER 1973—Con.

Fiscal year	Number of loans	Total amount	SBA share
Virgin Islands:			
1960	22	$61,160	$61,160
1961	2	23,000	23,000
1962			
1963			
1964			
1965			
1966			
1967			
1968			
1969			
1970			
1971	31	102,100	102,100
1972	3	23,800	23,800
1973[1]			
Total	58	210,060	210,060
Trust territories:			
1972[3]	2	35,000	31,500
1973[1]	1	30,000	27,000
Total	3	65,000	58,500
District of Columbia:			
1973[1,4]	103	583,822	583,822
National totals:			
1954	157	742,111	742,111
1955	1,086	7,872,477	7,799,477
1956	3,309	44,402,267	42,422,499
1957	1,597	12,991,664	12,243,939
1958	1,559	17,305,827	16,771,341
1959	908	9,201,747	9,013,061
1960	625	4,514,860	4,379,035
1961	2,778	25,735,643	24,726,193
1962	6,106	39,680,469	38,917,648
1963	2,305	20,230,360	19,482,369
1964	2,509	48,873,180	47,315,003
1965	3,891	76,454,552	73,596,360
1966	30,950	199,253,693	197,463,022
1967	2,035	24,237,021	23,769,036
1968	14,126	114,176,638	113,594,925
1969	2,128	22,347,775	22,231,869
1970	17,011	175,102,132	174,955,386
1971	57,407	298,084,815	297,941,725
1972	93,342	323,947,581	322,865,126
1973[1]	166,184	1,131,497,450	1,131,022,105
Grand total	380,013	2,596,652,257	2,581,252,230

[1] Through December.
[2] No loans approved before 1963.
[3] No loans approved before 1972.
[4] No loans approved before 1973.

EXPENSE AND WASTE INVOLVED IN FOREIGN AID

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, newspapers of July 25 published an excellent column by Henry J. Taylor concerning the expense and waste involved in foreign aid.

Mr. Taylor points out that the legislation voted upon in the Congress under the label "foreign aid" represents only part—it is actually about one-third—of the total cost of U.S. assistance to other nations.

I feel that Mr. Taylor's points are well taken and that new appropriations for foreign aid cannot be justified in this period of foreign government deficits and high inflation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Taylor's column, "America's Foreign Aid: Millions Down the Drain," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

AMERICA'S FOREIGN AID: MILLIONS DOWN THE DRAIN

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Afghanistan has been the toy of King Mohammed Zahir Shah for 40 years. And when strongman cousin Lt. Gen. Daud Khan overthrew him on July 17, luxuriating at the moment at an Italian health spa, the cheery sound you heard was the U.S. taxpayers' money tinkling, clinking, clanking down the drain.

Another $425 million of our foreign aid is gone with the wind.

Year after year, our tax payments pass into rich people's pockets around the world, as in Afghanistan, and precious little reaches the poor. Both King Zahir and cousin Daud operate like an octopus secure in a rocky cleft, snapping up what it wishes. And neither has any more interest in the Afghanistan people than in a horse race in Ireland.

This Stone Age fiefdom still has no economic base whatever. It is a poverty-stricken place where aged men and women stand idly by while ragged children walk aimlessly along the road. But you will find in Afghanistan flocks of air-conditioned Cadillac limousines for the officials and a hoard of governmental extravagances that would make old "Diamond Jim" Brady blush.

As in other, similar countries on the receiving end of our handouts, it's merely a case of "what I take belongs to me; what you give is your own fault."

We U.S. taxpaying peasants are presently supplying military and/or economic aid to 91 countries. Through many, many years we have been giveaway minded. That's what has cost us so much. This viewpoint creates compromises with wisdom, efficiency and good policy.

The record stands: We find countless places to start and no place to stop in projects that can acquire a momentum and a life of their own.

Like Coney Island's Magic Maze, there are all kinds of ways in and no way out.

Back in 1962, the countries getting aid (Afghanistan one of them) totaled 98. Out of the whole kit and kaboodle, only seven countries have been eliminated in all of the past 11 years. As one result, a brick thrown nearly any place in the world—as in Afghanistan—is sure to hit the American taxpayer.

We're told that the foreign aid bill we are paying for 1973 is $3.2 billion.

This disclosed $3.2 billion is bad enough, heaven knows; but when you really get into it, the $3.2 billion is only a part of the picture. The rest—which is colossal—is hidden.

The best authority I know for the truth about our foreign aid is long-time House appropriations subcommittee Chairman Otto E. Passman, D-La. He has held hundreds on hundreds of hearings on the subject, traveled himself to the main spending centers, continuously studied the whole setup from top to bottom and knows the facts fully—a no-nonsense man totally equipped.

Passman has told me that the disclosed bill is utter nonsense: It might as well have been popped out of an Afghanistan medicine man's basket of snakes.

Passman points out that more than double the billions is the true amount.

The $3.2 billion fails to include the Food for Peace deliveries; our payments for the Inter-AmericaBank, the International Development Association, other international organizations, the Peace Corps, etc. The additional billions are scattered in 14 other separate budget sections and are not included in the $3.2 billion foreign aid figure.

We have given more and asked less than any nation in the history of the world. That's another reason why we can be proud that we are Americans. A meat-ax attack on our foreign aid would be foolhardy and dangerous. But only a solvent America can be a helping America. We must donate our substance not according to our desires but according to our means. And the floating crap game known as our foreign aid program has long since become too large to support and too complex to understand.

Each of the endless reorganizations of the disbursing agencies, always with alibis, merely serves as a broken promise. And, hey—that's our money!

If we haven't anything better to do with our hard-earned U.S. tax dollars than send them to the ilk of most of these 91 countries, the entire U.S. Internal Revenue Service should turn in its uniforms.

AMTRAK SERVICE IS POOR

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a letter sent by my constituent, Mrs. Richard Sharkey, of Walnut Creek, Calif. to Amtrak, concerning the conditions she encountered on that system. On a train ride from Okaland, Calif. to Providence, R.I., she was confronted with dirt, cockroaches, long delays, poor service, and cold food. It is incredible to me that this type of service is found on a public transportation system; once purported to be new and improved. It is my opinion that my colleagues and fellow citizens should be made aware of this situation and consider what action to take to rectify the problems.

Mrs. Sharkey's letter follows:

LETTER

DEAR SIR: I am sending you this letter to inform you of the services I received on your so-called new train "Amtrak". You have changed the name but, it is still the same dirty, slow train.

I boarded the train June 7, 1973 at 9:15 a.m., Located my roomette # 8 car # 0635 which had been arranged for me by Van Ness Travel, Inc. 1703 Oak Grove Road, Concord, Calif. 94520. I was all settled waiting for the train to start when the porter informed me another lady had this room and told me to move to # 6.

We left Oakland at 9:30 a.m. arrived a few miles up the track and was told there was a derailment ahead. We sat there for sometime then started to back up to Richmond. It took them 4 hours to find out if they could use another railroad company's tracks. We were 6½ hours late getting started again. We arrived at Port Chicago at 3 p.m. I could have walked from my house in Walnut Creek and got there faster.

We arrived in:
Sacramento, 6 p.m.
Truckee, 9:45 p.m.
Odgen, Utah, 10:20 a.m., June 8, 1973.
Green River, Wyo., 1:40 p.m.
Cheyenne, Wyo., 6 p.m.
Creston, Ia., 10:50 a.m., June 9, 1973.
Osceola, Ia., 11:25 a.m.
Ottumwa, Ia., 12:40 p.m.
Chicago, Ill., 5:30 p.m., June 9, 1973.

The roomette I had was full of dust and lint. My mattress had the smell of urine on it. The next morning I reported this to the porter who said the train was full and there was nothing he could do about it. So Friday I slept in the same smelly bed.

In the morning I found out that there had been an empty room that night and that the porter had slept in it.

The car's air conditioning went out, also the units in other cars and the diner. There were cockroaches that got in a baby's car bed and the mother sat up all night with the lights on to watch they didn't get to her baby again.

Because of equilibrium problems, chronic asthma and a dust allergy, my doctor advised me to travel by train. Believing the advertisement in the newspaper about Amtrak I agreed with the doctor to travel by train, while my family flew to Providence, Rhode Island. They were expecting me to arrive June 10, at 2:45 p.m.

Since we arrived late in Chicago, Amtrak let me call my family and tell them I would arrive June 11, at 2:45 p.m. in Providence. Then they put me up at the Palmer House in downtown Chicago for the night. They didn't seem to care about the exact amount I had spent when I checked back to the Amtrak office. Then I was placed on the train in Chicago car #4031 Roomette #1. to New York. The roomette was dusty and had at least a weeks dirt and lint in and around the chair. In the morning I was informed we were a hour late and no one knew why. I went to breakfast and found the diner car air conditioning was out. I waited ½ hour before they took my order and when it came it was cold. The waiters were cross and unpleasant to everyone.

Arriving in New York at 12:15 p.m. I was told to sit down and watch the board for the time and gate it would leave from for Providence. I was afraid to leave my seat and get something to eat for lunch so I had to go without lunch. I got on the train for Providence and sat in the nonsmokers car because I also have an allergy to cigarette and cigar smoke. This car had the air conditioning out also. They told us to move to the smokers car because the air conditioning was working in that car. Finally arriving in Providence at 3:45 p.m. 1 hour later than my family had been told I found them very upset. They didn't know what else had happened to me and didn't know if I had even left Chicago.

So when it was time to make reservations to come home my husband said, "No way" was I going to travel by train and arrive home in the condition that I arrived in Providence.

So after taking double the dosage prescribed of tranquilizers, I boarded the plane. I was placed in the center of the plane where I would notice the least movement. I arrived home six hours in the same condition that I left Providence.

I would like to complement the waiters from Oakland to Chicago who had to feed us till 11 p.m. Thursday night because of the extra passengers they would not have had to feed if the train had been on time. The diner car again was not air conditioned but, they served us as fast as they could and there were no bad tempers and the food was served hot. They even apologized for running out of food.

Due to false advertisement of Amtrak and their so-called new train; to the worst trip I ever had to go through; to the extra expense of having to fly home, I believe I'm entitled to a full refund.

A duplicate of this letter is also going to: U.S. Senator Alan Cranston, U.S. Senator John Tunney, Rep. Jerome R. Waldie, Rep. Fortney H. Stark and Senator John Nejedly so they will know how some of their taxpayers money is being spent when the government has to subsidize Amtrak for there loses.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RICHARD C. SHARKEY.

HONOR GORDON GILLINGS, LONG-TIME MAYOR OF GURNEE

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most honored citizens of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois, Gordon Gillings, is to be feted at a testimonial dinner meeting on Sunday, August 26, at the Rustic Manor in Gurnee.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know Gordon Gillings during the entire period of his 24 consecutive years as president of the village of Gurnee, an office from which he retired only this year.

Mayor Gillings' service to his community and to this great part of mid-America has been largely as a volunteer. His contributions have involved the generous use of his talents as an engineer, as well as an innate ability to meet and deal with people from all walks of life.

Mr. Speaker, during Gordon Gillings' service as village president of Gurnee, the community has tripled in population. This has been an orderly growth in which the residential, business, and industrial areas of the community have been expanded and developed. During this period, a new village hall has been erected. A park district has been created, and new water and sewer systems have been constructed to serve the growing population.

Mr. Speaker, as chief engineer of the Warren Township High School for some 35 years, Gordon Gillings has been in close touch with the community and its citizens. He has been a faithful member and officer of the Bethel Lutheran Church in Gurnee, and he has headed an exemplary household comprised of his attractive and faithful wife, Carol, and two lovely daughters, Lynn and Cheryl.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives this outstanding citizen of Illinois, and to recall briefly his career in public service. On Sunday evening, August 26, 1973, I shall extend to Gordon Gillings and to his wife, Carol, heartfelt congratulations and best wishes, and I am proud indeed to call this event to all to whose attention these remarks shall come.

NIXON ON WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as the American people have been progressed from the failures of phase I to the devastation of phase IV of the administration's price controls, it is well to recall President Nixon's radio and television address on economic policy and productivity on June 17, 1970, when he said:

A third choice was the route of wage and price controls. That would lead to rationing, black marketing, total Federal bureaucratic domination, and it would never get at the real causes of inflation.

* * * * *

I will not take this nation down the road of wage and price controls, however, political expedient they may seem.

Controls and rationing may seem like an easy way out, but they are really an easy way in to more trouble—to the explosion that follows when you try to clamp a lid on a rising head of steam without turning down the fire under the pot.

Wage and price controls only postpone a day of reckoning, and in so doing they rob every American of an important part of his freedom.

Nor am I starting to use controls in disguise. By that I mean the kind of policy whereby government makes executive pronouncements to enforce "guidelines" in an attempt to dictate specific prices and wages without authority of law.

* * * * *

This is not the time for the Congress to play politics with inflation by passing legislation granting me standby powers to impose controls on wages and prices. The Congress knows I will not impose controls because they would do far more harm than good.

By now even the President should be convinced that he was right in 1970.

FLORIDA STATE FIREMEN'S ASSOCIATION STRESSES NEED FOR FEDERAL SUPPORT OF FIRE PREVENTION EFFORTS

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am a member, is currently holding hearings on fire safety and fire prevention. It is hoped that these hearings will afford us a better understanding of the scope of the fire problem and the extent to which the Federal Government must become involved. Historically, fire protection has been considered a local responsibility. In the State of Florida not only is this the case, but of some 17,000 firemen approximately 14,000 are volunteers. These hearings should demonstrate the necessity for a vigorous Federal focus on the fire problem.

On May 4, 1973, the final report of the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control was transmitted to the President. This excellent report, entitled, "America Burning," provides us a well-documented account of the seriousness of the fire problem in the United States. Fire is a major national problem. Annually, fire claims nearly 12,000 lives and injures over 300,000. Property loss figures ranging from $11.4 billion to $13 billion do not take into account the losses from businesses that must close and from jobs that are interrupted or destroyed.

Companion bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives and the Senate to begin the process of making the recommendations of the Fire Prevention and Control Commission a legislative reality. Of utmost importance is the creation of a U.S. Fire Administration in the Department of Housing and Urban Development which can bring the vast resources and personnel of the Federal Government to bear on the great threat of fire and provide essential assistance to local fire prevention and fire safety efforts. The establishment of a National Fire Academy must also rank high on the priority list of fire-related legislative efforts.

The Commission's report recognized

that those paying most heavily for destructive fires are the Nation's firefighters. Theirs is the most hazardous profession of all. Their death rate is 15 percent greater than the next most dangerous occupations—mining and quarrying. In 1971, the injury rate for firefighters was 39.6 per 100 men—far higher than that of any other profession. That same year, 175 firefighters died in the line of duty; an additional 89 died of heart attacks, and 26 are known to have died of lung disease contributed to by the routine smoke hazard of their occupation. It is high time that these public-minded citizens be provided the same consideration in the development of national priorities that are given other employment groups. Again, it is important to remember that a vast majority of the firefighting effort in this country is performed by volunteers.

We have in this country a solid base on which to build a stronger effort in the field of fire prevention and control. We have the technology with which this effort can be drastically improved. For example, in the ongoing programs at NASA and in the research applied to national needs program of the National Science Foundation, we have strong and imaginative research and development programs which are producing technology that can be used in this field. We have medical research efforts in the universities and in the National Institutes of Health which are making major strides toward the prevention and treatment of burns.

The report of the Fire Commission and the many bills which have been introduced in the House all propose that we now make a major, new effort in this area. The most striking finding in the Commission's report is, it seems to me, that by taking action now we can cut the losses in lives and property by 5 percent per year. One important area in which the Federal Government must participate is in the award of grants for the purchase of firefighting equipment incorporating advanced technology.

On Tuesday, July 31, 1973, it was my pleasure to introduce Mr. Charles R. Robinette when he submitted an outstanding statement to the subcommittee on behalf of the Florida State Firemen's Association and the Fire Fighters Standards Council of the State of Florida. Mr. Robinette is uniquely qualified to speak to the problems and needs of firefighters in the State of Florida and the Nation at large and I would like to give the House the benefit of his remarks to the subcommittee. Mr. Robinette's statement follows as well as an article that appeared in the Washington Post stressing the urgent need for Federal relief to beleaguered fire departments across our country.

Mr. Robinette makes an excellent point in his testimony—that we must depart from the concept of local, and frequently inadequate, funding and insert the State and Federal Governments into this funding void. It is important that the Congress pays special attention to the recommendations of those men who are involved in the day-to-day administration of fire safety and fire protection efforts. I believe these hearings dealing with fire prevention and control are some of the most important hearings the subcommittee has held in recent years. The testimony we have heard so far has confirmed my view that even a modest increase in the national effort can produce major savings in lives and property. For this reason, I feel we should make an all-out effort to insure even more dramatic results in terms of reducing human suffering, deaths and injuries to our firefighters, and property losses.

Mr. Robinette's statement and the Post article follow:

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES R. ROBINETTE

Mr. Chairman, Honorable members of the House Sub-committee on Science, Research and Development: This testimony is respectfully submitted by Charles R. Robinette, of Tallahassee, Florida, as first vice president and legislation chairman of the Florida State Firemen's Association, and vice chairman and legislation chairman of the Fire Fighters Standards Council of the State of Florida, for and in behalf of these organizations.

The Florida State Firemen's Association is a non-profit organization, with the expressed objective of improving the capabilities of the more than 17,000 fire service personnel of Florida in providing fire protection to the communities of the State. The Fire Fighters Standards Council is an agency of the State with important statutory responsibilities relating to training and education of fire fighters and the improvement of the level of fire safety throughout the State of Florida.

For too many years, Federal, State and local governmental agencies have failed to give full recognition to the needs of fire protection in their respective areas of responsibility. In a great many instances, the support that was provided amounted to only a token gesture which served to magnify, rather than minimize, the many problems associated with an acceptable level of safety for the lives and property of the citizens of this nation.

Despite this minimal support, the fire services have, consistently, attempted to perform the duties they have assumed with the resources afforded them. It is a matter of public knowledge and record that the fire protection problem with which the fire service is faced has gone beyond the point where makeshift improvisations are adequate to meet the need. The potential for major loss of lives and property inherent in the mind-boggling advancements in today's architectural designs, massive structures, exotic materials and fuels, industrial complexes, transportation facilities and problems, and the accelerating trend toward numerous megalopolitan communities, have created a situation in which the traditional and conventional approaches to fire protection are no longer adequate to provide an acceptable level of fire safety for the citizens of this nation.

In addition to the fire potential existing in the urban localities, serious consideration should also be given to the fire problem in the changing environment that was once the rural areas of the State.

In these rapidly changing land areas throughout Florida, as well as in many other states, there is a continuing proliferation of high rise motels, office buildings, and homes for the aged; as well as, major industrial, institutional and mercantile occupancies.

The transient population of the motels in these areas are particularly vulnerable to injury and death from fire, because of the occupants' lack of familiarity with the physical layout of the building and the difficulty of egress under fire conditions.

Furthermore, within these ill-defined rural areas are many of the institutions used for housing mentally retarded citizens, children, the aged and indigent, and others who rely upon the State or local government for their sustenance. The office buildings, industries, and mercantiles present a potential for a major fire that would tax the resources of a large city. Yet, fire protection services available to them are either non-existent, or if available are staffed and equipped to provide only minimal protection to small residences and stores. In a great many instances this additional fire potential has been created without the local fire officials even being aware of the condition being developed. Consequently there has been no effort made to increase the resources for fire protection, to meet the added hazards.

In many areas where this added fire potential has been recognized, it must unfortunately go unattended due to the inability of those local governments to provide the funds necessary to alleviate the problem.

The existence and magnitude of these problems dictate the departure from the concept of local, and frequently inadequate, funding and makes monetary support from State and Federal sources an essential part of a solution to the overall problem.

The programs I advocate in behalf of my constituents are not purely local in impact or application, each has clear and definite implications to the national problems of fire safety and are, therefore, of rightful concern to the Federal government and worthy of your support to the extent that these problems have national significance.

The proposed establishment of a National Fire Administration is of vital concern in that the increasing annual loss of lives and property by fires, the individual economic deprivation and costs associated with treatment of burns and injuries with the attendant emotional traumas, the personal disabilities and disfigurements, loss of earning capacity and, above all, the diminution of fulfillment as a human being, makes this as much a matter of importance to the Federal government as any other socio-economic problem with which it is faced.

Current statistics reflect a deplorable condition in this respect, and we believe that, with a proper information gathering system, there is no question that the loss of lives and property would be shown to be substantially higher and, thereby, more accurately reflect the true magnitude of the devastation and desolation suffered from unwanted fires.

We support the establishment of the proposed National Fire Administration in a department which is operational at the Federal, State, and local levels and which, by virtue of its present structure, is capable of implementing approved programs with minimal delay and the least additional administrative cost, and be most cognizant of and responsive to the needs of the fire service. Furthermore, we advocate the creation of the Administration in order that the program envisaged by this measure be administered by those having concrete knowledge and experience in the highly specialized factors associated with fire protection. Absence of this specialized knowledge diminishes the practicability of any approach to fire safety, and usually results in higher costs, excessive time delays, and ineffectual administration in the essential features of approved programs.

A National Fire Academy, as proposed, should not be a "bricks and mortar" facility but, rather, an aggregation of persons whose minds are finely attuned to the needs of the fire service, having significant experience in the science of fire protection and a superior ability to share this knowledge with others. The economic obstacles faced by most members of the fire service in attending classes far distant from their work situation could be overcome by the staff of the National Fire Academy utilizing existing state facilities suitable for such convocations, thereby eliminating undue costs that would attend the creation of a centralized facility.

The scheduling of classes, seminars, conferences, workshops, colloquia, and all the other means and devices currently used for the development of skills should be made

available at such State facilities under the supervision of the National Fire Academy; not only to career fire service personnel, but also to those who, by virtue of position or profession could most effectively improve fire protection in all its implications. These persons include architects, builders, educators, fire safey engineers, and especially state and local governmental officials who influence the level of fire protection in their respective communities.

The National Fire Data System, as proposed, and which we support, should to a great degree, provide for the needs of the fire service for access to authoritative information relating to prevention and control of fire, protection of lives and property from fire, reduction of economic loss, and other significant factors. Information so derived can then be used as the basis for effective fire protection programs at the State and local levels. These programs will include definitive provisions for fire safety in structures, institution of acceptable compromises with total fire safety that will allow for the productive use of certain environments such as chemical plants, industrial complexes, high-rise structures, and others which, currently, are highly susceptible to the ravages of fire.

Additionally, this information will have particular application to the improvement of fire safety in schools and educational institutions which, in many areas of our nation, have notoriously poor records of losses of lives and property from fire.

Within the recent past, industrial development, the introduction of synthetic materials, the use of roads, railways and waterways for the transportation of exotic, highly flammable and toxic materials, and other combustibles for which the fire service has insufficient knowledge to provide effective fire protection, and even the resources for prompt extinguishment and control, makes the establishment of a Fire Research and Development agency an indispensible adjunct to fire protection.

Existing laboratories and testing standards do not realistically reproduce the conditions that prevail at a going fire, and scaling factors now in use frequently give erroneous results. Because of these factors some materials are presumed to be safe for certain applications and practical use later proves this to be otherwise. By the same token, some materials that would have useful and economical applications are forbidden on the basis of small-scale testing. It is essential that development programs be conducted on protective clothing and equipment, extinguishants and methods of application, detection and alarm systems, installed fire suppression and life safety systems, methods of construction, and many other items which cannot be conducted by the private sector because of the economic factors involved. Research into the hitherto unknown secrets of the phenomena of fire could readily open the door to knowledge comparable to that obtained from the studies of nucleonics and aerospace with consequent benefits in terms of prevention and control of fire. Information derived from research and development would be made available to the fire service through the National Fire Data System. Information of this nature is not currently available to the fire service, resulting in less effective fire protection programs than will be possible when it is made available in useable form.

Protective clothing and equipment designed to provide adequate protection for the fire fighter against the hostile and deadly environments in which he must work cost in excess of $1,000 on today's market. This includes breathing protection against the toxic and suffocant by-products of combustion which are encountered in virtually every structural fire; body protection against the high ambient temperatures and direct flame impingement he must face in order to perform essential tasks; properly designed and constructed protection for his extremities and head to protect him against death or disabling injuries.

The cost of such items for adequate personal protection far exceeds the ability of the majority of fire protection agencies to pay, with the result that most fire fighters are exposed to the hazards associated with fire fighting without the protection ordinarily provided to the workman in many other lines of work having substantially lower personal risk factors.

The resources, in apparatus and equipment, for the control and extinguishment of fire must, of necessity, be designed and constructed to have a sustained life factor, dependability and durability in operation, and have all the capabilities associated with the demands of the fire potential of our communities. In order to obtain these essential characteristics, the purchaser is faced with the need to expend from $30,000 to $50,000 for a basic pumping unit, and from $60,000 to $100,000 for a basic ladder truck which is required for rescue and fire control in multi-storied structures.

The cost of these essential items of apparatus and equipment far exceed the ability to pay of any but the larger and more affluent communities, with the result that the smaller cities are forced to subsist with inadequate resources for fire control. This condition merits immediate Federal recognition and financial support.

However, it is important to recognize that the most expensive or sophisticated apparatus and equipment is virtually worthless in fire control unless the personnel who use and operate it are properly trained in its application to the tasks for which it was designed. Any grants of funds, or other Federal support, should be contingent upon all personnel who will use or work with these resources being properly and adequately trained, with provisions for sustained programs leading to retention of the essential skills.

The humanitarian aspects of the proposed burn centers forms an essential part of any comprehensive planning for alleviation of the human suffering and deprivation associated with unwanted fires.

In addition to the programs included in this legislation, we urge this committee to consider programs designed to insure practical identification of hazardous materials while in the process of manufacture, in transit, in storage, or on display for vending. The identification systems in present use fail, in most significant aspects, to serve the needs of emergency forces, the transportation industry, or of the public. We therefore recommend this Committee favor the adoption of NFPA 704M (Identification of Materials) in order to meet this essential need.

In summary, please let me say that my constituency believes that the magnitude of the fire problem in the United States, its adverse impact upon the economic stability of our nation, and its cost, in lost lives and injuries to its victims, makes it a matter coming within the rightful purview of our Federal government, and worthy of supportive funding and assistance to the State and local level.

I, therefore, respectfully recommend that this Committee favorably report the proposed legislation, together with our recommendations, in the best interests of the fire service and the citizens of Florida and of the nation as a whole.

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1973]

Panel Urges Creation of U.S. Fire Agency

(By Ted Frederickson)

Fire takes 12,000 lives, disfigures 300,000 people and destroys $111.4 billion in property each year in the United States—a problem met with striking indifference by most Americans.

That conclusion is at the heart of a 177-page report compiled by the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, which has recommended the creation of a U.S. Fire Administration to lead a coordinated attack on what the commission has called a major national problem.

The report, entitled "America Burning," was commissioned in the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 and compiled by the little-publicized, 20-member commission over a two-year period ending with the 1973 fiscal year last week. Although it has been transmitted to both Congress and the President, commission members are still hoping to discuss their recommendations with Mr. Nixon.

Most of the commission's 90 recommendations are embodied in a bill introduced in the Senate in May by Sen. Warren Magnuson (D-Wash.) and in the House by Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.). A staff member of the Senate Commerce Committee said hearings on the bill are planned for this fall—probably September or October.

The staff aide said he anticipated little opposition to the bill in the Commerce Committee because it is cosponsored by Magnuson, the chairman, and Sen. Norris Cotton (N.H.), the ranking Republican member.

Fire, says the commission's report, is a major national problem. "Appallingly," says the report, "the richest and most technologically advanced nation in the world leads all the major industrialized countries in per-capita deaths and property loss from fire."

One commission member, Dr. Anne W. Phillips, a burn specialist at Massachusetts General Hospital, pointed out in a minority report that U.S. fire deaths (143,550) greatly exceeded U.S. battle deaths (45,925) during the period of the Vietnam war.

After gathering information and conducting hearings in Washington, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, the commission said, "It became clear that a deeper federal involvement was needed to help repair the omissions and help overcome the indifference of Americans to fire safety."

The commission called for the establishment of a U.S. Fire Administration within the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist state and local governments in increasing the effectiveness and coordination of fire prevention and control.

In conjunction with the new agency, the commission recommended:

A national fire academy to help state and local jurisdictions in training and planning for fire protection and education programs.

A national fire data system to collect in one place all useful fire data, including death and injury statistics, property loss information, and data concerning causes, locations and numbers of fires.

A research and development unit to provide for and encourage new fire-preventing and fire-fighting technology, and to act as a central source of research information.

Grants to local governments to prepare fire protection.

Other key points in the commission's 90 recommendations called for:

Legislation to increase the number of burn treatment units in the United States from 12 to 25; increased training for burn specialists and more research into burn treatment.

An increased emphasis on prevention of fires, making it at least equal to fire suppression as a priority.

A high priority for identifying combustion hazards in materials by the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Adequate building and fire prevention codes in all municipalities, and strict enforcement.

Action by individual homeowners to prevent fire deaths, injuries and losses, by providing exit drills and early warning devices.

Adoption of strict codes requiring specific construction features, exit facilities, fire detection systems and sprinkler devices for institutions caring for the young and the elderly.

Richard E. Bland is an associate professor

of engineering research at Pennsylvania State University, a volunteer fireman for the last 30 years and the chairman of the commission. He says the message of the commission report is simple and frightening:

"As we have more people, we have more fuels, we have more power, we have more hazards. Death and destruction from fire are extensive now, and we can expect the death toll and property loss to increase unless action is taken—now."

Why a federal agency? "Well I don't particularly like the idea of creating still more bureaucracy," said Bland, "but the fire problem is a basic one. All fires are the same natural process, and we need a central place where we can bring it all together.

"There's a real tendency to be provincial in matters of fire, and we feel that a federal agency could cut across boundaries and improve fire prevention and fire suppression everywhere," he said.

"It would not be like a regulatory agency," said Bland. "Rather, it would allow states and cities to run their own fire programs, but would use the leverage of grant-making to encourage master planning."

In her minority report, Dr. Phillips opposes the creation of a federal agency, arguing that the agencies that already have responsibilities in fire prevention and control (primarily the Bureau of Standards in the Department of Commerce) could do the job if beefed up.

Her concern is that something has to be done now, and that lives would be needlessly lost during the time it would take to set up the new machinery.

Dr. Phillips also argues for a smaller overall budget, but more money for educational programs on fire prevention and control, particularly among the young.

"I appreciate her arguments," says Bland, "especially in regard to the young. But the majority felt the fire problem to be primarily a people problem—about 75 per cent people and 25 per cent technological—and we believed the fire program should not be in a hardware-oriented agency like the Bureau of Standards."

"That's why we advocated that the Fire Administration be established in HUD; we felt we could have more impact in the housing area, since about 80 per cent of fire deaths occur in one- and two-family dwellings."

Bland is a firm believer in fire prevention, but says he is not obstinate about it: "I'm not the kind of person who demands 100 per cent safety. But if we can cut fire losses in half, why not do it? If we got a 60 per cent cure for cancer, it would be treated as a big deal, and it is. A similar reduction in fire deaths is probably within our grasp, but we won't do it."

"For example, there's no good reason why buildings over three stories with over 10,000 square feet of floor space should not have a sprinkler system," he said.

The commission report predicts that if its recommendations were carried out, fire losses would be reduced about five per cent each year until losses were halved in 14 years.

People, said Bland, could do much for themselves in reducing fire losses and deaths. His recommendations to them, in order of priority, would be:

"Get an early warning device to detect the products of combustion, such as smoke and heat. They're not that expensive; I saw one in the Sears and Roebuck catalog for only about $45."

"Develop a plan for escaping in the event of fire, and practice it with all members of the family. Being conscious of the danger is important."

"Get a sprinkler system if you can afford it. Since they've started using plastic pipe, they are not as expensive as they once were."

"Have a fire extinguisher in the house. Most big fires start as small fires and could easily be put out with a 5- or 10-gallon extinguisher. I'll never forget seeing a farmer standing next to his barn, which was burning out of control. 'If only I had a fire extinguisher,' he told me, 'I could have put it out easily.' "

AMERICAN MOVIES ARE BETTER THAN EVER

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, "American movies are better than ever" was the unanimous opinion of the three distinguished authorities on American films who recently appeared on Washington Insight, a monthly discussion program I am privileged to moderate for station WSJV–TV in Elkhart, Ind.

Appearing on this program were Charlton Heston, actor and president of the American Film Institute; Pauline Kael, film critic of the New Yorker magazine and author of numerous books on film; and Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America.

All three of these outstanding citizens had appeared as witnesses for the Select Education Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, on legislation to extend and amend the National Arts and Humanities Foundation Act.

The AFI receives a degree of support from the National Arts Endowment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the transcript of this discussion:

WASHINGTON INSIGHT: THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN FILM, WSJV–TV, ELKHARDT, IND.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The Congressional Subcommittee I chair is busy right now considering legislation to continue the Federal program to support the arts. Both Democrats and Republicans in Congress and every President since President Eisenhower have supported help to the creative and performing arts in the United States as necessary to a genuinely civilized society.

Among the most powerful of the arts, surely, is the motion picture. And, equally sure, no country has made greater contributions to the film than the United States. Here today to talk with me about the future of American films are three distinguished persons from the world of film.

Jack Valenti is the President of the Motion Picture Association of America, a position he has held for over six years. From 1963 to 1966 Mr. Valenti was a principal assistant to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Charlton Heston is, of course, a noted actor and former President of the Screen Actors Guild. Mr. Heston is also chairman of the American Film Institute and a former member of the Council of the National Endowment for the Arts, which determines what Federal grants are made to the arts in the United States.

Pauline Kael is regarded by many as the ablest film critic in the United States. She writes for The New Yorker magazine and the most recent of her many books is entitled Deeper into Movies, a compilation of some of her reviews.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let's begin the questioning today and our discussion with you, Miss Kael, and let me ask you, are movies better than ever?

Miss KAEL. It's a terrible thing to have to admit because the industry always used that as a slogan in the days when they weren't, but I think they are now. I think that a new diversity has come into movies in the last few years and I've just been astonished at the riches. There was a period, the late '60's, when things seemed to become standardized and dead. The studios in Hollywood were putting all their financing into super-large productions and many of them were awful, awful disasters. Dr. Doolittle, Star, well, Camelot—we remember all those.

But now some of the younger talent has broken through and there's new talent all over the world and not just in this country. There are several new directors who are doing interesting work in Italy, some of the older directors of the new wave, the men in their 30's or 40's now in France and, from the emerging nations and also from the United States, young men have been breaking through. So far, no women except at a rather small level.

WHY AREN'T WOMEN MORE INVOLVED IN MAKING FILMS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Why is that? Why aren't more women involved?

Miss KAEL. Well, women were never really involved very much in Hollywood and they have not been involved, with rare exceptions, all over the world. Partly, in entertainment there is an old tradition that goes very far back. Women were considered harlots and actresses were the harlots. They never got positions of authority in the acting profession even though women became great stars on the stage.

It was very difficult for a woman to make her way into a directing position. Now women, however, did get into writing, and a lot of the important early screenwriters were women but there were very, very few women directors.

But recently the change in the whole temper of this country * * * the young girls * * * it is simply amazing. If you went to a college five years ago, the girls in the audience would only ask the question that would please their boyfriend. They would ask trivial little questions like, what do you think of the Academy Awards? Now they speak up and they speak with their own minds; they have direct opinions; and there is an audacity about their opinions that I think means they are going to move into real equality in film, which is tough in terms of the fact they are going to have to deal with union craftsmen.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Valenti, you in effect are the principal spokesman here in Washington for the motion picture industry. What do you think of two of the points Miss Kael made, one about the role of women in the making of films as distinguished from acting in them, and the other, about the relationship between the development of young filmmakers and the established industry?

WOMEN'S MAJOR BREAKTHROUGHS WILL BE IN WRITING

Mr. VALENTI. I think Miss Kael is right that women have not taken an active part. I see the principal role where women can make breakthroughs in the industry is in writing. It is my theme that the greatest poverty we have today in the motion picture world is the caliber of writing. I think we need more writers, better writers. I think this is an area where women can make a very definite contribution and I would think that in the next five to ten years, it would come from the colleges of this country and from the American film industry and other places where the emerging talent is now being fermented. I believe this is where they are going to make a big mark. Later on, perhaps, in the directing field.

It does take, as we talked earlier before this program, it takes a certain amount of stamina, a certain amount of physical stamina as well as stamina of the spirit to persuade yourself that you are going to do well in this business because it is not easy to break into the film world.

Miss KAEL. You know, Jack, I think they are going to want to direct because it is a challenge to young women now. It is easier to get in to be a screenwriter and I think just because of that, the new spirit of some of the younger women is going to make them want to break through and want to become directors.

Mr. HESTON. Some of the 40 fellows at the American Film Institute who are studying filmmaking now on grants from the Institute are women. I think the problem of women historically directing film is as you outline. I think there is another factor. I've been directed by a woman as an actor on the stage, never in film.

I think it's also important to remember that there have been a very few successful women directors. Oddly enough, probably the most successful was Ida Lupino who, in addition to her career as an actress, directed several films in the forties. Probably she remains to this day the most successful woman director of film.

Miss KAEL. Well, she worked rather independently compared to Dorothy Ourisner who did work for MGM and did direct big stars.

DIRECTORS ARE "PATERNAL" FIGURES

Mr. HESTON. But I think there is another factor of which I am unaware as a filmmaker. That is, it is not an insurmountable barrier for a woman who wants to direct but requires a special solution for her. The director-actor relationship is a paternal one. Now, you can make it a parental one, as I said in a seminar with some of these fellows at the Institute last week on directing and handling actors. Traditionally, what an actor, even an established actor, looks to in a director is at least a parental—and traditionally it has been a paternal—kind of relationship.

Miss KAEL. Don't you think that might change?

Mr. HESTON. I don't think it will change. It's inherent in how an actor-director channel of creative communication must work. It can work for a woman, as one of the girls, who is a directing fellow, said, "What about that?"

I said, "Well, among the many things a successful film director must be is a good captain. It has logistic problems and administrative problems and disciplinary problems that are simply inherent in the medium and what film is, any kind of film."

And, she said, "Well, how am I going to be a good captain?"

I said, "Maybe that isn't the role you should aim for. You can be the great earth-mother though, that might work."

Mr. BRADEMAS. And have a maternal role?

Mr. HESTON. Yes, I'm just suggesting that it's there.

Miss KAEL. I'm inclined to think that whole patriarchal relationship of the director who sits at the table when the crew's on location, who sits at the head of the table and is the big papa is passing away. I would like to think that some of that will break down as production becomes lighter and the crews become smaller because I think it's been an awful burden on the egos and on the energy systems of directors.

ONE CREATIVE CONCEPTION MUST BE IMPOSED

Mr. HESTON. Well, speaking from inside the film experience, as an actor, one of the problems of film is that it is a joint creative undertaking, which imposes, obviously, unique problems because art by collaboration is seldom successful. That may be one of the reasons why it's so hard to make a good film. There has to be one creative concept that is imposed. You can't say to the cameraman, "Now, naturally, I felt we should shoot it this way but I'll certainly concede to your shot; if you really feel in your heart that you want to do the other kind of shot, we certainly will."

And then the actor says, "Now wait, I think we should do this shot." I say, "Okay, now we're going to do it this way."

Miss KAEL. You see, I believe in the prime authority of the director, certainly, but I also think that younger people are going to think in terms of a participatory democracy and they are going to work much more flexibly with actors. They are going to want more improvisation, more looseness, more spontaneity.

Mr. VALENTI. I'm all in favor of improvisation. There is probably a far greater degree of input not only from actors but from cameramen, from makeup men, from prop men.

Now, let me give you the other side of that picture. And I have never made a film so I can speak authoritatively on all aspects of it. But I do know something about the problems that are inherent in making films.

I remember listening to Federico Fellini, who I think all of us would agree is one of the great filmmakers of all time. He was speaking to a seminar at the AFI and some of these young people were wanting Fellini to confirm some of their own feelings. And they would say, "Now, Mr. Fellini, isn't it true that when you get on the set that you do work with improvisation, a lot of cinema verite, isn't that the way you operate?"

Fellini looked at this young boy as if he were mad. He said, "Making a film is like taking a trip to the moon. It's terribly disciplined and structured."

He said, "I never make any film unless I know precisely what I am going to shoot . . . I do get on the set, and we do change from time to time but there's a basic theme, a very definite concept that I have already written out in advance. I know exactly what I am going to do."

Now I think it is very hard to tell Fellini as a great artist that he doesn't know how to make a film. I think this disciplinary aspect is inherent in the art.

DISCIPLINE VERSUS SPONTANEITY

Miss KAEL. But you asked the boy or man. Ask Jean Renoir and he'll say, "I want freedom. I want the actors to develop their ideas. I want to be able to improvise. I want to take off from the script."

Of course, they need the basic theme in the script, but he wants to be able to use the accidents, to use the location, to use the rain that comes or someone walking. And if you ask younger directors like Truffaut or, five years ago, when he was making better movies, you would ask Godard, or if you ask the young Americans, I think they would want that freedom and I think that the actors who work with them want that freedom too. Because they've been made to develop the other way, they feel emasculated.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Heston.

Mr. HESTON. I've never felt emasculated. I've worked for both kinds of directors. I think it's part of the actor's responsibility to respond. I worked with Orson Wells, who uses improvisation, who rewrites and restructures scenes to an incredible degree but who also is a very strong hand. John Ford tears out scenes and decides not to shoot them. Democracy is a marvelous way to run a country; it's a hell of a way to make a movie.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me ask you this question because it is in part I think related to what we've been talking about here. Someone spoke about the rise of young filmmakers in the United States, and Miss Kael earlier in our hearings on the arts bill talked about not directors of films but used, I thought purposely, the phrase, "filmmakers." I would like to ask Miss Kael, first, to expand a little on what she means by that and also on the direction she thinks movies might be going in the United States.

And then I'd like to ask Mr. Heston to say something about how he sees the work of the American Film Institute, and maybe Mr. Valenti on how we can encourage and make possible young people getting into the making of films.

Miss Kael, would you talk about that?

WILL FILMMAKERS REPLACE DIRECTORS

Miss KAEL. On the filmmaker as opposed to the older concept of the director? The term began to be current in the '60's and I think it was a reaction against the old methods of studio production technique. That is, a director was thought of as someone whom the studio assigned or who took a project and then shot it. Now this is not always the case. I mean very often the directors develop an idea based on something they feel very moved by, that they care about, but it is thought of in general as a more impersonal process, whereas the filmmaker thinks of expressing himself on film and putting together a project in which his personality and all of his creative drives would come out.

Now that is putting it at its boldest but I think most of the young Americans who want to go into films think of themselves as the filmmaker, not as directors, because they are frightened and turned off at the idea of being hirelings who are assigned to direct the film. And actually they don't know how to work that way and they don't want to work that way.

And I think they're right not to want to work that way, because it results in a very impersonal kind of filmmaking, and that kind of filmmaking already looks like television and has a slightly dead quality. Movies shot for television that are shot in 11 days, television series, have a certain routine quality that resembles old movies. That's very unappealing to young people because it reeks of the factory. And I think it would be very bad if they do get caught up in it because I do think that that's going to die out and it should die out.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Heston, you referred earlier to the AFI, the American Film Institute. I wonder if first, you could say what the American Film Institute is, and then maybe talk about what it's doing in the way of encouraging young filmmakers. I might ask you also to say something about its relationship to this legislation that we've been working on.

THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

Mr. HESTON. The American Film Institute is the only specially mandated creation of the whole Federal arts program. Under President Johnson's Administration, when the Foundation was first created, he said, let there be an American Film Institute and indeed there was an American Film Institute. We have in my view not enough money. We have a very small share of the total Federal art dollar, especially when you consider the enormous importance of film to the people of the world and the significance both historically and presently of American film.

But I think our programs are beginning to be well established. I guess the best way to summarize our function is that we are concerned with identifying and preserving the great heritage of American films and providing stimulus to the present American film and opportunity to the future of the American film. As Miss Kael says, this future very properly lies in the young, as is true in any art. I think it is particularly in films because filmmaking is enormously demanding. It's like running a war.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me ask Jack Valenti a question about that war. Has the war, as Mr. Heston put it, that's involved in making films or, as Miss Kael says is a killer, significantly changed in terms of the weapons and the fighters out in Hollywood over the last generation?

WARS CHANGE, TIMES CHANGE, BUT SOME THINGS STAY THE SAME

Mr. VALENTI. Yes, I think it's changed a good deal from the times that Miss Kael was talking about in the days of Hollywood, as we generically understand it to be the old

Hollywood, with the tycoons and the moguls and the vast studios and the fat contracts, with everybody under contract.

All that's changed. It's a lonelier and more fragile system today, from an economic standpoint. The major companies have been in deep financial troubles over the past decade and they've had to become leaner and fitter. There are no longer stars under contract; there are no longer directors and writers under contract. It's an entrepreneurial situation in which so-called independent actors, like Mr. Heston, or John Wayne or Kirk Douglas, make their own films and they go to a major distributor for financing and distribution. A young filmmaker has an idea and he is able to persuade somebody to give him private financing. And then he'll go to a larger company to try to get him the rest of his money, completion money that he needs, for his distribution.

The economic factor in movies is there and we didn't make it that way but that's the way it is. Also, we are overlooking one important element in the whole factor of moviemaking. And that is the American and world audience. It is one thing to make a film for yourself. It is another thing to make a film that people will want to see. Therefore, films are a very diverse mix. There is a so-called small, personal film which was created mainly, I presume from my reading the history of film, from Miss Kael, done largely in Europe, and post-war, beginning with the realistic directors in Italy and then moving on to France and England and then it moved to this country.

Then there is the so-called entertainment film, *The Poseidon Adventure, The Lost Horizon,* which are not small personal films. They have no message really but they are to entertain.

Now the financing company has to make a determination of the amount of money it has available and how to mix its films. The small film is the blockbuster, the audience-oriented film. And really what the problem is in the film industry today is how you make this mix because inevitably it comes down to your making a film for more than a million dollars, say a half a million dollars, a lot of money. And how do you get people to want to see it?

So, many people in this country will import the films of Bergman and Truffaut and the other great directors, knowing that the audience is going to be small but that they want to be attached to this kind of intellect. But at the same time distributors and financial backers must have the so-called action film, the Western film, the comedy, what we call the escape film, in order to find a way to the end of the year. The money that you have taken in must exceed the money you have put out.

Now the basis of the problem today is: how does a young filmmaker inject himself into this economic situation, because films are not an art form that live naked and alone beyond the shining ledgers of the bankers.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Miss Kael is yearning to be heard on this subject; I can feel it.

THE YOUNG AUDIENCE IS NOT BEING NOURISHED

Miss KAEL. Well, I feel what's happening is that the companies are by-passing the young audience because they don't know how to reach it and because it's safer to make films they know will have almost guaranteed response abroad and have a certain guaranteed audience here. These are the films, the big films.

The producers really don't take chances on anything risky because they don't have the feel of the young audience. Nobody quite has it because it's so volatile, but in a sense the whole young audience, the real audience of the movies, is not being nourished by Hollywood. It's being nourished from abroad and yet it could be nourished by the younger generation of filmmakers if we could just find a way for their work to reach theatres.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Heston?

Mr. HESTON. Miss Kael seems to feel that there is not only somehow sprung fresh from the sea like Venus an instant generation of remarkably talented young filmmakers, which I am inclined to agree with, but that there is facing them a unique agony, a maze that never existed before. Now, I think that on the contrary, the basic condition which has always been the main problem for any filmmaker and is certainly so now is the one Jack implied in his response, and that is the enormous cost of the raw materials of film.

Now historically, we tend to look at these things with tunnel vision often. It's interesting to get the longer view. We were speaking earlier of the exciting new capacities for improvisation of the young filmmakers. The most improvisatory film work ever done was, of course, done by the early silent actors in Hollywood when they went out in the morning with a few notes on the back of an envelope and came back with two reels of a movie.

But nonetheless, whether a filmmaker like Fellini or the early Harold Lloyd films or Buster Keaton films or Welles, whether they work in an improvisatory manner or work like Hitchcock and Fellini—I used him to cite the wrong example—in a totally scripted, totally prepared way, it is still necessary to reach an audience sufficiently large to pay for the cost of your raw materials.

Now, though Miss Kael's profession depends on discerning quality and attracting its audience to it—and I agree with the opinion of her peers that she is better at it than anyone currently writing about film in America—I think it is important to remember that historically contemporary critical judgments have often been in error. For example, I mentioned Buster Keaton. It wasn't until five years before his death that it suddenly occurred to everyone that he was one of the premier filmmakers of America.

Miss KAEL. That was largely because his films were not in distribution for people to see.

Mr. HESTON. Films were very popular when he made them but it never occurred to critical observers of art at the time to identify them as the artistic work that they undoubtedly were.

Miss KAEL. No, I think some of us did. I wrote about him as an artist long ago. But the problem was that he worked in the silent period and it was very difficult to convert those films to put them in a form for modern audiences. Actually they still haven't reached the American audience they should reach.

Mr. HESTON. The point I was making, it's a very minor point, but his films were very successful with an audience at the time they were made but they . . .

Miss KAEL. But they were also critically well received.

Mr. HESTON. Not very.

MANY EUROPEAN MODERNS STUDIED HOLLYWOOD

Mr. VALENTI. Let me inject something. I want to follow along on something that Chuck said. Because I think it is very germane to what we are talking about, and that is the volatility of critical judgment.

I, too, agree that Pauline Kael is the best writing today and if I'm hesistant about a judgment of a film, I'll take Pauline's judgment on it because I think it is usually going to be right. However, it is curious to me that some of the great, the personal directors, let's take Truffaut—he wrote in his own book that he learned the art of moviemaking in the Francaid cinematheque where he watched the gangster films of the 1920's and early '30's and the Mervin LeRoys and the Howard Hawks and all these people, and he learned his craft from these people who operated in the factory, the old caverns of the movie moguls and indeed the Hollywood that is now dead.

Miss KAEL. Right, let's take that for granted and I agree with you. But now we have generations of filmmakers in this country and there are several generations of them already who have learned to work on very light portable equipment. Some of them have never even handled 35 millimeter but they can do amazing things. But the only way for them now to reach a larger audience is to go out to Hollywood and try to do what the older generation knew how to do, which nobody really wants anymore and which the younger generation doesn't know how to do, and it defeats them.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me interrupt to say we only have about a minute left and maybe I can come back to each of you a 15-second comment on the question I put to Miss Kael earlier, beginning with Mr. Valenti. The question is: Are movies better than ever?

Mr. VALENTI. I share Pauline's feeling. I think they are. I think the quality, the perception, the intelligence of these movies is much better than it was and I think it's because of the audience today. It's more educated and more discerning and they are demanding a higher quality of films.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Heston.

Mr. HESTON. As usual about film I think Miss Kael was correct, I think some are better; I think the future may be even more exciting than the present and I'm lucky to be part of that.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Miss Kael, we'll let you have the last word.

Miss KAEL. I think it's the only institution in America we can be optimistic about.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Well, that's very encouraging indeed. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sorry but our time is up and I hope you have enjoyed, even as have I, this very lively discussion of the future of American films with three distinguished American authorities in the film world—Miss Pauline Kael, the film critic of the New Yorker Magazine; Mr. Charlton Heston, the distinguished actor; and Mr. Jack Valenti, the President of the Motion Picture Association. This is Congressman John Brademas thanking you for sitting in on another edition of "Washington Insight."

LAND-USE TYRANNY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in the near future the House will consider a Federal land-use bill. This proposed legislation would authorize the Federal Government to distribute grants to the States for use in the development of statewide zoning. The bill includes a number of specific provisions which make it clear that those States which seek Federal funds will have to adopt the federally promulgated rules.

While many seem to advocate Federal zoning plans, others who have studied local zoning ordinances in some depth find that even these are in violation of individual rights and serve no useful public purpose. In his volume, "Land Use Without Zoning," attorney Bernard Siegan compared Houston, a city which has no zoning ordinances, with nearby Dallas, which does.

Mr. Siegan discovered, after an extensive study, that Houston and its suburbs do just as well as Dallas, in fact, somewhat better.

In Dallas, the government tells individuals where they can and cannot build homes and office buildings, while in Houston there are no geographical restrictions. The result is that the Houston

skyline is just as orderly as the one in Dallas. The Houston business section is contained in one large self-created "district." The same is true of residential areas and Siegan discovered that land values proved effective in separating business and industrial real estate from the single family lots.

The only people, he discovered, who really benefit from zoning are the planners themselves.

If the Congress assumes the power to tell individual citizens what to do with their private property, it will be doing the opposite of what the Constitution mandates. Will private property any longer be private if the Government may tell individuals how they may use it?

Discussing this legislation the Phoenix Gazette editorially noted that its effect would be to make property owners,

Landless serfs beholden to the lord of the manor in Washington. With Washington controlling use, titles to property would become worthless scraps of paper in a modern system of feudalism.

The Gazette points out that,

Because the bill provides no compensation to land owners whose property values would be reduced or even demolished by the environmental provision, the measure very likely may be unconstitutional. The Constitution provides that private property shall not be taken for pubic use without compensation.

I wish to share with my colleagues the editorial, "Land Use Tryanny," which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette of June 11, 1973, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

[From the Phoenix Gazette, June 11, 1973]

LAND USE TYRANNY

For all that land use planning has to recommend it, Arizona and every other state would be better off with no planning at all than with planning directed from Washington that would usurp local control and all but confiscate private lands.

With Washington having bungled so much on so many local scenes, it is surprising indeed that the majority of the Senate Interior Committee would report out legislation that would make Uncle Sam a czar over land use everywhere in the country. Yet that is precisely what has happened.

To his great credit, Arizona's Sen. Paul Fannin, who cosponsored the bill with the hope of providing federal assistance and cooperation for local planning, is blowing the whistle on the version that came out of the committee.

Sen. Fannin says the Land Use Policy Act as it reads now "would do great violence to our traditional American rights," certainly an accurate description. If Washington gets to decide on land use, the states, other local governments and the people will have no say in the destinies of their neighborhoods and communities.

In effect, property owners would be reduced to landless serfs beholden to the lord of the manor in Washington. With Washington controlling use, titles to property would become worthless scraps of paper in a modern system of feudalism.

Under the Land Use Policy Act, areas of "critical environmental concern" would be subject to severely limited uses. According to Sen. Fannin, that provision is so broad that it "is not folly to say that in some states every square foot of private and state land could fall within such a limitless definition."

Oddly enough, lands owned by the federal government, which in Arizona at least are threatened by very real environmental hazards, would be exempt from designation as areas of critical concern. What sort of foolishness is that?

Because the bill provides no compensation to land owners whose property values would be reduced or even demolished by the environmental provision, the measure very likely may be unconstitutional. The Constitution provides that private property shall not be taken for public use without compensation.

If it becomes law, however, the courts would be left with the sticky question of deciding when a restriction becomes "taking" of land. Litigation on that issue could continue for years, during which property owners might lose investments, and the results could be disappointing.

All in all, S. 268, the Land Use Policy Act, is a dangerous piece of legislation that promises to do little good for Americans but could do a lot to destroy their rights.

ALASKAN PIPELINE BILL

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of concern and discussion has revolved around the so-called Dellenback amendments to title II of H.R. 9130.

I herewith attach a statement directed toward clarifying the position of those who do not believe them to be necessary:

THE ALASKAN PIPELINE BILL (H.R. 9130) AND THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

The amendments to H.R. 9130 proposed by Congressman Dellenback and others are for the announced purpose of rendering the action of the full committee compatible with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The amendments are unnecessary to achieve this purpose and the adoption of the amendments would guarantee substantial delay, due to litigation, in the development of much needed North Slope reserves.

Title II of H.R. 9130, as reported, (1) finds that actions of the Secretary heretofore taken with respect to the proposed trans-Alaskan oil pipeline constitute satisfactory compliance with NEPA (Sec. 202(d)), (2) directs the Secretary to issue the necessary rights-of-way and permits for construction of the pipeline (Sec. 203(a)), and (3) declares that the issuance of authorizations for construction of the pipeline shall not be subject to judicial review on the basis of NEPA (Sec. 203(d)).

The proposed amendments would delete these three provisions and substitute a provision calling for expeditious treatment by the courts of any ensuing litigation.

The issues are as follows:

1. Is H.R. 9130 incompatible with NEPA?

H.R. 9130 does not exempt the pipeline from NEPA. It simply provides that since NEPA has been complied with, additional delaying litigation should be prevented.

A. There has been NEPA compliance.

An inter-governmental task force, under the leadership of the Department of the Interior, devoted more than 175 man-years of research and analysis to comply with NEPA and to produce the most comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement (6 Volumes) ever prepared under that Act. In addition, a 3 volume Economic and Security Analysis and the most comprehensive and stringent set of technical and environmental stipulations ever imposed upon any project were prepared. The entire effort utilized the services of hundreds of highly competent government career professionals from every applicable discipline.

All four Federal judges who considered the environmental issues in the Wilderness Society litigation (District Court and 3 Courts of Appeals judges) determined that the Secretary had fully complied with the requirements of NEPA. The 4 judges constituting the majority in the Court of Appeals decision did not decide to the contrary but refused to consider the issue until Congress amended the Mineral Leasing Act (a "monstrous" refusal, according to Judge MacKinnon).

B. Congressional authorization of the pipeline, as provided in H.R. 9130, is not subject to NEPA.

NEPA applies only to actions of Federal agencies. It does not, and could not apply to specific actions of the Congress itself. Under H.R. 9130, Congress, rather than a Federal agency, is taking the major Federal action with respect to the trans-Alaska pipeline. Thus, NEPA, as a legal issue is irrelevant. This is the same approach adopted by the Udall proposed substitute bill. Even lawyers for environmental plaintiffs in the Wilderness Society litigation agree with this interpretation. See attached Exhibit A.

2. Would the adoption of the proposed amendments result in extensive delay due to further litigation:

A minimum of 1 to 2 years of further delay will occur if Congress merely delegates the decision-making role on the pipeline to the Secretary.

After the Secretary made his May 11, 1972 decision to authorize the trans-Alaska pipeline, it took almost a year for the courts to review that decision in the Wilderness Society litigation, despite the fact that each court accorded the case extraordinary expedition. The parties to the suit agreed to expedited pre-trial discovery and a stipulated record for trial; the District Court Judge issued his decision on the day the trial ended; the Court of Appeals waived its rules by permitting use of the trial court briefs on appeal and prompt argument; the *certiorari* petition to the Supreme Court was expedited without regard to the time permitted in its Rules. The net result was no decision on the NEPA issue.

Under the proposed amendment, the case would be relitigated. There is no way possible for the second litigation to require less time than the first. Thus, the proposal to order judicial priority will avail nothing. Moreover, in the likely event that the Supreme Court would accept review of the case after another Court of Appeals decision, final decision could be delayed an additional year. And, after all that time, if the court should send the case back to the Secretary on a technicality, we would be right back where we are today. This is no fanciful supposition; Judge MacKinnon voiced concern that this case might be a repetition of the *Three Sisters Bridge case.*

In sum, the Secretary has been unable, and the courts have been unwilling to take the necessary action to get North Slope oil and gas to the Nation. There is no possibility that they can or will take the action needed for a year—or several years. Only Congress can resolve the dilemma. By adopting the proposed amendments, Congress would be shirking its responsibility in this important matter.

PREGNANCY AND BENEFITS—THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, recently in California a major victory was won when

a Federal court decided that California working women were entitled to State disability benefits for pregnancy or pregnancy-related complications. In a 2 to 1 decision, section 2626 of the California Unemployment Insurance Code was declared unconstitutional. Section 2626 states:

"Disability" or "disabled" includes both physical illness and mental or physical injury. An individual shall be deemed disabled in any day in which, because of his physical or mental condition, he is unable to perform his regular or customary work. In no case shall the term "disability" or "disabled" include any injury or illness caused by or arising in connection with pregnancy or termination of such pregnancy and for a period of 28 days thereafter.

The purpose of the California Unemployment Insurance Code is "to compensate in part for the wage loss sustained by individuals unemployed because of sickness or injury and to reduce to a minimum the suffering caused by unemployment." The disability insurance program grants benefits to those unable to work because of nearly any physical or mental conditions. Pregnancy is as debilitating—no more or less so—as other physical or mental conditions covered by the disability insurance program. The economic hardship suffered by pregnant women when they cannot work is identical to the hardship of other disabled workers.

The State failed to show any rational grounds for excluding pregnancy—the State was merely saving expense by arbitrarily denying benefits to a class of citizens. Certainly a State should be concerned with preserving the fiscal integrity of its programs, but it cannot accomplish this by "invidious distinctions between classes of its citizens," *Shapiro* v. *Thompson*, 394 U.S. 618, 633 (1969). If cost is an issue, perhaps all claims which exceed a certain amount should be excluded. But to arbitrarily deny benefits to women who are pregnant has no justification. It would be as discriminatory as denying benefits to those who have sickle cell anemia.

Some myths have allowed this to happen. Those who oppose pregnancy inclusion claim that women will abuse the disability fund. But the fact is that women work because of economic necessity. Forty percent of all women work, and the overwhelming majority of these women are single, widowed, divorced or separated, or have husbands who earn less than $7,000 per year. The State has denied benefits on the basis of generalities and stereotypes contrary to fact and to the equal protection clause. Some women suffering pregnancy-related disabilities will have large claims, many will not.

Those who oppose pregnancy inclusion claim that since pregnancy is voluntary, it should not be covered. No woman chooses to have abnormal pregnancies or pregnancy complications. The high number of abortions also attests to the fact that many pregnancies are not voluntary. Meanwhile, it should be noted that other "voluntary" conditions such as injuries resulting from drunken driving, cosmetic surgery, sex-change operations, attempted suicide, lung cancer caused by smoking as well as solely male disabilities such as vasectomies or prostate operations are all compensated under the State disability law.

This case is currently being appealed to the Supreme Court.

Since the pregnancy exclusion has no rational basis, the California court declared it unconstitutional. This decision will aid thousands of California women. I hope that all States and insurance companies with similar discriminatory policies will likewise follow suit. Pregnancy-related disabilities must be treated like all other disabilities.

THEOLOGY AND ECOLOGY

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment and the Republican Task Force on the Environment, and as an ordained Presbyterian clergyman who served as a parish minister before coming to the Congress, I am intrigued by the theological rationale that could possibly be developed to undergird, explain, and motivate modern man's efforts to preserve the environment from pollution; and I offer the following thoughts on theology and ecology with the hope that they may be of some interest to my colleagues. I am sure it is possible for persons holding similar commitments about saving earth, air, and water from abuse and spoilage, to come down on different sides of given particular issues, as for example, the trans-Alaskan pipeline which we are debating today, and we must certainly always remember that reasonable men will often differ on the right method for implementing a mutually agreed upon goal; but deeper than these differences lies a fundamental commitment, a basic intent, a comprehensive rationale—and it is to this that I would address myself in these remarks:

It has been suggested that the decade of the 70's will be known as the "Age of Ecology"—and to ignore this would be irresponsible. As the Chairman of the Department of Religion at Earlham College, Dr. Richard A. Baer, Jr., has observed, "The Church is badly in need of a distinctly 20th century theology of nature and of a land ethic pertinent to this age of technology and population explosion."

Begin with two contrasting pictures—one a Norman Rockwell painting, the other a recent cartoon.

"Rockwell painted a picture of an elderly woman who had paused to say a prayer of thanks before she began her meager meal in a cafeteria. It portrayed her with head bowed and hands folded, completely oblivious of those around her. Laboring men and business people had paused to watch her, not merely curious but obviously impressed by the act. The picture appeared on the cover of a popular magazine and occasioned widespread comment throughout America. It sounded a note which a materially-minded people found strangely appealing. Millions who had been careless in their attitudes toward God were stirred by memories of days gone by when they were thankful for all God's goodness and when they, too, had paused to express their gratitude to the Almighty before they began a meal." (Quoted in Wallis, Chas. L., '70 from G. E. Thomas, Spiritual Life in the New Testament, p. 297)

The carton to which I referred is not made for laughing. Six smoke stacks from a large and especially grotesque factory, labelled industry, spread black ink across the sky, while three huge drains gush filth into a surrounding cesspool. Amid the tanks and pipes looms the proprietor of this enterprise, a fat-faced man with a cigar. He grins toothily down at a wretch crawling from the slime with a newspaper that proclaims, "Pollution Latest: Science Foresees End of Life on Earth in 35 years." Mr. Industrialist is replying, "Boy, you had me worried for a moment there—I thought you said three to five years." (Wall Street Journal, January 8, 1970)

If, with the woman in Rockwell's picture we have truly thankful hearts, it will influence our attitude toward the world of nature, its products and environment. He who is not careless in his attitude toward God will not be careless in his attitude toward God's gifts to His children, one of which is the world of nature. Anyone who truly believes that the fruits of the field, the trees of the forest, the natural resources of the ground, the air we breathe, the water we drink, the animals we kill for food, the earth we inhabit, the crops we harvest, are God's gifts, and truly appreciates them as such, will, it seems to me, not only pause like Rockwell's devout woman to express gratitude, but also do whatever he or she can to see to it that God's gift of the physical environment in which we live and move and have our being is protected and conserved, rather than polluted, wasted or destroyed as was the case with the selfish profit-minded industrialist in the cartoon.

THE ECOLOGICAL CRISIS

The evidence of our senses, what we see and hear and read almost daily, compels us to recognize that mounting levels of pollution and population, trash and noise, are plunging us deeper into an ecological crisis. It may not be as dire as some apocalyptically predict, but none will deny that it is real. I am not expert enough to judge, for example, whether biologist Paul Ehrlich is right or wrong in his speculation that on the basis of trends already well evident, the oceans of the earth will, within ten brief years from now, by 1980, have lost their ability to support animal life—which would, needless to say, plunge the world into a horrendous chaos. I am as ill-equipped as probably 99% of the American people to assess the long-range affects of foul air, impure water, depleted natural resources and exploding populations. I am not sure whether or not there won't be any air left to breathe by the year 2,000, or any ground for the people to live on, or whether the ice cap will have melted and we'll all have floated away. It is difficult for me to know whether or not trees are being cut faster than they are growing, or whether or not our country will possibly be engulfed by trash since right now we have to cope with 3.5-billion tons of solid waste each year in America, and the figure is increasing. A layman like myself does not have the scientific answers to these problems; but *when all is done and said, is it not safe to conclude that we have a serious problem?* It has produced a rising ground swell of indignation in our country as more and more people realize the magnitude of the present crisis and the perilous consequences of further neglect? An avalanche of published information signals that the crisis is worldwide and that it does pose a threat to the survival of human life.

ITS TWO DIMENSIONS

It seems to me that the ecological crisis has *two dimensions*—a pragmatic one and a

philosophical one. Call them scientific and theological. At the one level, we attack the surface manifestations of the problem—uncontrolled technology, unlimited population growth, unregulated industry, and so on; at the other, we talk about people's attitudes and values in their view of life. The *Wall Street Journal* was right in an editorial on the ecological crisis (Apr. 21, 1970) when it observed that "the quality of life in America is by definition more than physical." I do not think therefore that it is wide of the mark to suggest that the ecological crisis is at bottom religious. What we do about the environment depends on our basic beliefs about the world and about ourselves.

THREE BIBLICAL PRINCIPLES

So may I suggest three Biblical principles that in my opinion should inform our thinking about the ecological problem?

(1) *This Is God's World*

This is God's world, and as such, all things in it have value. That's part of the meaning of the Creation Story in Genesis. God made the world and everything in it and pronounced it all good. The Psalmist says: "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein . . ." (Psalm 24:1–2) Paul quotes that Old Testament passage with approval in his First letter to the Corinthians, as if to teach man respect for nature and appreciation of God's world. The Bible rings with songs of thanksgiving to God for the blessings of food and air and water and land and harvest, and our attitudes as Christians should be equally grateful. "God has two dwellings," said Isaac Walton, "One in heaven, and the other in a meek and thankful heart."

To be sure, we cannot always be grateful for the world of nature—not when an avalanche destroys a mountain village in the Alps, or an earthquake a city in California or Japan, or a forest fire a summer vacation spot, not when a tidal wave engulfs a half-million people in Pakistan or a typhoon ravages the Philippines. Our little six-year-old came home with a joke this fall that was funny the first 20 times we heard it. "What is a tornado?" he asks. "I don't know, Teddy, tell me." "It's Mother Nature doing the twist." Mother Nature does do a twist sometimes. She does go on rampages.

But by and large, with the blessings of food to eat, land to cultivate, air to breathe, and light to see, with the reliable changing of the seasons and the beauties of sunsets and flowers and starry nights and mountain-top vistas, we have a great deal to be thankful for. "For the beauty of the earth, for the beauty of the skies." we sing with gratitude. A religious man will value nature as God's creation. He will not regard it as a means to his own ends, as if the world exists for his own unconditional use. Think of Job, who was finally overwhelmed by the majesty and wonder of nature. Think of Jesus talking about the lilies of the field and giving countless illustrations from nature to make His points. Think of God noticing the sparrow's fall—even if the culprit is DDT. Think of St. Francis delighting in God's birds and animals, sensing the dignity and equality of all creatures, and calling the earth His sister and the sun His brother. Nature belongs to God and does not simply exist to be exploited by man.

(2) *Man Is a Steward*

This leads to the second basic principle. Man is a steward. He is given dominion over the earth, as we read in Genesis and Psalm 8. This does not mean he is given a carte blanch to exploit and subjugate and plunder and rape and destroy. He is a trustee of the gift God has given him. The Creation Story teaches that God created man to till the ground (Gen. 2:15) to care for it and cultivate it and use it well.

The modern mind does not necessarily agree with this view of man's relationship to the world. Modern man tends to view God's world as His own exclusive property. Many of us went to "Expo '67" in Montreal and thought it exciting, fantastic and wonderful. But did we catch the heresy of the main theme—"Man and His World"? Is it true, as Woody Guthrie sings, "this land is your land," or was Abraham Lincoln closer to the mark when he spoke in his last Thanksgiving Day Proclamation (1864) of the land as being assigned to us by a gracious God as our dwelling place? Is it right for the American alligator to be exterminated for ladies handbags, or for ancient California redwoods to be cut down for patio furniture? Religious people must ask: what are our responsibilities as stewards of the world of nature? And we must confess, with Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia: "We have for too long taken a careless, unthinking approach to our use of nature."

I think we must say that from the biblical viewpoint, with the privilege of dominion there goes the responsibility of trusteeship. After all, the Catholic Church produced not only Franciscans who marvelled at the world of nature, but also Benedictines, whose careful agricultural practices transformed much of Europe's wilderness into gardens, and incidentally, transformed a few grapes into some pretty good wine. Jesus pointed out in some of His parables (Luke 12:42; 16:1; etc.) that men must make a good accounting of themselves as to how they use the talents and resources God has given them. Which suggests to us that our responsibility is to deal as wisely as we can with the limited resources of nature's animal and vegetable and mineral kingdoms which have been entrusted to us, just as we try to do with things that belong directly to us, like our money and cars and homes and clothes.

(3) *Love of Neighbor*

Then thirdly, I think a theology of ecology will stress that we are our brother's keeper, as we read in Genesis 4, and that we must have the welfare of our neighbor in mind. Jesus said that love of neighbor is the second great ethical imperative after love of God (Matt. 19:19). Sin is self-centeredness. Sin is pursuit of self-interest at the expense of others. The trouble with the prevailing values in our culture is that they are thing-oriented rather than life-oriented, profit-centered too much, people-centered not enough. They are materialistic, not personal. This means that all too often, we do not care what happens to the other fellows so long as we make our money and enjoy our comfort. But followers of the biblical ethic are people who care. They take the needs of their neighbors seriously. They try to express love in their daily attitudes and actions. They are concerned about the quality of life as well as the quantity of production. They understand that no man is an island unto himself and that what one man does usually affects many others. It is reported that a sign in Texas advertises a local park as the cleanest park in America, and the reason why it is so clean is that near the picnic tables are signs that say: "The people here before you left this clean for you."

So the third Biblical principle that should influence our thinking about the ecological crisis is the one of love of neighbor. Religious man will be concerned about the health and welfare of his fellowman, and he will be committed to whatever steps he can take to humanize and improve the quality of life on this planet.

THREE PRACTICAL STEPS

These three principles drawn from the Bible can serve as a start in thinking about the theological dimensions of the ecological crisis we are facing today. How do we translate our concern into action?

(1) First of all, we must recognize that the crisis does have a religious dimension. Pollution is a moral problem. Poisoned air and water and land have moral implications. We must not say that it is just a question of technological improvements solving the problems that we face. It is also a matter of attitudes and values. We must understand that we cannot live responsibly unless we are willing to grapple with the problems of nature and natural resources.

(2) Secondly, we must act where we can and where we are as individuals, to combat waste and pollution and to support the conservation effort: We must try our best not to pollute the environment or deface God's world or contribute to the devastation of our natural resources. And this says something to me personally about how I keep my car tuned up and how I get rid of my leaves and how I dispose of litter along the highways and trails that I travel, and how I plan the size of my family, and so forth and so on. And it also says something to me personally about channeling some of my charitable giving to programs and agencies that are trying to keep my country that I love beautiful and clean and safe and healthy.

(3) Thirdly, we must act corporately wherever we can to achieve our goals.

Two illustrations, one negative and one positive. In Michigan, there is a lake called White Lake. It is almost 60 feet deep. Not long ago, you could see to the bottom of it. In 1970, I was told: "You can't do that now, and you're not even supposed to swim in it." It was polluted, due to several contributory causes, not the least of which is that just a mile north, near Montague, Michigan, a manufacturing company is discharging into Lake Michigan pollutants at the following rate: Sulphides, 255 lbs. per day; chloride, 54,443 lbs. per day; nitrogen, 2544 lbs. per day; copper, 141; antimony, 283; flourides, 1785; chromium, 4.25; cyanide, 11.22; and phiocyanates, 70 lbs. per day. Concerned citizens wrote letters to the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor and the Water Resources Commission and appealed to the company, but in 1970 the 17,000,000 gallons per day being discharged by this company into Lake Michigan had not been purified of the polluting materials I mentioned. And I think this was a sad commentary on corporate irresponsibility.

On the other hand, you can cite many examples in the business world where corporations are trying to meet some of the social problems that afflict us today. So I quote the following from a 1970 speech by the former President of Eli Lilly and Company. Burton Beck was speaking of the Corporation's social consciousness which he said "we view as a corporate strength."

"We pride ourselves on our sensitivity to the needs of society and on the efforts we make to help answer those needs . . . (one) area of current concern in which we feel we have been able to make a substantial contribution is pollution control . . . Our new manufacturing plant near Clinton, Indiana . . . is expected to be in full operation by the first quarter of next year. In building the Clinton Laboratories our goal was to design a plant that would not in any appreciable way cause pollution or degradation of the environment. We asked our engineers to seek new approaches to waste disposal even if this meant designing new manufacturing processes. The result was a significant pioneering effort."

Here is an illustration of translating theology of ecology into responsible positive corporate action.

CONCLUSION

This is God's world. He has given it to us as a trust. He wants us to use it well, and to make it inhabitable and pleasurable for our fellowman. He wants us to be co-workers with Him in the conservation of an earth that is safe and fair and clean.

TAX REFORM AND THE AMERICAN WAY

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Mr. Speaker, American education is improving by encouraging the diversity which has been present since the founding of the country.

Private higher education can be innovative and responsive to student needs relatively unfettered by regulations often governing public institutions. I strongly believe this diversity should be encouraged. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 contained some provisions which have tended to "dry up" charitable contributions. At the present time, the House Ways and Means Committee has completed hearings on another tax reform measure and will be resuming consideration of this issue after the August recess. Some proposals would revise the Internal Revenue Code in a manner which would be even more restrictive and reduce charitable contributions further.

I submit for the information of my colleagues an article written by Dr. Edgar Carlson, executive director of the Minnesota Private College Council:

TAX REFORM AND THE AMERICAN WAY

What would you say is the most distinctive thing about America?

We are not any longer alone in espousing the fundamental rights of man.

We are not the only country that believes in the democratic process; some countries get much larger turn-outs at the polls, even when they do not have a single party system.

I am prepared to argue that the most distinctive element in the "American way" of doing things is that we believe in the public-private sponsorship for public services. Unlike collectivist countries we do not believe that *only* government should be involved in programs intended to meet human needs. Unlike most western European democracies we do not believe that public policy should *discourage* private initiative in meeting human needs and social problems. We believe that public policy should *encourage* such efforts.

This is most evident when one compares tax policy in the United States and tax policy in Scandinavian countries, for instance. In those countries no deductions are allowed for gifts to education or cultural activities, or health or welfare agencies and efforts, since these services are being provided through tax dollars. Where such private enterprises exist and have demonstrable needs they may receive support from tax sources but they do not characteristically qualify as beneficiaries of tax-deductible gifts.

In the United States private initiative in providing such public services has been an inherent part of our national development. Schools and colleges, hospitals, welfare services and institutions, centers of art and science and nearly all comparable activities were first the concern of private persons and agencies before they became the concern of governing bodies. In part, this is the direct product of the separation of church and state. Historically the religious and the political structures and commitments have been the two major sources of social services and institutions. The decision of the founding fathers that there should be no "establishment" of religion meant that the impulse to service which has always characterized the religious spirit founded independent institutions and agencies to perform many of those functions which in the countries from which they came had been performed by a society in which state and church were not easily distinguished. It is the uniqueness of our American history which has in fact given us this unique tradition of dual sponsorship of programs and institutions that are designed to meet basic human needs—education, hospitals, welfare, art, research and all the rest.

In the course of our history we have developed policies intended to encourage individual initiative and support. Among these policies are those that relate to the deductibility of gifts to charities. Far from being "loop-holes" for avoiding social responsibilities, these are consciously designed "tax incentives" to encourage people to assume social responsibilities on their own. When the government succeeds in inducing people to freely support schools, care centers, cultural and other activities which are admittedly good for society, they reduce the demands for tax resources to carry on the same or similar functions. In fact, they reduce such costs in most cases because the degree of subsidy is generally less under private than under public sponsorship. However, the principle at stake is not primarily the question of dollars saved; the principle is the distinctiveness of the "American way." It is part and parcel of our country's tradition and character that private impulses should be permitted—even stimulated—to participate voluntarily in meeting our public needs. A society which did the same things but relied solely on tax monies to do them would be a drastically different society than one in which both public and private efforts are engaged in meeting those needs.

The Congress must keep this in mind as it reviews again what is and is not proper by way of tax incentives and tax preferences. Those who believe in this American way should be careful not to protect those who are only concerned with preferential tax arrangements for themselves, but we must be equally vigilant against the temptation to channel all resources into the support of public programs and thus destroy the viability of the characteristically American public-private way of meeting public needs.

There are two specific changes proposed in legislation before the Congress which educators agree would have a very damaging effect on private support of private and public institutions. The first is the reduction or elimination of the right of a donor of property to claim credit for the fair market value of that property. It is proposed that his deduction should be the cost to him rather than the value to the recipient and that he should then be taxed for the appreciation.

Another proposal is that the deduction allowed for gifts to charitable organizations from estates should be limited to 50% of the gross estate, with the remainder subject to full tax even though going to charity.

Current laws allowing credit for appreciated value and allowing donors to transfer their estates to meet public needs through privately or publicly sponsored agencies are not "tax-loop-holes", they are "tax incentives". No one can use them unless he is willing to help meet a public need.

UNITED NATIONS EXPANDS LAND HOLDINGS TO AUSTRIA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a proposed "United Nations City" to house an ever-increasing international bureaucracy is reported to have the Austrians in a turmoil.

Apparently Austrians, who are conservative are more inclined to worry about Austrian taxpayers than the Socialists in power or the U.N. crowd, find it difficult to explain the biggest building project in the history of their country; that is, $600 million to be placed under the control of sinister one-world outside influences.

Reportedly, they take little assurance that the "U.N. City" would contribute to Austria's national security. Possibly even the Austrians realize that the U.N. occupation of their country would make them a U.N. satellite.

I insert a related newsclipping in the RECORD as follows:

OVERRUN SOARS TO $450 MILLION: U.N. OFFICE COST STIRS AUSTRIA

(By Richard Homan)

VIENNA.—The biggest building project in Austria's history, a $600 million "United Nations City" to house U.N. and other international activities in Vienna, is seriously imperiled by huge cost overruns and disputes between Austria's leading political parties.

As Parliament recessed for the summer, Chancellor Bruno Kreisky tried to salvage the project on the ground that it was "essential to Austria's national security." But he warned in a closed caucus of his Socialist Party that if the opposition does not diminish, U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim "can save himself a trip to Vienna in the fall for the cornerstone-laying."

Work on the controversial project, which is to be a complex of five buildings on the banks of the Danube, began in February after more than four years of dispute over the awarding of contracts. The cornerstone ceremony has tentatively been scheduled for late September.

The dispute has produced libel and slander suits, some involving Kreisky and other leading figures, and a parliamentary investigation followed by a stormy debate last year. During the debate, two opposition members interrupted Kreisky's discussion of persons involved in the project with shouts of "They're all Jews." The minority report of the Parliamentary committee made accusations of "graft" in the awarding of contracts.

In recent weeks, new cost figures and indications that voters are becoming more concerned with priorities of public spending have prompted the conservative People's Party to renew its opposition, although the project was conceived by that party during its rule.

Four years ago, U.N. City was to have cost $150 million. Projections in this year's federal budget indicate that it would now cost $350 million, but in his most recent statements Kreisky has called it a $600 million project.

Karl Schleinzer, leader of the opposition party, said recently that in view of the new cost estimates, "The entire questionable complex must once again be very carefully examined, since we don't have enough money for schools and hospitals.

Kreisky proposed that the entire issue "be taken out of the political arena" and he asked for a pledge from the opposition that "you won't bring it up every three or four months."

Continued opposition or a scaling down of the project, he warned, "would raise doubts throughout the world as to whether Austria is qualified to house international organizations."

Austria, a neutral nation, has made an effort to identify itself closely with the United Nations and other international organizations, and Kreisky has related the construction of U.N. City with Austria's security.

"What is Vienna, after all?" he said. "A big city squeezed into the edge of Western Europe. Vienna can have prestige only if it becomes a major international center; otherwise this construction would be an excessive luxury. It will be an essential factor in the security of all Austria. Our nation will become a relay-station for world politics. Other nations will protect it and respect it and will not endanger it."

Kreisky also saw commercial advantages: "The federal Chamber of Commerce cannot be indifferent to the question of whether Austria builds a $600 million project or spends only $150 million," he said, in an effort to win stronger support from businessmen, who control the People's Party.

The U.N. City complex is chiefly to house two major agencies with headquaters in Vienna—the U.N. Industrial Development Organization and the International Atomic Energy Agency—and the much smaller office of the U.N. High Commission for Refugees.

These organizations now have 2,000 employees in cramped, temporary quarters throughout Vienna. Both expect to expand if new buildings are made available, but a spokesman for the International Atomic Energy Agency has said that the U.N. City, as now planned, would provide considerably more space for his organzation than it will need.

In an international design competition held four years ago, an American team headed by Cesar Pelli of Los Angeles, a partner in the internationally known firm of Victor Gruen Associates, won first prize. British and West German groups finished second and third.

A year later, however, the contract for the design of the project was given to an Austrian architect who had finished fourth in the competition. Kreisky has said that the decision was based on the cheaper cost and greater flexibility of the proposal by Johann Staber, the Austrian.

During the parliamentary debate last year over the handling of the contract award, the government arranged a public exhibition of the 1,804 documents and pieces of correspondence involved in the affair, and Kreisky himself conducted some visitors through the display of neatly arranged photocopies on long wooden tables in the federal chancellery.

HOLDING THE LINE ON SPENDING

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, when I campaigned for election last year I promised the residents of my district that I would work to hold down the cost of operating the Government, because I know that increased Government spending is the cause of higher prices, higher taxes, and inflation.

I believe that this Nation can and must do more to control the rising cost of Government and the rising cost of living. I am not alone in that belief. Among those who share my opinion, especially as it relates to the field of aviation, are the many aircraft owners and pilots across this Nation. At this time, under my leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a recent editorial on this subject which appeared in the August issue of The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association magazine The Pilot:

SPENDING

"The most important single thing the Congress can do in holding down the cost of living is to hold down the cost of government," he said. ". . . I shall continue to veto spending bills that we cannot afford, no matter how noble-sounding their names. If these budget-busters became law, the money would come out of your pocket—in higher taxes, higher prices, or both. . ."—Richard Nixon, June 13.

It's almost as if someone in AOPA had written that. We've been saying the same thing for years. In 1963 we recommended a carefully documented 36-percent cut in the FAA's budget, which, at that time, was $810 million. Today, 10 years later, the budget is 262 percent higher and stands at $2.126 *billion*.

The time is long past due when Congress should take long, cold looks at government expenditures for civil aviation, and what it's costing the taxpayer. We've already commented on the extent of this vast bureaucratic empire: 56,500 employees for a total of 141,570 active aircraft, or 2.5 planes per employee. The average cost per active plane is a monumental $15,017, just to support this bureaucracy for one year.

Responsible government officials must listen to us. We think the days of unreasoning panic over aviation accidents and resultant huge budgets have long outlasted their usefulness. The entire civil aviation community—airlines and general aviation alike—is probably as safety-conscious a group of humans as exists. The only justification we've ever heard for all the costly bureaucracy has been, 'Think of what the accident rate *might* have been were it not for the FAA." Uninformed laymen and Sunday feature writers may believe that, but it would be hard to convince many others. Every major accident in civil aviation in recent years has invariably been with planes and pilots fully certificated by the FAA.

Of greatest value to users of the airspace are the air traffic control system and the navigation aids. But now they are badly distorted. Instead of serving the user, ATC is designed to fly planes loaded with exotic equipment, while pilots sit by as virtual automatons. Almost everything FAA now buys costs twice what it should. And every user of the airspace is presently being hammered into a preconceived FAA mold; either you do it this way, or you don't fly. This is 180 degrees out of phase with FAA's original public-service concept.

The FAA needs a thorough, knowledgeable, and ruthless going-over. Once again, we have studied its many parts, as we've been doing for years. Today, we'd estimate it could be cut back at least 50 percent. Rules and regulations could—and should—be pulled back to the point where simpler basic rules exist for the great majority of users. Any users who can't abide by those rules must bear an additional burden, to whatever extent is necessary, to bring them up to a minimum safe standard.

The destruction of general aviation is now a distinct possibility. All of the forces that threaten its existence are visible on the horizon, and all of them are being fathered by the Department of Transportation and its $2,126-billion-a-year subsidiary, the FAA. They are like buckets of water, poured on a drowning man: TCAs, altitude-reporting transponders, new microwave landing system, tough new requirements of Part 61, 25-kHz channel spacing—they go on and on. And what the FAA forgot, or couldn't do legally, other bureaucracies have concocted: sweeping threats in the name of the environment, more and higher charges by the FCC, costly gadgets dreamed up by well-meaning members of Congress, etc. Even the price of charts is up over 100 percent.

Are all 346 control towers in the country essential, or just FAA featherbedding? No spokesmen for general aviation ever said they needed them—nor were they asked. The criteria for towers must be overhauled and, if the facts warrant, drastically rewritten. Considering the price of a typical tower, the only ones that should be left are those whose necessity is clearly proved, and which general aviation agrees to. Even those that remain must be cut back; at least one shift of costly employees can be eliminated from almost all towers.

The same is true of traffic control centers. General aviation has never been asked for its requirements. The entire ATC system must be drastically revised—downward. The federal government only has a responsibility for providing a basic system, one designed to serve the vast majority of users. Any super-system must be paid for by those who profess to need it, not the overwhelming majority. Restrictions must be cut back severely; the TCA is the symbol of the distorted manner in which the great majority of airspace users are being discriminated against in favor of a glittering few.

Actually, the DOT has supplied its own ultimate answer. The entire cost-allocation study of DOT operated (and still does) on the premise that civil aviation in the U.S. serves no public interest. If one is to believe these bureaucrats, then what right has the federal government to spend any public funds at all on aviation? Logically, it should fold up the FAA, or at least reduce it to a policing body, and turn the entire civil aviation industry over to private enterprise. A private company operating the air traffic control system would never think of foisting a 747 system on Cherokees; they'd sell various types of users only those services for which they were willing to pay.

Many of us in general aviation have a serious responsibility we've ignored all these years. We've revelled in the luxury of all these exotic devices and systems, somehow being content with what the government has "given" us. That's an old American fallacy, and now we're facing the moment of truth. As the majority segment of the civil aviation industry, general aviation has never stated a requirement for the bulk of all this costly stuff—yet it's now being dunned for it. And the dunning will almost certainly wreck general aviation, at least as we know it today.

If Mr. Nixon and/or Congress truly are concerned with economy in government, the civil aviation bureaucracy is a ripe place to start.

FOND FAREWELL?

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Department of Defense, I am including below the farewell message prepared by Dr. James R. Schlesinger, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and distributed to all employees of that Agency upon his departure to assume the post of Secretary of Defense.

I am informed that CIA employees who survived the recent RIF, accomplished mainly by forced retirements, were not too impressed by this fond farewell by Dr. Schlesinger after his bull-in-the-china-shop approach to reorganization of this Agency. Having endured his unknowing and unfeeling presence for 3½ months, employees cheered at the news of his pending departure.

One wonders by what authority and for what reason the Secretary of Defense could promise "continued scrutiny" of the CIA. What role does he envision he will play in future years based on his familiarizing himself with that Agency for only 3½ months?

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, D.C., July 2, 1973.

MEMORANDUM FOR ALL PERSONNEL OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY STAFF

As the time comes to bid farewell, let me say a few words to those of you in the Agency and on the IC staff who are, of course, the special responsibility of the DCI. Brief as has been my tenure as DCI, my interest in the intelligence community and intelligence processes is of long standing and will continue. Along with the other elements of the community, you will have my interest and sympathy—as well as my continued scrutiny—as you grapple with the difficult problems that are unavoidable.

Let me make two observations.

First, as the international environment becomes more fluid and the balance of military power approaches more closely to a rough equality, the importance of good intelligence will increase rather than diminish. The wider range of political forces and the counterpoise of opposed instrumentalities mean that excellence of intelligence will in many circumstances determine the ultimate outcomes.

Second, in light of both the stakes and the limitation on resources, the intelligence community must function as a community rather than a collection of warring entities. The Central Intelligence Agency, properly to fill its function, must itself be one Agency, part of a larger community serving our national leadership. To assist our leaders, intelligence must be absolutely first class. The story must be told exactly as you see it, but the style and manner of presentation should be such to ensure that the story gets through and is understood. There must be no muffling or waffling of the message. Differences of view can be clearly stated. And the true range of possible outcomes of U.S. policy choices must be exposed to our national decision-makers.

Moreover, the community will have to fulfill its larger role on a diminished level of real resources. That is indeed a challenge. I am pleased that my successor as DCI shares my own determination that the many talents in the intelligence community be efficiently managed, be flexible in responding to new challenges, and will adhere firmly to the established legal limitations.

There is more talent in this Agency than in any comparable group within the Federal Government. Harnessed together and properly exploited, this talent can and, I am confident, will make an indispensable contribution to the future of this nation.

Let me close by expressing a personal word of thanks to all of you for your support during this recent period, and to wish all of you the best in the future.

JAMES R. SCHLESINGER.

PLEASANT HILL HIGH SCHOOL HONORED

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have received notice of an award presented to the Mount Diablo Unified School District in Concord, Calif., in my congressional district. The award consists of a grant in kind by the National Humanities Faculty, part of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The school which will benefit from the award is Pleasant Hill High School, in particular the American studies program taught by Mr. Richard McElhare and Mr. Mike Schultz. They will be visited and assisted throughout the year by professionals in the field of the humanities.

The type of program that the National Humanities Faculty sponsors is the type of progressive innovation in American education that deserves our full support. I commend the NHF, the Mount Diablo Unified School District, and Mr. McElhare, and Mr. Schultz for their efforts and participation in such programs.

For the RECORD, I submit the letter received from the National Humanities Faculty:

THE NATIONAL HUMANITIES FACULTY,
Concord, Mass., July 16, 1973.

Hon. JEROME WALDIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR WALDIE: It is a great pleasure for me to be able to report to you that Mt. Diablo Unified School District in Concord, California, has been accepted as a National Humanities Faculty project school for 1973–74. Through the program a team of outstanding scholars and practitioners in the field of the humanities will meet with a group of District teachers on the evaluation, enrichment, and dissemination of a team-taught course in American Civilization and 11th graders.

Funded principally with federal funds through the National Endowment for the Humanities, the NHF was established in 1968 to help improve the teaching of the humanities in the schools. To carry out this task, we conduct a program of visiting humanists, bringing university professors, creative artists, and others into a chosen group of schools who have applied to us for help. Essentially, we make it possible for teachers to enter into informal conversations with professional humanists about their common concerns in the teaching of the humanities as disciplines and the exercise of humanistic values as the core of the whole educational process.

A maximum of twenty schools are chosen as project sites each year, so it is particularly noteworthy that Mt. Diablo was chosen among applicants from across the country.

After five years of operation and work in over 130 schools in all parts of the country, we truly feel the NHF is making a significant contribution to American education, and we are most happy to be working at Mt. Diablo.

Yours very sincerely,

LOWELL S. SMITH,
Assistant Director.

1974 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 5

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the information of Members, their staffs, and others who may be interested, a few excerpts from the "Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 5, as of July 28," prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. The report itself has been sent to all Members.

This report reflects the latest official budget estimates, as revised on June 1, which project a unified budget deficit for fiscal year 1974 of $2.7 billion—with a Federal funds deficit of $18.8 billion. In a recent statement, the President indicated the possibility of a balanced budget on the unified budget basis for fiscal year 1974, assuming further increase in revenue and assuming no increase in current outlay estimates.

This scorekeeping report is as of July 28 and shows that the impact of congressional actions completed to that date would be to increase budget outlays by nearly $1 billion. However, it should be noted that many significant actions are as yet incomplete; these can be expected to materially affect the final impact of congressional actions on 1974 outlays. In other words, these scorekeeping figures should be regarded as preliminary since much legislation is yet to come.

It is evident that, if we are to adhere to the $267.1 billion ceiling approved by the House last week, the Congress must restrain itself. This ceiling would require outlay reduction of $1.8 billion from the current budget outlay estimate, and implies absorption of any spending increases the Congress may provide—by our actions as well as inactions on pending requests affecting the budget.

We are hopeful that when all the appropriation bills for this session are in we may be able to remain within the budget and achieve a reduction. But, of course, there are a number of legislative measures pending which would mandate additional spending if enacted.

Also it should be especially noted that the budget totals assume congressional action on a number of measures which would reduce certain program costs by some $1.4 billion. Inaction on this requested reduction and reform legislation would have the effect of increasing 1974 spending totals. These items are shown on table No. 4 in the report.

The staff of the joint committee is making every effort to keep this 1974 budget scorekeeping information as current as possible, so that it will be useful to Members in ascertaining our present fiscal position. Another report in this series will be published very shortly, bringing the information up to the date of the August recess.

The excerpts from the July 28 report that I am inserting here include the scorekeeping highlights from the text and the main scorekeeping table. These excerpts follow:

EXCERPTS FROM 1974 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 5 AS OF JULY 28, 1973

FISCAL YEAR 1974—SCOREKEEPING HIGHLIGHTS

The impact of Congressional action to July 28 on the President's fiscal year 1974 requests (revised June 1) for budget authority and budget outlays, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

[In millions]

	House	Senate	Enacted
1974 budget authority requested	$288,135	$288,135	$288,135
Congressional changes to date (committee and floor action):			
Appropriation bills	+1,197	+1,080	+431
Legislative bills:			
Backdoor and mandatory increases	+2,180	+3,784	+1,393
Shifts from 1973 and other changes	+3,311	+3,849	+3,311
Total, changes (see table 1, for details)	+6,687	+8,712	+5,135
1974 budget authority as adjusted by congressional changes to date	294,822	296,847	293,270

	House	Senate	Enacted
1974 budget outlay estimate	268,671	268,671	268,671
Congressional changes to date (committee and floor action):			
Appropriation bills	+892	+1,276	+576
Legislative bills:			
Backdoor and mandatory increases	+565	+934	+532
Adjustments and other changes	−157	−41	−157
Total, changes (see table 1, for details)	+1,300	+2,169	+951
1974 budget outlays as adjusted by congressional changes to date	269,971	270,840	269,622

While this report reflects congressional increases over the budget amounting to about $1.0 billion as of July 28, it should be noted that many significant actions are as yet incomplete which may materially affect the final impact of congressional action or inaction on budgeted 1974 outlays.

Deficit position

The 1974 unified budget deficit, as revised June 1, is estimated at $2.7 billion—a decrease of $10 billion from the original January estimate of $12.7 billion. This latest official deficit estimate reflects a federal funds deficit of $18.8 billion and a trust fund surplus of $16.1 billion.

On the basis of changes to date (including committee action) by the respective Houses of Congress in budget outlay and revenue requests, the 1974 unified budget deficit would be:

[In billions]

Budget estimate (revised June 1)	$2.7
Based on House changes to date	4.9
Based on Senate changes to date	4.7
Based on changes enacted to date	4.5

The above deficit calculations are based on the latest official deficit estimate as of June 1. Although the President indicated the possibility of a balanced budget in his statement of July 26, official Budget/Treasury reestimates have not been transmitted and are therefore not incorporated in this report. The President's statement in this regard was: "With the economy now operating at a high level, revenues in fiscal year 1974 should approximate, without any tax increases, the overall level of expenditures I proposed last January—about $269 billion."

Appropriation bills

Completed action to date on appropriation legislation reflects the 1974 outlay impact of actions taken with respect to 1973 supplemental appropriations and other requests in the Urgent and Second Supplemental bills. Conference committee action is reflected for two regular 1974 appropriation bills, with the major impact for:

HUD, Space-Science-Veterans bill: increase of $439 million in budget authority, with negligible effect on outlays.

Incomplete action on 8 regular 1974 appropriation bills is reflected in this report, with the major impact as follows:

Passed House and Senate:

Agriculture bill: House reduction of $134 million in budget authority and increase of $135 million in outlays; Senate increase of $657 million in budget authority and increase of $625 million in outlays.

Transportation bill: House reduction of $140 million in budget authority and $70 million in outlays; Senate reduction of $42 million in budget authority and $21 million in outlays.

Passed House:

Labor-HEW bill: increase of $1,264 million in budget authority and $490 million in outlays.

Legislative bills—"backdoor" and mandatory

Completed actions: To date, there has been completed action on 8 legislative bills carrying backdoor or mandatory authorizations affecting fiscal 1974. The major items are:

Welfare and medicaid amendments: mandatory increases of $122 million in budget authority and outlays.

Social security—exempt wages: backdoor increase of $100 million in outlays.

Unemployment benefit extension: backdoor increase of $116 million in outlays.

Veterans benefits: two bills expanding mandatory veterans benefits by $175 million in budget authority and outlays.

Highway programs: additional backdoor contract authority of $1.3 billion. The 1974 outlay impact is undetermined. (Conference action.)

Traffic safety: additional backdoor contract authority of $281 million. The 1974 outlay impact is undetermined. (Conference action.)

Pending actions: In addition, there are 16 legislative bills carrying backdoor or mandatory authorizations which have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress.

House action pertaining to 9 such measures would increase budget authority by $408 million, having an outlay impact of at least $383 million excluding the undetermined effect of increased contract authority.

Senate action pertaining to 10 such measures would increase budget authority by $2.4 billion, having an outlay impact of at least $362 million excluding the undetermined effect of increased contract authority.

The scored backdoor or mandatory impact of these pending legislative bills includes the following major programs and amounts in excess of the budget:

Veterans drug treatment: mandatory veterans benefits of $144 million in budget authority and outlays as passed by the Senate.

Veterans pensions: mandatory veterans benefits of $208 million in budget authority and outlays pending in the House.

Legislative bills—shifts from 1973 adjustments and other changes

Completed action has been taken on 3 additional legislative bills having impact on the 1974 budget totals:

REA loans: removes lending program from the budget, thereby decreasing budget totals by $579 million in budget authority and $157 million in outlays.

Airport development: enactment of this contract authority in fiscal 1973, instead of 1974 as requested, has the effect of reducing 1974 budget authority by $560 million and shifting it into 1973.

Highway programs: enactment of this contract authority in fiscal 1974, instead of 1973 as requested, has the effect of reducing 1973 budget authority by $1,450 million and shifting it into 1974.

Urban mass transportation: enactment of this contract authority in fiscal 1974, instead of 1973 as requested, has the effect of reducing 1973 budget authority by $3 billion and shifting it into 1974.

Revenue legislation

The June 1 budget revisions estimate revenue for fiscal 1974 at $266 billion. This is an increase of $10 billion over the original January estimate of $256 billion. Although the President indicated the possibility of a further revenue increase of about $3 billion in his statement of July 26, official Budget/Treasury reestimates have not been transmitted and are therefore not incorporated in this report. The President's statement in this regard was: "With the economy now operating at a high level, revenues in fiscal year 1974 should approximate, without any tax increases, the overall level of expenditures I proposed last January—about $269 billion."

To date, legislation has reduced 1974 revenue estimates (revised June 1) by $840 million, as follows:

Railroad Retirement: decrease of $612 million due to failure on part of the House and Senate to provide additional trust fund receipts requested.

REA loan repayments: decreased receipts by $348 million by removal of program from budget totals.

Social security wage taxes: increase of $120 million in trust fund revenue due to a wage base increase.

FISCAL YEAR 1973: SCOREKEEPING HIGHLIGHTS

The impact of now completed congressional action, and inaction, in the current session on the President's revised 1973 requests for budget authority and outlays, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

[In millions]

	House	Senate	Enacted
Congressional changes:			
Budget authority:			
Appropriation bills	+1,024	+1,507	+1,019
Legislative bills	+560	+840	+620
Inaction on proposed legislation	−4,455	−4,455	−4,455
Total	−2,871	−2,108	−2,816
Outlays:			
Appropriation bills	−142	−97	−147
Legislative bills	+245	+339	+154
Inaction on proposed legislation	−1	−1	−1
Total	+102	+241	+6

The scored impact of appropriation and other legislation affecting fiscal 1973 budget requests includes the following major items:

Inaction on proposed amendments reducing requests for certain voted Labor-HEW bill items by $966 million with little or no outlay impact due to the lateness in the fiscal year.

Second Supplemental appropriation: reduction in items in the bill offset by inaction on proposed rescissions has the effect of increasing budget authority by a net of $52 million, with estimated outlay reductions of $219 million in 1973.

Airport development: enactment of this contract authority in fiscal 1973, instead of 1974 as requested, has the effect of increasing 1973 budget authority by $620 million shifted from 1974.

Impoundment restoration: such legislation has been considered with regard to four rural loan and grant programs. One legislative restoration has been enacted relating to rural emergency loans; this is expected to increase 1973 outlays by $154 million.

Federal-aid highways: failure to enact requested backdoor contract authority reduces 1973 budget authority by $1,450 million.

Urban mass transportation: enactment of this contract authority in fiscal 1974, instead of 1973 as requested, has the effect of decreasing 1973 budget authority by $3 billion and shifting it into 1974.

THE 1973 BUDGET TOTALS

The revised budget estimates for fiscal year 1973 submitted January 29, and as subsequently revised, are compared with the preliminary actual 1973 figures which were announced in Treasury/Budget statement of July 27, as follows:

[In billions]

	Jan. 29 estimate	As subsequently revised	Preliminary actual
Budget authority	280.4	281.6	[1] 280.0
Unified budget outlays	249.8	249.8	246.6
Unified budget receipts	225.0	232.0	232.2
Unified budget deficit	−24.8	−17.8	−14.4
Trust funds surplus	(+9.3)	(+10.9)	(+10.5)
Federal funds deficit	(−34.1)	(−27.9)	(−24.9)

[1] Partially estimated.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 93D CONGRESS ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF JULY 28, 1973)

[In thousands of dollars]

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House (1)	Senate (2)	Enacted (3)	House (4)	Senate (5)	Enacted (6)
Fiscal year 1974:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the 1974 budget):						
1973 bills:						
1973 Labor-HEW appropriations (continuing resolution, Public Law 93–9)				[1]	[1]	[1]
Urgent supplemental, 1973 (Public Law 93–25)				+36,000	+36,000	+36,000
Second supplemental, 1973 (Public Law 93–50) [2]				+34,000	+209,000	+149,000
Inaction on proposed rescissions				[3] +370,600	[3] +370,600	[3] +70,6030
1974 regular bills:						
Legislative Branch (H.R. 6691)	−16,900	−36,592	[4]	−16,000	−11,400	[4]
Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection (H.R. 8619)	−133,813	+657,375	[4]	+135,000	+625,000	[4]
District of Columbia (H.R. 8658)	−5,281	−15,281	[4]	−5,000	−14,500	[4]
Transportation and related agencies (H.R. 8760)	−139,501	−42,281	[4]	−70,000	−21,000	[4]
Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, Veterans (H.R. 8825)	+453,501	+500,920	[5] +439,047		[6] +45,000	[5]
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare (H.R. 8877)	+1,264,352			+490,000		
Interior and related agencies (H.R. 8917)	−4,877			+9,000		
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary (H.R. 8916)	−82,134			−40,000		
Public Works and Atomic Energy (H.R. 8947)	−81,074	+15,513	[5] −8,066	−16,400	+37,000	[5] +20,000
Treasury, Postal Service, and general government (H.R. 9590)	[5] −57,647			[5] −35,000		
Subtotal, appropriation bills	+1,196,626	+1,079,654	+430,981	+892,200	+1,275,700	+575,600
Legislative bills (changes from the 1974 budget):						
"Backdoor" spending authorizations (not requiring further appropriation action):						
Federal Financing Bank (contract authority) (H.R. 5874, S. 925)	[5] +25,000	+25,000		[5] NA	NA	
Flood insurance (borrowing authority) (H.R. 8449)	[5] Indefinite			[5] NA		
Federal-aid Highway Act of 1973 (contract authority) (S. 502) (increase over requests)	[7] +1,307,220	[7] +1,307,220	[5] +1,307,220	NA	NA	[5] NA
Airport development (contract authority) (Public Law 93–44)				+20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Traffic safety (contract authority) (S. 502)	+915,000	+245,000	[5] +281,000	NA	NA	[5] NA
Freight car loan guarantee (borrowing authority) (S. 1149)		+2,000,000			NA	
Subtotal, "backdoor"	+2,247,220	+3,577,220	+1,588,220	+20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Mandatory spending authorizations (requiring payments over which there is little or no control through the appropriation process):						
Uniform relocation assistance (S. 261)		+95,000			+95,000	
Feed grain program (H.R. 6791)	[5] +89,000			[5] +89,000		
Eucalyptus tree fire hazard (S. 1697)	[5] +11,000	+16,000		[5] +11,000	+16,000	
Peanut support (H.R. 6646)	[5] +8,600			[5] +8,600		
Winema Forest expansion (H.R. 3867)	+60,000	+60,000	[4]	+60,000	+60,000	[4]
Welfare—medicaid amendments (Public Law 93–66)		+122,000	+122,000		+122,000	+122,000
Public safety officers death gratuity (S. 15)		+6,000			+6,000	
Public safety officers group life insurance (S. 33)		+20,000			+20,000	
Victims of crime—payments (S. 300)		+7,000			+7,000	
Deputy marshals pay raise (H.R. 5094)	+2,070			+2,070		
Early retirement—customs inspectors (H.R. 6078)	[5] +3,900			[5] +3,900		
Veterans drug and alcohol treatment (S. 284)		+144,136			+144,136	
Veterans dependents' health care (S. 59)	+64,915	+103,800	[8] +64,915	+64,915	+103,800	[8] +64,915
Veterans national cemeteries (Public Law 93–43)	+96,720	+110,000	+110,000	+96,720	+110,000	+110,000
Veterans pension increase (H.R. 9474)	[5] +208,400			[5] +208,400		
Civil Service—minimum retirement (S. 1866)		[5] +14,500			[5] +14,500	
Social security-exempt wages (trust fund) (Public Law 93–66)		+120,000	+120,000		+100,000	+100,000
Unemployment benefits—extension (trust fund) (Public Law 93–53)					+115,700	+115,700
Railroad retirement (revenue) (trust fund) (Public Law 93–69)	−612,000	−612,000	−612,000	NA	NA	NA
Subtotal, mandatory	−67,395	+206,436	−195,085	+544,605	+914,136	+512,615
Other legislative bills (with provisions having impact on budget totals):						
Rural electrification loans—remove from budget (Public Law 93–32)	−579,000		−579,000	−157,000		−157,000
Forest roads and trails—repeal of permanent appropriation (S. 1775)		[5] −40,900			[5] −40,900	
Airport development (contract authority)—shift to 1973 (Public Law 93–44)	−560,000	−560,000	−560,000			
Federal-aid highways (contract authority)—shift from 1973 (S. 502)	+1,450,000	+1,450,000	[5] +1,450,000			[5]
Urban mass transportation (contract authority)—shift from 1973 (S. 502)	+3,000,000	+3,000,000	[5] +3,000,000			[5]
Subtotal, other	+3,311,000	+3,849,100	+3,311,000	−157,000	−40,900	−157,000
Subtotal, legislative bills	+5,490,825	+7,632,756	+4,704,135	+407,605	+893,236	+375,615
Total, fiscal year 1974	+6,687,451	+8,712,410	+5,135,116	+1,299,805	+2,168,936	+951,215
Fiscal year 1973:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the revised 1973 budget):						
1973 Labor-HEW appropriations (continuing resolution, Public Law 93–9)	[1] +966,000	[1] +966,000	[1] +966,000	[1]	[1]	[1]
Urgent supplemental, 1973 (Public Law 92–25)	+1,800	+1,800	+1,800	+72,000	+72,000	+72,000
Second supplemental, 1973 (Public Law 93–50) [2]	−326,196	[9] +155,885	−331,196	[10] −225,000	[10] −180,000	[10] −230,000
Inaction on proposed rescissions	+382,888	+382,888	+382,888	[3] +11,000	[3] +11,000	[3] +11,000
Legislative bills (changes from the revised 1973 budget): Airport development (contract authority)—shift from 1974 (Public Law 93–44)	+560,000	+840,000	+620,000			
Legislative bills directing restoration of certain program reductions (impoundments) contemplated in the budget (changes from the revised 1973 budget):						
Rural electrification loans (Public Law 93–32)	[11] NA		[11] NA	[11] NA	+84,000	[11] NA
Rural environmental assistance (REAP) (H.R. 2107)			[4]	+41,000	+51,000	[4]
Rural emergency loans (Public Law 93–24)				[7] +154,000	[7] +154,000	+154,000
Rural water and sewer grants (H.R. 3298)			[12]	+50,000	+50,000	[12]
Inaction on legislative proposals in the 197' budget:						
Federal-aid highways (contract authority)—shift to 1974	−1,450,000	−1,450,000	−1,450,000			
Urban mass transportation (contract authority)—shift to 1974	−3,000,000	−3,000,000	−3,000,000			
Other (see table 5)	−5,000	−5,000	−5,000	−1,000	−1,000	−1,000
Total, fiscal year 1973	−2,870,508	−2,108,427	−2,815,508	+102,000	+241,000	+6,000

[1] The continuing resolution extended funding for items in the vetoed 1973 Labor-HEW appropriation bill to June 30, 1973, in lieu of processing another regular 1973 appropriation bill in this session. The revised 1973 budget estimates showed appropriations for these items at the level requested last session, and also proposed amendments to the then-pending requests. The level of the budget authority under the continuing resolution, the same as provided last session, is estimated to be about $1,000,000,000 higher than shown in the budget, and no action is contemplated on the proposed amendments to reduce budget authority by $966,000,000 with potential outlay effect of $470,000,000 in 1973 and $391,000,000 in 1974. The scorekeeping above shows the impact of inaction on the proposed amendments in budget authority.

[2] Replaces vetoed bill, H.R. 7447.

[3] Estimated increase due to obligation of funds, proposed in the budget for rescission, pursuant to congressional intent and related court orders.

[4] Subject to or in conference. Committee action.

[5] Does not reflect possible outlay effect, estimated at $70,000,000, of Senate floor amendment which provided that funds in bill for housing programs would not become available unless HUD funds presently impounded are released and used for purposes appropriated.

[7] Enacted figure used for comparability.

[8] Pending signature.

[9] Includes increases of approximately $192,000,000 in the nature of reappropriation of impounded 1973 funds.

[10] Does not reflect any possible effect on outlays resulting from denial of transfer authority requested for Defense Department.

[11] Would provide for program continuation at higher level than requested, but would remove program from budget.

[12] Vetoed.

NA—Cost estimate not available or undetermined at this time.

CLOSING THE ENERGY GAP

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the Alaska pipeline legislation, H.R. 9130, here on the floor of the House of Representatives today, I have decided to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent speech delivered on May 23, 1973, by a nationally recognized environmentalist, Mr. Robert W. Fri, the Acting Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

I believe Mr. Fri's comments are timely, profound and provocative but, more importantly, they place in "historical perspective" the facts relating to the so-called energy crisis and should serve as "food for thought" for every thinking American.

Mr. Fri suggests two ways to close the energy gap—"produce more, waste less." I ask my colleagues to read this article because I sincerely believe it portrays the "situation in America" as it relates to the energy and full requirements of our people:

Americans are far and away the most energy intensive society in the world, accounting for more than one-third of total energy consumption while representing only about six percent of the world's population. Our hard-working energy servants have made us the most productive and affluent people on earth, and we like these servants so well we get more all the time. Thirty years ago Buckminster Fuller estimated that the average American had at his beck and call the equivalent of 153 slaves. Today that number would be about 400.

Americans use 70 quadrillion Btu's of energy every year. That's the equivalent of 2.8 billion tons of coal, or 616 billion gallons of oil, or 70 trillion cubic feet of gas. These are impressive figures, but they're really incomprehensible.

To put it into one frame of reference—2.8 billion tons of coal is a string of 100-ton railroad hopper cars 265,000 miles long; and the mean distance to the moon is only 240,000 miles.

Or try this—the *Globtick Tokyo*, at 477,000 deadweight tons, is the largest supertanker now in service. Depending on cargo density, this ship can carry about 180 million gallons. If we had to import all our energy needs by tanker, nine of these mammoth vessels would have to be offload every single day—nearly 3,400 ships a year.

We have become so accustomed to energy in its various forms that we take it for granted. Reportedly, a schoolboy when asked to name Edison's greatest achievement, replied: "Without Edison we'd have to watch television by candlelight."

That's an ingenuous response to be sure but it typifies a general attitude. We have been so prodigal in our energy habits for so long that very few people give more than scant thought to energy sources and the complexities involved in making that energy available for our use. We're numb to what making this much energy means.

How many people translate household electricity into strings of coal hopper cars or strip-mined hillsides? How many people realize that the gas which flames beneath the morning coffee pot may have left a well far out into the Gulf of Mexico days beforehand? What motorist, refueling at the neighborhood service station, thinks of tankers and refineries, pipelines and oil spills?

Yet, as an environmentalist, I want energy, too. Energy is a vital component in our environmental rehabilitation program, as well as to our efforts to bring the full measure of prosperity to all Americans. The problem is not what we want, but how to get it. How can we satisfy a reasonable demand for energy, and keep our environment whole and healthy, too? In a sense, the answer to that question is plain. We will have to produce more and waste less. These are not options—we must do both.

For America's energy needs today are supplied overwhelmingly by fossil fuels, with oil and gas providing 77 percent. There are all kinds of estimates on fossil fuel reserves and a confusing array of predictions on how long they will last under varying degrees of husbandry. One thing alone is certain—fossil fuels are finite.

We need time—a great deal of it—to develop a perpetual supply. Fossil fuels powered the industrial and technological revolutions. They have made us a high-energy culture. But if we are to maintain our high standard of living and preserve our environment as well, we must look to other power sources for the long term. And we must develop these sources while we still have fossil fuels available to provide the energy required for further breakthroughs.

The National Science Foundation estimated that the United States could have 395 million kilowatts of geothermal electric generating capacity by the year 2000. That's more than today's total capacity.

We are working on breeder reactors which are perpetual power systems but they must contend with problems of radiation and disposition of spent fuel elements. And we have barely begun our search for ways to use our largest nuclear power source—the Sun itself. NASA is studying the feasibility of an orbitting satellite to collect and convert sunlight into electricity and beam it by microwave to Earth.

There is much work to be done and, to buy the time we need, it is imperative that we make the wisest use of our existing fossil fuel resources. The trick is to get us safely into the 1980s with known technology. To accomplish this in ways which are least harmful to the environment will demand judicious evaluation and balancing of the environmental complexities in the whole energy chain—exploration, production, processing, transportation and consumption.

There is no perfect solution. The energy situation is replete with bittersweet alternatives. Our greatest fossil fuel resource is coal—but most of it has a high sulfur content. The ideal fuel is natural gas—but it's the fuel in shortest supply. There are large reserves of oil and gas in Alaska's North Slope area—but there is the permafrost, earth faults and the North Pacific.

Nearly everyone agrees that refineries and deep-water ports must be built—just build them somewhere else. On the whole, offshore drilling holds great promise—but this or that particular shoreline must be exempt. A nuclear power plant seems like a great solution—but don't build it too close to home. And so goes the energy thrust and environmental parry of our fragmented way of developing new energy sources.

At a time which demands dispassionate analysis and sound judgment we seem, instead, to be getting escalated psychological warfare. People in the oil and gas states blame consumers in the Northeast for low fuel prices. A bumper strip in Louisiana reads: "Let the bastards freeze!" In Oklahoma they've added: "And in the dark, too!" When a trade group touts: "A nation that runs on oil can't afford to run short"; an environmentalist counters with: "A nation that runs short can't afford to run on oil."

We simply can't afford the luxury of automatic opposition, whether it be industry opposition to environmental regulation or environmental opposition to energy development. Such behavior only leads to conflicts which delay decisions, often for so long a period of time that the ultimate decision must be made between poorer alternatives than were available in the first instance.

It is extremely difficult to weigh the environmental impacts of energy facilities against the benefits of energy use. And this is especially true where, as in most instances, the people who are adversely affected are not the same people who benefit.

In this context it is important to appreciate fully that as the United States is not a self-sufficient nation, no city, no state, no region within the country can go it alone. The benefits one area provides to others at some environmental cost are recompensed by benefits supplied to it from outside at environmental costs to others. It is, therefore, just and prudent to make our environmental decisions on the basis of the society as a whole. The problem is doing it.

It is relatively easy to determine the environmental impact of each link in the energy chain; it is much harder to determine which of these impacts is the most serious. Which is the greater risk—a coastal oil spill or an inland health hazard? Which is more disruptive—a power brownout or gasoline rationing? Forced to a choice, which is more valuable—clean air or clean water?

But hard as it is, we must incorporate rational consideration of tradeoffs into our decision making process, generate as many of the revelant facts as possible, carefully analyze the alternatives, debate them responsibly, and come to reasoned judgments as the best choice for society. We—all of us—must learn to advocate energy programs that best solve the twin problems of power and pollution.

In his energy message last month President Nixon specifically provided for environmental assessment of each proposed new energy source. This was a call to reason; not a signal to choose sides. There is room for give and take on energy matters—and there is a need.

The clean fuels problem is an excellent case in point. The Clean Air Act directs the Environmental Protection Agency to set air quality standards which protect the public's health and welfare. Primary standards—those intended to protect public health—are to be met by 1975. The secondary standards—those relating to the public's welfare—do not have a precise target deadline but are to be achieved within a reasonable period of time.

For stationary sources—electric generating stations, industrial plants, office buildings, stores and residences—the main problem lies in achieving the sulfur oxide standards. The problem is resolved by burning low sulfur fuels in the first instance or by removing sulfur from stack gases where high sulfur fuel is burned. The pinch comes because there will not be sufficient clean fuel in 1975 to do the job and there will not be enough desulfurization or stack gas cleaning facilities to make up the difference.

Our studies indicate that by 1975 power plants alone will need 600 million tons of coal, more than 1.2 billion barrels of oil and about 25 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Analysis of state regulations shows that roughly three-quarters of this coal and five-sixths of the oil must meet stringent sulfur content limits if the clean air standards are to be met.

But strict enforcement of all state sulfur regulations in 1975 will create a clean fuel gap of 100 million tons of coal. We would just not be able to use one-sixth of the coal we would need to meet energy demands. In the process, we would put some 15 to 20 thousand miners out of work. And what would replace this coal?

It is not in this Nation's best interest to rely heavily on natural gas to meet industrial environmental requirements. As a boiler fuel,

gas is better suited to serve smaller users—residential and commercial customers—since sulfur removal equipment is most efficient and economical in large scale operations.

And oil is clearly the most expensive alternative to solve the sulfur problem. In addition to the higher cost per Btu, the probable need to increase oil imports would adversely affect our balance of payments. Furthermore, in view of our recent problems with refining capacity and the world supply of crude oil, it is not at all clear that we can depend on large scale oil imports to solve our problems even if we wanted to.

So we must use our coal reserves to meet our energy needs. And we must attain the primary, or health-related, air standards. We have written the Governors of the key coal-using states urging them to modify state plans as necessary to insure that national air quality health needs are met first. If these states modify their plans, the available clean coal and limited supplies of coal and limited supplies of coal stack-gas cleaning technology can be used in the most polluted areas and the primary standards can be met. This amounts to a policy of phasing-in secondary standards which would probably be achieved in all states by 1977 or by 1978. But it is a policy that allows us to have clean air and adequate energy—both by narrow but reliable margins—in this decade.

If this policy is implemented, and if energy producers and consumers act in good faith to solve their own problems, we must still go through a complicated transition period between now and 1975. We must, for example, physically redistribute clean fuel supplies to where they are needed. During this transition, some spot shortages of clean fuels may occur. Thus, our clean fuels policy and our variance policy go hand-in-glove to produce the result we all want by 1975.

This is a carefully crafted solution to a very complex problem. How easy it would be to listen to the simplistic call to abandon environmental health in favor of unconstrained energy production. But our answer offers the only prospect of achieving our environmental goals in a way which minimizes dislocations in our energy situation and the costs to the consumer.

Can we do it? Yes, it is legally permissible and physically possible. Will we do it? Will the states extend the dates for meeting secondary standards? Will users voluntarily redistribute low-sulfur fuels to the areas where it is most necessary? To these last questions I must confess that I just don't know. It seems naive to say "yes" and cynical to say "no."

I do know that if it is not done voluntarily Congress will be faced with two unpleasant options—to relax the Clean Air Act or to give some Federal agency authority to allocate scarce fuel supplies to meet the Act's requirements. We intend to be vigorous in urging other Federal agencies and the Congress to adopt energy policies which will stimulate production of needed clean fuels and insure their availability where most needed.

But there are two ways of closing the energy gap—producing more and wasting less. Until the day comes when we can afford to be as extravagant with energy as we actually are today, we must take steps to conserve it. We need not docilely accept a seven percent per year growth in energy demand.

We are energy grasshoppers, living for today without a thought for tomorrow. We consume our energy nearly as fast as we produce it. Any significant slowdown in production or delivery forces curtailments such as those we witnessed last winter.

One-half of every barrel of domestic crude oil goes for gasoline to power automobiles and trucks, very convenient but inefficient vehicles. We have let our rail passenger and transit systems fall apart. Airliners, on the average, fill only half their seats. In intercity freight transportation railroads carry one-half of the tonnage at one-tenth of the total fuel consumption. Nine times as much energy is used by trucks to move the other half of the tonnage.

We can't make more fossil fuels but we can extend the useful lifetimes of what we have. Last year the Office of Emergency Preparedness released a study on energy conservation. The most significant suggestions were improved home insulation, more efficient air conditioning, streamlined industrial processes and equipment, and four transportation improvements:

Shifting intercity freight from highway to rail;

Shifting intercity passengers from air to ground;

Shifting urban passengers from autos to mass transit;

Consolidating urban freight movement.

The environmental ethic for energy is not quite "waste not, want not" but conservation will carry us a long way. If we undertake a coordinated program we can reduce energy use by up to 20 percent without impairing our standard of living. The potential benefits from the energy savings in the residential and commercial markets are particularly important for pollution control because most fuel savings will be in natural gas and electricity.

By cutting down on energy demand and with some adroit juggling of clean fuel supplies we should be able to get through the mid-1970s crunch. For the mid-term—1980 into the 21st century—we must develop our present energy technologies to the optimum. And for the long-term we need to make wise investments today in research and development of perpetual power supplies. Estimates of 300 and 400 year lifespans of fossil fuel reserves may seem like a comfortable margin but looking over our shoulder that would only take us back to around the founding of Williamsburg. And that wasn't so very long ago.

TIME FOR THE DOLLAR TO COME BACK HOME

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, recent events in international finance have made two points painfully apparent. First, unilateral actions in the international money markets do not in the long run benefit anyone very much but speculators. These unilateral actions and crisis reactions provide flexibility to speculators which they otherwise would not have. By being able to play one side off against the other and by being able to anticipate currency reactions made necessary by the unilateral moves of other countries, the present situation provides to speculators what a recent article in the Economist calls, "a one-way option to make profits." It is clear that the solution to the currency problems of this country and of our international partners can come only through a determined multilateral effort at developing joint, long-range international economic policy. Only by moving together to deal with our currency situation is there any hope of a meaningful long-term solution.

The second point which has become painfully apparent is that, despite two devaluations of the dollar and what is now generally regarded as an undervalued currency, the dollar has been unexpectedly slow in returning to this country. With the dollar deflated and with prices on Wall Street declining, it is indeed an economic time to "buy American." Still, there is now approximately $90 billion of American overseas investment as against only $14 billion of foreign investment in this country. We should be able to look forward to American companies who receive substantial earnings on their overseas investments exercising their financial leadership by seeking to return a portion of their overseas earnings through nonprofitable investment in this country. Without such leadership, it may well become necessary to require a specified percentage of these earnings to be returned, or at least reinvested, back home.

These developments in the direction of favoring money speculators and of the slowness of dollars to flow back to the United States are discussed in a rather timely article recently published in the Economist. I hope my colleagues will seize upon the opportunity to note the observations of this distinguished journal on these matters:

CRISIS IN THE MILLPOND

British tourists in France and some other countries got about 10 per cent less for their sterling than they expected last weekend, so that they found themselves spending £22 for each £20 of holiday expenditure they had budgeted for. This was very embarrassing and annoying for them, especially as some hotels and shops were not changing sterling at all, so they had to join sweltering queues at banks to be rooked. Probably, too, both the dollar and sterling were somewhat, although not dramatically, undervalued—and had become so with too much of a jerk. It was therefore sensible that the world's central bankers should devote their usual monthly Sunday in Basle to discussing what to do about it.

Everybody should welcome any steps they now take to remove those of their own restraints that make exchange markets more unstable than they otherwise would be. The key problem is that more dollars have piled central banks want, chiefly because they will not use them to buy dollar assets that are going most cheaply; such as, just now, shares in American industry. Most of these countries would be overjoyed if their other public investments—such as Maplin and the Chunnel—promised to cover purchase costs, even from this year's profits, in less than 10 years. Just such a public investment project—an export-earning one that would desirably counter excessive American influence on the biggest multinational corporations—would be achieved by switching excess central bank dollars either directly or by lending to some other public institutions, into buying General Motors' equities on Wall Street at their present p/e.

But it is said that central banks must not participate in buying foreign assets that might go down as well as up in price. Instead the German Bundesbank has in these past months put many billions of its marks into foreign assets (i.e., liquid foreign exchange holdings) that were quite certain to go down in price, because speculators were dumping them on it in the knowledge that the Bundesbank's other artificial commitments (e.g., attempting to keep the D-mark within the EEC's snake) obligated it to buy foreign exchange precisely at the moment when everybody knew that its depreciation was imminent. When bodies like the Bundesbank give speculators a one-way option to make profits by thus legally obligating themselves to be the fall guy, those speculators naturally withdraw money from freer markets (such as world stock markets) in or-

der to enjoy this privilege; and everybody then pretends to be most surprised when world stock markets go down.

The switch of foreign central banks' dollars into buying parts of American industry would be the most effective cure for the present malaise; so it would also be the biggest break with present tradition, and therefore will not be widely adopted (although Britain, which now has more dollars than it needs, would be wise to cause a great surprise by loosening its artificial restrictions on investing them: i.e., abolishing the so-called dollar premium). The second most obviously artificial restriction which the central banks hug to themselves may be abandoned more quickly, because we probably are now reaching a term to Europe's willingness to go along with America's delusion that gold prices, will be kept down (and South Africa and Russia injured) if central banks agree never to trade in gold with each other except at one-third of its market price. Since central banks have more gold to sell than buy, this restriction now does the opposite. Of course, central banks should sell and buy gold at whatever price they can get for it; this would now help the dollar a bit.

THE FAULT WAS A FIXING

At Basle on Sunday the central bankers preferred to concentrate on the belief that they can counter the speculative movements of funds by secretly borrowing a masse de manoeuvre from each other and craftily playing it into the market in the reverse direction. To the extent that the present exchange rates of the dollar and sterling are illogical, this will work. The danger is that some countries (especially France) may be confusing exchange rates that are illogical with rates that are just inconvenient.

The biggest muddle is the argument that the "crisis" shows that floating rates have failed, so that the world had better return to fixed rates. The world fortunately cannot return to the old fixed-rate system because it was an attitude of mind: a blind trust that countries which ought to devalue (like Britain in 1957–67) would for some reason sacrifice a lot of growth and borrow a lot of money before eventually doing so, and that countries which ought to upvalue would accumulate a lot of about-to-be-depreciated dollars and import a lot of mounting inflation before doing so. Now that nobody believes countries will be so foolish for long, the surprising new orthodoxy is that they should please be so foolish for a little. So ministers say that rates should be "fixed but adjustable" (which is the same as saying that a shape should be square but round) and continental EEC countries are supposed to be able to operate a snake in a tunnel (i.e., to be able to float best while tied together).

Each delusion means that a one-way option is offered to speculators for a brief gasping space, and it was the temporary existence of the snake that caused the last fortnight's "crisis". The German mark was up at the top of the permitted range and so was being supported there (i.e., the Germans were selling marks at a cheaper price than everybody knew would soon be paid for them), so speculators naturally took their fill of these until the Germans had to act, and then the Brandt government did not act in a logical way. Instead of floating out of the snake, it tried to fix a new and more expensive rate against the other EEC snake currencies. This promptly provided a one-way option that other EEC currencies like the French franc, previously near the top of the snake, might be upvalued (certainly they would not be devalued), so last week there was a move into them out of any other currencies lying about (chiefly dollars and sterling).

It is true that one virtue of the old fixed-rate system has foolishly been jettisoned in the new regime of what will (perhaps with very brief intervals) now be perpetual floating: namely, the discipline that fixed rates imposed on weak currency countries to try to keep their interest rates and exports up, and on strong currency countries to keep their interest rates down. Today the United States is responding to the inflation caused by the weakness of the dollar by making the dollar weaker still by illegally banning its biggest export, soybeans (on the ground that these are so expensive that it needs to keep them at home), and the British are responding to the inflation spurred by the weakness of sterling by cajoling building societies and others to hold their interest rates down (and thus to keep sterling weaker and house and other prices up).

Through the looking-glass, the Germans, faced by an inflation caused by the inflow of money, are inexcusably raising their domestic interest rates, which will cut back their internal demand but cause more money to come in. In both exchange markets and macroeconomics the Brandt government is now eerily repeating all the mistakes of the Wilson government in Britain in 1964–67, and for much the same reason: it is a nominally left-wing but actually very cautious government which has an inferiority complex towards a right-wing financial establishment that insists that demand deflation is the only orthodox policy to pursue even at a time when it is horribly inappropriate.

SELF-CORRECTING MUDDLES

Could the world be precipitated into an actual slump by these muddles in high German and by the failure of so many of the world's rulers to understand what their own financial system is all about? Fortunately, so long as capital movements are kept reasonably free, most of the muddles are eventually self-correcting; and the world should not be too worried at the thought that its leading finance ministers are meeting again later this month.

If the meeting makes any announcement about moving back to a new ptatern of "fixed but adjustable exchange rates", there will be an outcry from most economists; but this will not matter because any such restrictive system will not last long anyway. It would be better if smaller restrictive systems, like the European snake, died sooner than later; but the snake's death will be caused by market movements, not ministers' itineraries. The restrictions that persist are causing some distortions which will correct themselves in time. Our guess is that the main ones are that Wall Street is too low, that sterling exports to Europe are too cheap (maybe no bad thing in this first year that Britain is in Europe), and that sterling and dollar prices of imported commodities are too high (partly because some have been used, like gold, as speculative counters). The commodities distortion has certainly hurt Britain, but the corollary is a guess that they will come down, although there are large questions over the timing. This is an important consideration in gauging the right policy to tackle Britain's real economic problem, to which the next article turns.

THOUGHTS ON THE BICENTENNIAL

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. John R. Kanline, of Alexandria, Va., has come up with a rather novel idea for helping celebrate this Nation's bicentennial in 1976. Mr. Kanline outlined his thoughts on the subject recently in a letter to the editor of the Washington Star-News and at this time under my leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include that letter in the RECORD:

U.S.A. IN MINIATURE

SIR: With the Bicentennial fast approaching I believe that the creation of a small and different type of national park depicting in miniature the main features and sites of this great nation would have great tourist (20 million tourists to D.C. a year) and patriotic appeal to our international guests and citizens who live and visit here.

Supporting this idea are the many Americans who may have had the good fortune to visit such a park called "Modurodam" near The Hague in the Netherlands. This small 4-acre park includes two miles of miniature railroad, 44,000 lights, castles, bands that play, windmills, ships, ports, canals and the major sights of the Netherlands, all carefully done to scale. Princess Beatrix is the Mayor, with a children's council. Each year on occasion blind children are brought to see the exhibits with their hands.

In an American version one could visualize both modern and historical sites with walkways or a conveyance to permit visitors to get a close look at such Americana as Mt. Vernon, the Capitol, Washington Monument, the White House, New York Skyscrapers, Niagara Falls, Mt. Rushmore, the Golden Gate Bridge, steel mills, industry, airports, oil refining, the Grand Canyon and numerous other possibilities. Perhaps U.S. architectural and engineering schools could participate in the project.

The Dutch miniature park was established by the wealthy parents of a young Dutch student executed by the Nazis in World War II. It attracts several million visitors each year with revenues going to sick students and to make yearly additions to the park. Even with only several million visitors a year this feature has functioned successfully for fifteen years and at a profit.

This points to the opportunity for such a facility here which could be a feature attraction for the Bicentennial. In my opinion it would rank with the Kennedy Center as a popular site for tourists and local citizens and take up a minimum amount of space.

As a profitable venture such a proposal should appeal to the Smithsonian, U.S. industry, the Park Service and Philanthropic organizations. I'm sure our Dutch friends would lend their experience and technical know-how to the project. But, what is needed first is that the proposal be placed before the citizens of the area and the nation. I hope this letter will stimulate the beginning of some interest and later action by those who are in a position to assist in some way.

JOHN R. KANLINE.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

SOLVING THE PENN CENTRAL CRISIS

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks the Congress will be considering legislation aimed at alleviating the ominous Northeast railroad crisis. It will hardly be the first time in recent years that Congress has addressed itself to the problems of the rail transportation industry. The last three Congresses have passed more than 25 railroad-related measures, and have given close scrutiny to many more. Already this session, House and Senate members have introduced 130-plus pieces of railroad legislation.

This body is well aware that dealing with the crisis of the rails has been an

enormously challenging task. But it has also been an enormously frustrating one.

We have recognized the indispensible character of rail service to our national transportation system. We have dealt extensively with rail passenger service, labor-management difficulties, and retirement and safety provisions. But we have yet to fully resolve the problems in any of these areas.

To recall the legislative History briefly:

We have argued and negotiated, reargued and renegotiated, the terms by which a viable intercity rail passenger system can be maintained. What emerged from those arguments and negotiations—the Amtrak system—has demonstrated that well-managed and reliable train service, such as that provided between Washington and New York, can be of significant value in moving people between cities. But Amtrak has certainly not lived up to our fullest expectations or to its fullest potential, and—as any Connecticut commuter knows—passenger travel by rail can still be an exasperating experience.

We have heard repeatedly from both sides of the chronic labor-management dispute. We have puzzled long hours over the employment requirements of the rail companies and rail unions. But we have never found a long-term plan that was agreeable to both sides of the conflict.

We have acted to upgrade safety conditions of rail operations and to increase retirement and social security payments. We have met with some success in this regard, but areas for improvement and conciliation still remain.

Despite the progress that we have made in these and other rail-related matters, there is today in Congress a sense of deep frustration concerning the railroads. Their problems are complex and seemingly inexhaustible. But, Mr. Speaker, none of these problems have proven as relentless and annoying as the dilemma of the Penn Central railroad system.

Penn Central is the largest of the Nation's railroads, operating over 20,000 miles of track in 16 States and two Canadian provinces. Over its lines flow one-fifth of the Nation's freight and two-thirds of its passengers. It employs 83,000 persons system-wide. It is perhaps the primary artery for the flow of goods and services through the Northeast. In Connecticut and Rhode Island, many shippers are entirely dependent on it alone to move needed supplies in and out.

Clearly, the services provided by the Penn Central are critical to the economic and social health not only of the States served by the Penn Central but of the entire country. Yet for the past 3 years the Penn Central has lingered near total collapse. And today, that collapse looms larger than ever before, with the recent court order that Penn Central either reorganize or liquidate. The final day of reckoning has come for the Penn Central.

What would that collapse mean, Mr. Speaker? First of all, it would mean the additional collapse of virtually the whole railroad system in the Northeast. Already five other railroads besides Penn Central are in bankruptcy, and others are consistently operating in red ink. Should Penn Central's services halt, the effect on the morale of the entire railroad industry would be grave. Further, many of the smaller railroads throughout the Northeast use Penn Central facilities or services in their daily operations. Were these services and facilities to close, these smaller rail interests would be hard pressed to find substitutes for them. The Penn Central undergirds the whole Northeast rail structure, and without that undergirding the structure would collapse.

The economic and social effects of such a collapse would be disastrous.

This is particularly true for New England. New England relies extensively on the rails to obtain vital commodities from all over the Nation. As much as 40 percent of commercial traffic in New England moves by rail, and for certain essential goods—fuel, lumber, steel—the figures are higher. Industry depends heavily on the rails to acquire raw materials and to ship finished products; without rail service, many existing industries would be forced to close, and no new ones would be built. Likewise, the agricultural interests of New England utilize the railroads to ship in vital feed grains from the Midwest and to move produce out to other areas of the region and country. In terms of the overall labor market, a shutdown of the Penn Central could affect hundreds of thousands of workers in New England alone.

In Connecticut, for example, the Penn Central operates 654 miles of track and employs 3,900 persons on a payroll of $43 million. Its State and local taxes total over $130,000 yearly. It purchases $3½ million in goods and services from industries located in the State, thereby generating more than 11,000 supplementary jobs. It invests close to $11 million per year in industrial development within the State. Add to those figures the jobs and revenues of industries that depend on Penn Central services, and the consequences of a rail shutdown for the labor and economy of the State become frightening. Further, the effect on the Connecticut consumer would be harsh: the Penn Central, along with the Central Vermont, ships into the State for in-State use 1,600,000 tons of coal, 800,000 tons of primary metals, and nearly a million tons of foods every year. None of these vital imports could be moved by truck at anything like comparable rates, and the result would be either large-scale inflation in the retail prices of these goods or disappearance of these commodities from the market. These figures indicate how disastrous a shutdown would be for Connecticut—and Connecticut stands to suffer less than a number of States like New York, New Jersey, Indiana, and Pennsylvania.

Termination would also have detrimental environmental results. The railroads not only provide an essential public service, but they do so with significantly less harmful effects on our energy and environmental resources than any other mode of transportation. Studies conducted by the Department of Transportation indicates that the pollution level per passenger-mile for a modern electric train is only one-thirtieth that of the automobile, while its energy consumption requirements are one-tenth that required by the automobile. Rail freight burns one-fourth the fuel per ton-mile required by truck freight.

And I need not remind this House of the overcrowded conditions of the Nation's highways, such as the Connecticut Turnpike or Route 91 between Hartford and New Haven. It is especially important in these times of fuel shortages, motor vehicle pollution, and strangling highway congestion that we not allow our vital railway system to cease functioning. The costs in environmental damages alone would undoubtedly be much greater than the cost of maintaining and reorganizing the Penn Central and other crippled railroads.

Further, the delicate position of rail commuter and passenger operations would be undermined by the collapse of the Penn Central and other bankrupt rail companies. Although the current Northeast rail crisis focuses on freight carriers, Penn Central is deeply involved in Amtrak services. As a result, it takes little imagination to grasp the harmful fallout for commuter traffic that would follow inevitably from a collapse of the freight rails.

What more would the collapse mean? To appreciate the full results, we must remember that we are not talking about simply a regional problem. The demise of the Penn Central railroad would have a rippling effect that would be felt in every area of the Nation. The 17 States serviced by the Penn Central and other bankrupt railroads hold half the Nation's population—100 million people. These millions are the primary market for many farmers, businesses, and industries throughout the Nation. Into the Northeast flow lumber from the Northwest, grains from the Plains States, produce from the South—and this is only a fraction of the total picture. Were the national transportation system unbalanced by a Penn Central shutdown, the entire country would suffer adversely.

Congress has taken full note of the critical importance of the rails to the Nation's welfare. It has affirmed repeatedly its willingness to aid the Penn Central and other troubled railroads in times of emergency. The 91st Congress enacted emergency rail services legislation, guaranteeing $100 million to the Penn Central in trustee certificates. The 92d Congress authorized substantial loans to the Penn Central and other railroads damaged by Hurricane Agnes. And this 93d Congress acted to delay crippling strike against Penn Central for 90 days just this past spring. We have clearly indicated our readiness to aid the ailing rails to restabilize themselves. And we have heard repeated assurances from the management of these rails that only 6 or 8 or 12 months of congressional aid and patience would be necessary for the troubled companies to become solvent again.

Yet, today, 3 years after the original Penn Central crisis of June 1970, the situation has only worsened. The short-range, ad hoc measures Congress has enacted have not countered the effects of the railroad's continually inept management. Ineffectual government regulation of the rails has further compounded

the problem. It is now clear that Congress should have moved more swiftly to develop a comprehensive national transportation policy, including northeastern rail service as a vital factor. But in the final analysis, it is rail mismanagement that has led us into this swamp. Management in its present form has failed to deal adequately with its own problems, and Congress must again come to its aid.

How should we approach the problem this session? The time has come for decisive action. We are tired of simply applying Federal bandages to the gaping wounds in Penn Central's cash flow, and I believe there are few in this House who are willing to go this route again. We must not continue our stop-gap methodology any longer. It is essential that we seek to provide for a long-range and hopefully permanent solution to the ills of rail transportation, and that we do so now. It is time to get the Penn Central monkey off Congress' back.

We must have a bill which is similar in scope to legislation now before the Senate, one which provides the funds and the mechanism for designing a rational core system in the Northeast and Midwest regions, and one which protects all existing routes, branches and spur lines while the final masterplan is being developed.

Once this design is delivered, Congress would have in its hands a thoroughly researched reorganization plan. It would then be the task of Congress to approve the details of the plan and provide the necessary funds for implementing it. Although we cannot say now exactly what the final contours of the solution will be, there are a number of premises on which I believe Congress should base its final deliberations.

First, we must be cautious not to equate a rational rail network with a significantly smaller rail network. I believe that, as our Nation becomes more and more disenchanted with highway congestion and pollution, and as modernized rail design and technology make rail travel and shipping more desirable, the rails will occupy an increasingly central position in filling our transportation needs. There is a danger that, in our haste to reorganize the present rail mess, we will lose many rail services that could prove beneficial in the future. Instead, we must attempt to maintain and modernize existing facilities to accommodate technological innovation, and we must consider expanding the rail system for a primary role in 21st century transportation.

Second, in the immediate realm, we must recognize that a rational plan will include not only profitable lines, but some unprofitable ones as well. It is an inescapable fact that some lines providing necessary public services will operate at a loss. The plan must include provisioins for assuring that these unprofitable but essential branches remain in service.

Third, we must halt further abandonments of rail service in the affected regions until a complete study of the effects of anticipated abandonments can be executed by the ICC. While we are in the process of assessing the rail service needs of the Nation, it makes no sense to discontinue services, thereby crippling many communities, when a full study of the Northeast rails is imminent.

Fourth, during the planning interim, it is essential that present rail facilities and rights-of-way be retained. It would be calamitous if segments of railroad deemed vital to the final core system were auctioned off by a liquidated company during that interim period. Continued liquidation of branch and main lines would eliminate valuable rail assets which could be utilized in and might even prove critical to a new core system, as well as cause severe economic hardships for many of the communities involved. In the words of Robert T. Cairns, chairman of the Connecticut Transportation Authority,

> We must see that piecemeal dismemberment does not destroy the possibility of a viable core system.

Fifth, Congress must see to it that a full-scale track and facility renovation program is included in the reorganization plan, supported by Federal funds if necessary. Present rail service is hindered by outdated equipment and track, which reduces top speed levels—the key factor in the train's competition with motor and air transportation. Much of what the rails operate with and over is antiquated, left over from the days of the railroad explosion into all parts of the country near the turn of the century. Coequal with rail reorganization must be rail upgrading and renewal.

Finally, Congress must address the problem of protecting employees dislocated by the reorganization. Although no reliable figures are available as yet, it is certain that Federal assistance will be necessary in some form for laborers whose lives are disrupted by necessary changes in the railway map.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, deals with a long-term solution to the railroad crisis. But we are still left with the present emergency. Penn Central needs immediate assistance to avoid liquidation. Although funds are available through the Hurricane Agnes legislation and other sources, it is possible that the totals will not be enough to satisfy the bankruptcy court or to reverse the railroad's negative cash flow. In that event, Congress must stand ready to provide further operating funds. On this matter we have no real choice. But while doing so, we must make it clear that we do not intend to subsidize the bankrupt railroads any longer than is necessary to develop a comprehensive reorganization plan. This should be the last time that Congress is forced to rescue the rails from imminent collapse.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has long grappled with the vexing Penn Central problem. But it has not yet focused on developing a comprehensive long-term solution to the whole northeastern transportation mess. Once again, we must act with haste under emergency conditions. But this time we must simultaneously lay the groundwork for a reorganization and restructuring of the rails which will enable this marvel of 19th century technology to play the major role it is capable of playing in a new and revitalized 20th century national transportation system.

REVENUE SHARING FAILS LABOR AND MINORITIES, AFL-CIO BELIEVES

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, general revenue sharing, and now the special revenue sharing proposals, have been touted by the administration as a revolutionary means of revamping and improving the way the State and local governments deliver federally funded public services.

Like so many of the Nixon administration's proposals, however, these ideas are long on rhetoric but short on promise.

At the recent 63d annual conference of the National Urban League held here in Washington, AFL-CIO Legislative Director Andrew Biemiller set out a most cogent analysis of what is wrong with these proposals.

I recommend Mr. Biemiller's analysis to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

The labor movement and the civil rights movement share a vital interest in setting the record straight on revenue sharing.

Our mutual concern for human welfare and human dignity makes it imperative to expose and stop the cruel, callous hoax that is revenue sharing.

It is the people—working people, unemployed people, city people, minority people, poor people, low- and middle-income people—who have been short-changed, bypassed, and ignored by revenue sharing.

NEW FEDERALISM STOPS SOCIAL PROGRESS

The Nixon Administration touts revenue sharing as a way to strengthen state and local government by giving them more control over more federal money.

This is little more than the old "states' rights" slogans and policies we fought against together in the past. The so-called "New Federalism" is a thinly-disguised effort to turn back the clock on social progress in America.

The basic issue is human welfare and human dignity. That was the issue when we opposed "states' rights", and it is the issue today as we oppose revenue sharing.

REDISTRIBUTING FROM THE POOR TO THE RICH

Bitter experience shows very clearly that revenue sharing redistributes federal money from those who have little to those who have much; from the inner city to the high-hat suburbs; from those who support strong, effective labor standards and civil rights protection to those who want to weaken these standards.

Revenue sharing was merchandised—like so much deodorant—in such an alluring political package last year that Congress passed the so-called "general revenue sharing" bill. It's hard to say "No" to Santa Claus.

Let me note for the record that the AFL-CIO opposed this legislation. When we saw that congressional approval was inevitable, we tried to get improvements into the bill. Regrettably, we had very little success.

REVENUE SHARING: FOOL'S GOLD

Governors and local officials truly believed they were going to receive a general revenue sharing bonanza of $30 billion over a five-year period. It's no wonder they put the heat on Congress to approve what they were told would be additional revenue—revenue to reduce taxes and improve services. They were looking for the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow—more than $5 billion in 1972.

Many of these state and local officials now

realize their revenue-sharing pot is full of "fool's gold".

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNORS REPORTED TO BELIEVE REVENUE SHARING A MISTAKE

Instead of getting more money, state and local governments are getting less. There is much agreement that revenue sharing is an inadequate substittue for existing federal grant money.

Here's one typical comment from a Mayor, Boston's Kevin White, quoted in the Washington Post of June 17:

"I'm one who fought for the basic tenents of New Federalism in the form of general revenue sharing for the past three years. I find myself chagrined that I don't know now what I have, except that I have less money in the short run and probably the prospect of less money in the long run." And a governor, Jimmy Carter of Georgia, said recently:

"I was at a meeting . . . with a good portion of the 31 Democratic governors, and I believe the opinion now unanimously is that it (general revenue sharing) was a mistake . . . I believe there's a general feeling on the part of many mayors, governors and others that this has indeed been a step backward."

AN OUTRAGEOUS ADMINISTRATION ATTACK WHICH MUST BE FOUGHT

Instead of piling general revenue sharing money on top of existing federal grant money, the Nixon Administration launched an extraordinary attack against established categorical federal grant programs. This outrageous effort to cut back or kill the social programs—programs we worked so hard to get started in the 1960s—must-and-will-be fought at every turn.

Existing federal categorical grant programs are being strangled and starved. And the AFL–CIO, for one, is not willing to stand silent while the hopes and futures of millions of Americans are committed to a grave of governmental indifference.

President Nixon is using his veto power to kill appropriations bills. Programs aimed at providing jobs, improving health and education, better housing, and controlling pollution are given varying degrees of the Administration's "Kill-them-dead" treatment.

AFL–CIO FOUGHT "NO STRINGS" SHARING IN 1965

Congressionally-appropriated funds have been impounded, raising a serious confrontation between presidential power and our constitutional form of government.

The AFL–CIO has fought "no-strings' distribution of federal money since 1965 when it was first proposed. We said then, and we say now, it is ludicrous to pass out federal money to state and local governments without firm controls to make certain taxpayers' money is spent to meet national priorities and in accordance with national labor and civil rights standards.

"NO STRINGS" ALSO MEANS "NO ADDITIONAL"

We have repeatedly pointed out that "no-strings" general revenue sharing money would not add one federal penny to the money available to the states and local communities. With no requirement for priority targets, revenue sharing money can go to reducing a rich man's property taxes while poor families continue to be shortchanged on basic education, health, welfare, housing, and employment.

While the general revenue sharing law piously calls for fair labor practices and federal civil rights guarantees, the fact is there can be no enforcement of these "paper" requirements.

The labor movement and the civil rights movement share a common interest in getting federal money targeted into priority areas of human need. We have a common interest in making sure that federal civil rights guarantees and federal fair labor practice requirements are properly and fully enforced in projects and programs supported by federal money.

PITFALLS REPEATED IN SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING

Unfortunately, the same dangers and pitfalls that exist in connection with general revenue sharing are repeatedly in special revenue sharing.

In 1971, before Congress passed the general revenue sharing bill, the President proposed "special" revenue sharing block grants which would consolidate some 130 categorical grant programs. The President suggested consolidation of these existing grant programs into six broad "block-grant" areas—law enforcement, manpower training, urban development, transportation, rural development, and education.

There's no question that the rapid growth of federal grant programs in the 1960s, to help meet America's need for public facilities and public services, almost inevitably created some administrative problems and overlapping grants.

But this situation by no means justifies dismantling and destroying essential social programs. Nor does it justify an abdication of the federal government's key role in developing, financing and guiding the public investment and public service that are essential to the nation's welfare and progress.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES ABDICATED IN SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING

The AFL–CIO opposes special revenue sharing block grants. We believe that national priorities and national goals must be set at the national level. No rational person can deny that America faces vast unmet public needs. If anyone tries to tell you that the "hour of crisis" for America's cities has passed take him for a walk down Florida Avenue. Meeting these needs requires the cooperation of all citizens and all institutions, private as well as public.

Many major domestic problems are rooted in a shortage of services and facilities that are traditionally and appropriately the responsibility of government. Some of these problems and shortages can be dealt with at the state and local community level, with administration and financing by state and local government.

But it is the federal government—which represents all of the American people—that holds the key. To put it very simply, the federal government cannot escape its responsibility for national problems and the states cannot exercise that national responsibility.

PRESSING PROBLEMS ARE NATIONAL IN SCOPE

The most pressing domestic problems—unemployment, equal opportunity, housing, health care, pollution, and crime—are nationwide in scope and impact. These problems are not confined by the boundaries of the 50 states and 80,000 local government units. They require national leadership with federal programs and federal financial support. And national leadership, in turn, requires a willingness to meet the problems that face this country.

LEAA—A TRIAL RUN THAT FAILED

One area in which there is experience with block grants is the federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—a "trial run" at special revenue sharing. The experience has been bad, very bad.

The billion-dollar block-grant law enforcement assistance program has been "characterized by inefficiency, waste, maladministration and, in some cases, corruption," according to the report of a House Government Operations Subcommittee. The report finds that law enforcement block grants have had "no visible impact on the incidence of crime in the United States," that there is "woefully inadequate" information on state programs, that there is little assurance that the taxpayer will soon have the fiscal and program safeguards to which he is entitled.

And we have reports that, in some areas, so-called "law enforcement" block grant funds are being used to pay prison labor $5 a day to build more jails and prisons. This is progress?

The chairman of the Subcommittee, Congressman John Monagan (D) of Connecticut, declared that "LEAA continues to be either unwilling or unable to curb state abuses under the block grant programs, despite the strong rhetoric of its guidelines."

This is precisely the concern of the AFL–CIO.

FROM BAD TO WORSE

It's bad enough that revenue sharing means less money for urban problems. It's even worse that whatever money does become available is going to be passed out without adequate labor protections and anti-discrimination requirements.

Regulations and guidelines written on paper don't mean a damn unless there is a capacity and a willingness in the national government to enforce these requirements. Unfortunately, this kind of leadership is utterly lacking in the Nixon Administration.

CUTTING $100 BILLION TO PUT THE PEOPLE LAST

For fiscal 1974, the Nixon Administration is proposing to emasculate or eliminate federal programs totalling $17 billion. Over the next five years the Nixon budget cuts will result in a cumulative total reduction of more than $100 billion. If successful, President Nixon will have succeeded in reordering this nation's priorities in reverse—putting the people and their needs last.

If Congress adopts the special revenue sharing programs proposed by the President, many vital job-creating public service and public investment programs will be totally dismantled and others will be rendered virtually inoperative.

For example, in the area of community development and housing, the Nixon Administration's budget proposals would, in effect, bring to an end the direct federal role in revitalizing the nation's cities and increasing the availability of housing for low- and moderate-income families.

SUBSTANTIAL JOB CUTS

Budget cuts threaten to end urban renewal, model cities, low-rent housing and homeownership programs. These cuts could mean substantial job losses—in on-site construction, as well as in production and distribution of steel, lumber, glass, cement, and other building materials—at a time when almost 5 percent of the total workforce and nearly 10 percent of minority workers are already unemployed.

No amount of revenue sharing rhetoric and statistic doubletalk can hide the fact that, in city after city, Administration budget policies are victimizing the poor, the sick, the young, the old and minorities. While the San Clementes and Key Biscaynes may not need public housing, the Newarks, Clevelands and Oaklands do.

BUDGET ABANDONS EDUCATION

In education, the Administration's vaguely-formulated program of special revenue sharing means a large-scale abandonment of quality education for all children as a goal. It would eliminate or under-fund vital programs that are investments in our children.

Categorical aid-to-education programs were enacted by Congress to meet critical needs largely ignored by state and local officials. By lumping these programs into a single big special revenue-sharing check, the Administration blatantly invites state and local officials to return to past practices of allocating funds on the basis of whim, rather than genuine demonstrable need.

PROCLAIMING MYSTICAL POWERS FOR AMBROSIA OF REVENUE SHARING

I don't doubt that many education programs can be improved—but improvement is quite different from dismantling and destroying whole programs. Too often the problem has been bad administration by local officials who used education money

contrary to the intent of Congress. And it is these same local officials who have hindered progress and thwarted national goals that the Administration now proclaims will draw mystical super powers of administration from the ambrosia of revenue sharing. By loosening controls, the Administration would aggravate the problem of poor local administration rather than contribute to its solution.

The AFL-CIO has consistently pressed for more federal funding for schools. We are not going to abandon education programs we fought so long to achieve.

What's at stake is not a few education programs we are proud to have played some small part in getting passed. The stakes are much higher. Are education problems going to be attacked in a national effort? Or are they to be attacked piecemeal, in thousands of schools districts with varying degrees of competence and desire?

That is why we reject completely Administration proposals for special educational revenue sharing. They provide no additional funds for the schools. They would only divert money from existing programs which Congress carefully designed to meet specific needs.

MINORITIES LOSE MOST UNDER MANPOWER REVENUE SHARING

The biggest losers in the Administration's plans for manpower revenue sharing would be minority workers and minority youths.

First of all the Nixon Administration wants to kill the job-creating Public Service Employment Program established by the landmark Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

This program opened up about 150,000 jobs in 17,500 state and local government agencies. It provides jobs, income and self-supporting dignity for workers. And it also provides useful public services in a variety of fields—health, education, recreation, environmental protection and public safety.

Yet the Administration wants to kill this program that is widely recognized as effective and successful and useful.

Furthermore, the federal government's role in planning and operating on-the-job and classroom training programs, funded under the Manpower Development and Training Act, would be turned over to state and local government by "special" Manpower Revenue Sharing.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS WOULD DISAPPEAR

The Neighborhood Youth Corps, which helps open opportunities for part-time jobs so that low-income youths can complete their education, would no longer be a federal responsibility. It would disappear in Manpower Revenue Sharing.

In fact, if it wasn't for recent court action and the determination of a bipartisan group of Senators, the entire Neighborhood Youth Corps program would have disappeared this year. If the Administration has its way, the hopes of some 600,000 young people would be impounded along with the $256 million for the program.

Look at what the Administration has been telling local governments about Neighborhood Youth Corps funds. "Use your EEA money instead," they say. What they mean is fire the fathers and mothers to hire the kids. That's the "New Federalism" in a nutshell, and that's the kind of mentality we are fighting.

The Administration also wants to cut back funds for the Job Corps and decentralize its activities into Manpower Revenue Sharing where it too would soon disappear totally.

WIN A PUBLIC RELATIONS GIMMICK

The only manpower program of any consequence in the Nixon budget is WIN, the Work Incentive Program, aimed basically at getting welfare recipients to work. Labor protection standards in the WIN program are so weak that welfare recipients far too often are placed in marginal, substandard, low-paid jobs. They go from poverty on welfare to poverty on the job. The only people who win with WIN are Administration public relations experts.

That is the trouble with the whole Manpower Revenue Sharing proposal—it is a Madison Avenue gimmick. Decentralizing and decategorizing are slogans that simply don't meet human needs for jobs, training, income and human dignity.

The Nixon Administration is now trying to put Manpower Revenue Sharing into effect by Executive fiat, in direct defiance of the constitutional system of checks and balances.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION IS IMMATERIAL TO THE ADMINISTRATION

The House Education and Labor Committee reports that "high-ranking officials of the Labor Department have indicated to the Committee that, as far as they are concerned, they have their orders, and congressional action or inaction is immaterial to them."

The Watergate hearings show that the Administration played fast and loose with the Bill of Rights. Manpower revenue sharing shows they have been trying to play fast and loose with Articles I and II of the Constitution.

Make no mistake about it. The "New Federalism" and revenue sharing are but code words for a massive attack against social programs that contribute to human welfare and dignity.

The AFL-CIO is determined—and I am confident the Urban League is determined—to repulse this attack. And let me make it crystal clear, we are not just fighting a holding action. We intend to press on for social and economic justice for all Americans.

PHASE IV SHOULD BE GIVEN A CHANCE TO WORK

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, when the President and his advisers announced the imposition of the most recent price freeze on June 13, they emphasized that the phase IV price controls program which would follow would involve tighter standards, and more mandatory compliance procedures than phase II. They also stressed that the new guidelines would be temporary and designed to return the economy as quickly as possible to a free market system. The President said:

We are not going to put the American economy into a strait jacket. . . . Such actions would bring good headlines tomorrow and bad headaches six months from now for every American family. . . . We must not let controls become a narcotic—we must not become addicted.

Phase IV guidelines have now been announced, though not yet finalized. The administration's ill-conceived and premature effort to end controls under phase III exacerbated the inflationary trend and necessitated the "tougher" controls now proposed under the phase IV program. Even before the proposed regulations were being formulated, however, we were warned that the new controls would be short-term. It seems to me that the administration's apologetic, even hostile, attitude toward curbing inflation by price controls could abort any effort to alleviate and rectify the distortions.

On July 15, 1973, the Washington Post carried a commentary by Hobart Rowen which explains the importance of allowing phase IV controls the time to work. I wish to call my colleagues' attention to this problem by inserting the article at this time.

The article follows:

NIXON SHOULD GIVE CONTROLS CHANCE TO WORK

(By Hobart Rowen)

Even as the final touches are being put on what we are assured will be a "tough" Phase IV (something like Phase II of wage-price controls), the administration keeps making noises about decontrol.

"The only way to get out of controls is to get out of controls," a high administration officials says somewhat belligerently.

The Labor Management Advisory Committee, on which Cost of Living Council director John Dunlop puts great reliance, issued a statement the other day urging the elimination of all controls as soon as possible this year.

"The only way to extricate the country from wage and price controls is to phase them out," the L-M statement said. The language sounds suspiciously like Dunlop's; if he didn't actually write it, he surely would have no philosophical disagreement with it.

In a speech to the New York Sales Executive Club last week, Commerce Secretary Frederick B. Dent began to chatter about "Phase V," which would mark the end of controls.

"The most important issue," declared Dent, "is what kind of an economy we will have in Phase V."

And Mrs. Anne Armstrong, a presidential counselor, told reporters in Tallahassee, Fla., that "because of the toughness (of Phase IV) it will be very brief."

Thus, the administration seems really not to have learned a lesson from the senseless junking of Phase II (economist Walter W. Heller calls it the "summum boner"). When it moved into Phase III, the administration gave the impression that it was no longer serious about pursuing controls—that it could hardly wait to get rid of them entirely.

As Brookings Institution economist Barry Bosworth observes, many of the problems that surfaced in Phase III—for example, rising food costs—would have developed even had Phase II been continued.

"But the widespread interpretation of Phase III as a signal of an end to controls multiplied price increases in early 1973," Bosworth says.

There is certainly a limit to what we can reasonably expect from Phase IV, in view of past blunders of the Nixon administration, rising food prices (which stem in good part from stupid agricultural policies), and the hysterical flight into commodities and out of paper money which is boosting imported raw material prices.

But some things can be expected, not the least of which is an administration attitude that is not apologetic about nor downright hostile to controls. Mr. Nixon and his aides must quit a covert sniping at controls and give them a chance to work.

That requires, as a backdrop, the maintenance of a strong fiscal-monetary policy. Many economists, including Heller and Arthur M. Okun, now think the time when a tax increase might have been useful has already slipped past. That puts the burden on monetary policy and many people already see a parallel with the money "crunch" of 1969–70.

As for Phase IV price controls, they will have to do even better than Phase II in limiting increases. Of course, there must be a return to the pre-notification principle—elimination of which was perhaps the biggest of all Phase III blunders.

Some prices, after the freeze, will have to go up. But COLC staff people have been talking too loosely about the "back-up" of cost increases for large industrial companies during Phase II and III. The sharp rise in consumer finished goods prices (averaging about 1 per cent a month) at a time when—as Dunlop proudly claims—wage advances have been modest can only mean that there has been a good deal of unjustifiable price hiking during Phase III. This shouldn't be legalized at one stroke and called an unpreventable "bulge."

But the main thing the administration must avoid is any sort of promise to get rid of controls quickly. A specific time limit to Phase IV would be the ultimate disaster.

"The way to unwind controls is to untie one knot at a time," says Okun. "We ought to tiptoe out of rigid controls very gradually to avoid the risk of a new inflation followed by a new freeze. The overeagerness to return to a free market in Phase III gave us the opposite movement in Freeze II."

The language of the forthcoming announcement on Phase IV will tell us a lot about whether Messrs. Nixon, Shultz and Dunlop have learned this lesson. Don't get your hopes too high.

THE APPLICATION OF JUSTICE TO FEDERAL NARCOTICS AGENTS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1972, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs agents, dressed as hippies, and carrying rifles and shotguns, illegally broke into the cabin of Mr. Dirk Dickenson in Humboldt County, Calif. The agents suspected Mr. Dickenson of running a million dollar hallucinogenic drug lab on his heavily wooded property. None of the agents identified themselves as law enforcement officials.

Mr. Dickenson, unaware of the fact that the men who had entered his home were Federal agents, attempted to flee and was shot and killed by BNDD agent Lloyd Clifton. A search of Mr. Dickenson's property, however, did not reveal even the remnants of a drug lab.

The Justice Department, in an investigation which resembled the Department's first Watergate probe, cleared Agent Clifton of any wrongdoing for shooting Mr. Dickenson.

In January 1973, the State of California indicted Agent Clifton on second degree murder and involuntary manslaughter charges.

The Justice Department recently filed a brief in a California Appeals Court to have the charges against Agent Clifton dismissed on the grounds that he was a Federal employee acting in an official capacity when he shot Mr. Dickenson.

A few weeks ago, I sent a letter to Attorney General Elliot Richardson asking him to withdraw the Department's motion to have the State of California's charges against Agent Clifton dismissed. I firmly believe that there is no reason why this man should not stand trial. The Attorney General informed me, however, that since Agent Clifton was originally cleared of any wrongdoing by the Justice Department, that the Department was now bound by law to provide his legal defense. Further, because this matter is now in the courts, Agent Clifton could not even be suspended from the Drug Enforcement Administration since a suspension would ultimately lead to a public hearing which could be quite prejudicial to the court cases.

I do feel, however, that my colleagues should be informed of this incident for it is absolutely essential that the Department of Justice realize that Congress will not permit this type of activity to take place again. San Francisco Chronicle correspondent Paul Avrey wrote an excellent article on this shocking occurrence. I would like to place this article in the RECORD.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 15, 1972]

STORY OF DEATH IN DRUG RAID

(By Paul Avery)

ALDERPOINT, HUMBOLDT COUNTY.—At 1:43 p.m. on April 4, Dirk Dickenson and his girl friend Judy Arnold heard a roaring whup-whup-whup-whup above the cabin on Pratt mountain and ran out onto the back deck.

"My first thought was 'far out,' " Miss Arnold recalls. "It was a big, green helicopter. Filled with longhairs. Dirk and I waved at them. A couple of them waved back."

A minute later, Dickenson, 24, the suspected "chemist" of an illegal drug ring, lay dying on a steep, rocky slope just below the cabin. Attempting to flee down the slope, he had been shot in the back by federal narcotics agent Lloyd Clifton.

DEPUTY

A Humboldt county sheriff's deputy, pistol at the ready, was first to the side of the writhing body. Sure he would find a gun—"or some sort of weapon"—he searched everywhere around.

He found nothing. Dicksenson had not been armed.

It was some 20 minutes before a first aid kit and stretcher arrived and Dickenson was carried to the Army helicopter. He died on the helicopter en route to a hospital 60 miles away in Eureka.

While Clifton and the deputy kneeled by Dickenson, helpless to do anything for him, other members of the 19-man raiding party fanned out over the property. They were searching for what government "hard intelligence" had indicated would be there: a "million-dollar lab" manufacturing the dangerous hallucinogen drug PCP (phencyclidine hydrochloride).

EMBARRASSED

Two days later it was acknowledged with embarrassment that while some drugs (small "stashes" or marijuna, hashish and peyote) and other possibly incriminating items (one a pill-making press, obviously not recently used) had been discovered, a careful search of 40 acres had failed to turn up a laboratory.

What had been touted to Eureka newsmen invited along as "the biggest drug raid in Humboldt county history—possibly the biggest in California" had turned out to be a bust.

And a man was dead.

Here is the anatomy of that raid.

Dickenson's death has been cited as the reason for the shroud of secrecy that has surrounded the events of April 4 at the remote mountain cabin seven miles west of the little town of Alderpoint, itself hardly more than a wide spot on a southern Humboldt county road.

The fatal incident is being investigated by both District Attorney William F. Ferroggiaro of Humboldt county and U.S. Attorney James L. Browning in San Francisco.

The outcome of both investigations will be determinations as to whether agent Clifton will be criminally charged in connection with the fatal shooting of Dickenson.

Browning must decide whether Clifton unlawfully "summarily executed" Dickenson (in other words, deprived him of his right to appear in court), or acted properly in firing at the fleeing suspect.

If it is decided no federal charge is warranted, Ferroggiaro must then determine whether Clifton should face trial on a state charge that could range from involuntary manslaughter up to first degree murder.

STORY

What happened during a period of less than a minute is what both investigations are trying to determine.

The Chronicle has talked with a number of persons involved with the raid and this version of what occurred—confirmed by a law enforcement official investigating the entire incident—has emerged:

The suspected PCP drug ring had been under intense federal investigation since January when an undercover agent made a "buy" of the drug from a man in Hayward who said his "connection" was named Dirk.

Other buys were set up, cars were followed, addresses noted and, by mid-March, the federal investigators had identified Dickenson and a number of other persons as alleged coconspirators in the making and sale of PCP.

It was learned Dickenson and two other suspects owned the 40 acres near Alderpoint and, when the man allegedly selling PCP to them remarked the "lab" was near Garberville, the pieces seemed to fall together. One federal agent is said to have shouted "eureka."

PREPARATIONS

Humboldt county came into the case in March. Undersheriff Robert Bollman was told there would be a raid on a "million-dollar lab" and was asked to supply deputies to go along with the federal strike team. He took part in some of the planning but—for some reason thus far unexplained—did not notify District Attorney Ferroggiaro about what was supposed to be the biggest raid in the county's history. The D.A. first learned of the raid when notified of Dickenson's death.

Although aerial photographs of the property were taken at an altitude of 5000 feet by a light plane, at no time did the investigators attempt any form of ground surveillance of the cabin—which one county detective had strongly suggested.

In late March, the raid was scheduled for April 4 and federal arrest and search warrants for five persons and three locations were obtained on April 3.

READY

Late the night of April 3, Bollman learned for the first time that an Army helicopter—loaned by the Presidio of San Francisco—was to be used. The federal agents also first learned then Bollman had invited three Eureka newsmen to cover the raid. The agents were furious but finally agreed the newsmen could go along.

Nine lawmen, Clifton among them, boarded the helicopter and ten others drove from Eureka in squad cars.

They were unaware that Dickenson, his girl friend and a neighbor were at that very moment in the sheriff's substation in Garberville talking over a business matter with county animal control officer Bill Bushnell.

Less than two hours later, Bushnell had been enlisted as part of the raiding team—to shoot, if necessary, several "vicious" Saint Bernard dogs owned by Dickenson.

The raids in Alderpoint, Hayward and Burlingame were supposed to occur at the same moment—but didn't. The cabin raid was late.

At 1:30 p.m., Dickenson and Miss Arnold, who is 23, were drinking Jack Daniels whiskey on the rocks and talking over plans for one of his business ventures, making elegant coffee tables out of slabs of redwood burls.

SURPRISE

They heard the helicopter, waved as it passed the cabin, then to their surprise, saw it turn and start to land in the front yard.

"We ran back inside. The helicopter was blowing dust through the front door, which was open. Dirk shut it and then he shouted 'look!' I saw all these men with guns running toward the cabin," said Miss Arnold.

(All of the federal officers on the chopper raid could easily have been mistaken for hippies. They had long hair, wore hip clothes—one sported a blue and white football jersey with the number 27 on it—and their small, gold badges, were concealed from view.)

"Dirk yelled to me 'Run, Judy, Run!' Then the door crashed open and two men with guns grabbed me. One held me and the other continued on.

"There was terrible confusion and I couldn't hear anything because the helicopter was starting to lift off.

"When it got quiet again, I heard someone say 'he's been hit.' I somehow knew they were talking about Dirk and that he'd been shot, even though I never heard any shot.

FLIGHT

"I broke up at that point and I don't remember much of what happened, except they wouldn't let me go down and see Dirk or go with him to the hospital."

Dickenson had vaulted the railing of the back deck, dropped 12 feet to the rocky slope below and was making his way toward a six-foot-high barbed wire fence, 110 feet away.

Undersheriff Bollman apparently was the single witness to the shooting. He has said he saw narcotics agent Clifton on the back deck, his arm outstretched, aiming a snub-nosed revolver down the hill.

"I heard him (Clifton) say 'halt or I'll shoot.' I looked down and saw someone running and then I heard a gunshot and he (Dickenson) went down." Bollman has told investigators.

The question as to why Clifton fired at Dickenson remains unanswered—officially.

"I can't discuss any aspect of a matter under investigation," said U.S. Attorney Browning. District Attorney Ferroggiaro has echoed that statement.

The Chronicle has been told its reporters cannot talk with Clifton.

ACCOUNT

But from two authoritative sources, it has been learned that Clifton gave this account of the incident to his superiors in the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs:

Among the first out of the helicopter—its engine roaring and its rotor blades popping loudly—Clifton was racing toward the cabin door when, out-of-the-corner of his eye, he saw a fellow agent suddenly fall sprawling on the ground.

Clifton believed the agent had been shot by someone inside the cabin (it had been expected several armed drug makers might be inside).

Clifton rushed into the cabin along with federal agent Ed McReedy, who took Miss Arnold into custody. Clifton continued out onto the back deck and saw Dickenson going down the rocky slope.

Still believing an agent had been gunned down, and believing the running man—it is not clear whether he knew it was Dickenson—had done the shooting, Clifton yelled out the warning, then fired.

The bullet entered Dickenson's back three inches above the waist next to the spinal cord, coursed down at a 60-degree angle and exited through the groin. Death, 30 minutes later, resulted from massive internal bleeding due to severed arteries.

DELAYS

Although "gunplay" has been considered a strong possibility because of intelligence as to "weapons in the cabin" (a .22 caliber pistol and a number of hunting rifles and shotguns were found), no one had thought to bring a doctor along on the raid and the closest first aid kit was in a squad car parked a quarter-mile away.

The helicopter pilot refused to land in the same spot again, because he felt it was too dangerous, so Dickenson had to be carried a considerable distance to the chopper.

Fellow agents said Clifton seemed shocked to learn he had shot an unarmed man and that none among the raiders had been wounded.

About 30 minutes after the raid started, the Eureka newsmen were ordered to leave the area. They left with a number of questions unanswered.

More than a month later many questions are still being answered with "no comment."

REPORTS

But the night of April 4, reporters in San Francisco were informed by the federal narcotics bureau that the three "coordinated" raids had produced four arrests, seizure of numerous varieties of drugs, including "150,000 tablets of LSD," that some agents on the Alderpoint raid had suffered "minor injuries" and that a fleeing suspect had been killed.

Government documents showing what was seized in the Bay Area raids list only "2000 LSD tablets" and a small quantity of other drugs. No mention of any PCP, except as "white powder," was made.

Just as puzzling was the discovery on the Alderpoint property on May 2 of two cans of a chemical component of PCP, a shattered lab measuring flask and pieces of broken chemical bottles. The find was made by District Attorney Ferroggiaro who was at the scene, making diagrams for his investigation of the shooting, when he wondered where a long, black water hose, leading into the woods, might end.

He followed it 200 yards into a clearing and found a wooden tent platform and the described objects that could possibly be construed as being part of a "lab."

CONFLICT

The district attorney refused comment as to why the federal search of the 40 acres had failed to find this possibly important evidentiary cache only 200 yards from Dickenson's house. Defense lawyers contend the government planted it. The government denies this.

The continuing investigation also was cited locally as the reason to refuse to give The Chronicle any information regarding possible guidelines federal narcotic agents have relating to use of firearms.

But a routine check in Washington shows that the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs gives a manual to its agents' which contains this paragraph:

"The agent should not shoot at any persons except to protect his own life or that of some other person. The agent will not fire at fleeing automobies, suspects or defendants. The firing of warning shots is prohibited. It is not intended, of course, that an agent remain passive in a threatening situation, therefore endangering his life or that of a fellow agent. He must, however, use caution and act in a calm and deliberate manner when he finds use of his firearm necessary."

That paragraph, says attorney Philip Scott Ryan, who is representing Miss Arnold (arrested on a "possession of marijuana" charge and Dickenson's parents in a civil action), "is the keystone to the whole incident."

"Dirk Dickenson wasn't any PCP chemist. He was a high school dropout with a minor police record. But none of that matters.

"Even if he had been a kingpin Mafia heroin supplier he was wrongfully shot and killed that day at Alderpoint. The government's own regulations show this and common sense should have made it apparent then, as it is apparent now."

MURDER BY HANDGUN: A CASE FOR GUN CONTROL—No. 12

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, each day, on the average, 57 people in this country are killed by guns.

Eddie Eldridge, age 25, was one of the people who was killed today. He was fighting with another man, Derr Andrilik. Andrilik's wife took a gun and fired it once. She did not know how to use it and said she only wanted to fire it into the air to frighten her husband's assailant. Instead, she killed him.

Ronnie Miller, age 18, was also killed today. He was shot by another 18-year-old on the sidewalk in front of his house. We do not know why.

Those two murders, typical of a nationwide pattern, took place in Chicago. But if we picked up the newspapers in Los Angeles, or Detroit, Philadelphia, or Dallas, we would be almost certain to find at least one murder reported.

The increasing numbers of handgun deaths—21,000 every day, led former Congressman Abner Mikva of Illinois to comment on the need for strong gun controls. He said:

The real American tragedy is that murders like these might have been avoided with strict handgun control. Handguns made death not only possible but probable. They made the crime safe, easy and sure. We can stop making it so easy to get a handgun. We can stop listening to the people who complain that banning the sale and manufacture of handguns will "inconvenience" them because they will not be able to buy handguns to shoot at targets. It would be better to begin listening to the complaints of the victims—the wives, friends, husbands, lovers, innocent bystanders who have been cut down with a weapon that has one basic function—to kill human beings.

The article from the Chicago Sun Times of August 2 follows:

TWO MEN, A GIRL FRIEND, A WIFE, A GUN—DEATH

Two persons were killed in unrelated incidents after shootings Wednesday on the North and South sides.

Eddie Eldridge, 25, of 5125 N. Kenmore, was killed after a fight with Derr Andrilik, 43, of 5131 N. Kenmore. According to Patrolman Thomas Moss, Andrilik allegedly insulted Eldridge's girl friend. Eldridge hit Andrilik with a bottle and began beating him, police said. Andrilik's wife, Margaret, 30, concerned over her husband's safety took a gun and fired it once.

Eldridge died after being taken to Weiss Memorial Hospital. Mrs. Andrilik said she did not know how to use the weapon but wanted to fire it in the air to frighten her husband's assailant. Andrilik was being treated at the hospital.

On the South Side, police have charged Michael Echols, 18, with murder in the death of Ronnie Miller, 18, of 8049 S. Carpenter.

Echols, of 6928 S. Lafin allegedly shot Miller on the sidewalk in front of his house. He was to appear Thursday in Felony Court, 26th and California.

THE 15TH OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the incoming mail on the observance of Captive Nations Week is most reassuring. People and officials in all parts of our country have enthusiastically responded to this annual event.

As the evidence shows, we have not, by far, lost our politico-moral commitment toward the two dozen and more captive nations.

The following examples well indicate this:

First. Proclamations by Govs. Otis R. Bowen, of Indiana, Edwin Edwards, of Louisiana, and Marvin Mandel, of Maryland;

Second. An editorial on "Captive Nations Week" in the July 12 edition of the Catholic Standard; and

Third. In the same publication an article by Rev. Denis Dirscherl, S.J., "Oriental Despotism, Aftermath of Revolution."

The material follows:

STATE OF INDIANA: PROCLAMATION

To All To Whom These Presents May Come, Greeting:

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as a bulwark of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing the captive nations 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 ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Otis R. Bowen, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15-21, 1973, as Captive Nations Week in Indiana.

STATE OF LOUISIANA: PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the subversive policies of Russian and Chinese Imperialism have reached across international frontiers to the very shores of America; and

Whereas, these policies have enslaved the citizens of free nations into a Colonial Empire serving the interest of Russia and Peking to the detriment of the historical and cultural values of the enslaved peoples of the captured nations; and

Whereas, the United States has a warm understanding and sympathy for all peoples to have the right to self-determination, which means the right freely to choose their own government and to pursue their own economic development; and

Whereas, Louisiana has been a haven for the many thousands of refugees who have fled the entrapped nations in the hope of continuing the good fight through peaceful means against the tyrants of totalitarianism; and

Whereas, in accordance with Public Law 86-90, wherein the Congress of the United States sets aside the third week of July each year as Captive Nations Week and urges the people of the United States to join in prayers and appropriate action to peacefully liberate these captives, for it is only in the freedom for all nations will we find a just and lasting peace,

Now, therefore, I, Edwin Edwards, Governor of the State of Louisiana, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15-21, 1973, as Captive Nations Week in Louisiana.

THE STATE OF MARYLAND: 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 for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Marvin Mandel, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15-21, 1973, as Captive Nations Week in the State of Maryland, and call upon the citizens of this State to join in observing this week by offering prayers for the peaceful liberation of oppressed peoples all over the world.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

While many people look with some hope, if not enthusiasm, toward the efforts for the reestablishment of a modus vivendi between the United States and the Communist-dominated nations of the world, there are many more who view the efforts as ill-fated. It is difficult for this latter group to visualize the success of such a venture in the light of modern history.

Since 1920, more than 29 nations have lost their independence and sovereignty as a direct result of the ruthless oppression of their Communist conquerors. None has regained its freedom as yet. Nevertheless the policy of our country has been moving slowly toward an accommodation with these oppressors. Many logical but pragmatic reasons are being put forward in support of this effort.

This year the 15th annual observance of Captive Nations Week will be held here and abroad during the week of July 15-21. This annual observance serves as a reminder to the rest of us that many people and nations throughout the world are captives who have little or no hope at this time for even eventual freedom.

It seems to us that any efforts that are made by our leaders to establish better relations with the Communist-dominated countries must be accompanied by demands for the guarantee of freedom for all peoples. Anything less on our part would be an ignoble capitulation for reasons of pure expediency.

AFTERMATH OF REVOLUTION

(By Fr. Denis Dirscherl, S.J.)

The following article was prepared in conjunction with Captive Nations Week, which will be observed July 15-21.

The Russian Revolution of this century was supposed to build a new society over the dust and ashes of the old. To wipe out the Czarist police state and put an end to all human exploitation, to liberate all men and create an equitable, happy society—in a word, to build a heaven on earth—these were the avowed aims and promises of the Russian revolutionaries of this century.

What they instead effected, confirming Marx's own worst fears, is a system of Communist entrenchment termed "oriental despotism" by a modern Russian scholar.

The Civil War of 1917 tore Russia apart and laid much of it waste. The Reds fought viciously to save their revolution and the Whites tried to overthrow it. For a time, the latter seemed likely to succeed, since Britain, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Poland and the United States were opposed to the Bolsheviks.

The resistance these countries offered to the Reds, however, proved in the end to be mere crumbs. They failed to appreciate the significance of the Revolution and the devastating consequences of their failure to repel the Red forces.

The Whites, strung out across the Soviet Union, could boast of many capable generals and military strategists: Denikin, Kolchak, Kornilov, May- Maevsky, Mannerheim, Wrangel, and Yudenich. But these men were simply unable to reach unanimity on how to conduct the war and, more importantly, what kind of society to organize after the war. The Whites lacked the narrowly defined cohesion of the Reds.

In brief, the most glaring and fatal catastrophe of the White campaign, besides the absence of strong general leadership, was the failure to mount an attractive and compelling political credo. The Whites, in addition, lacked a pragmatic "do it now" spirit. They had the opportunity to re-route history. Instead, the Reds took it from them.

The next revolt was more symbolic than actual, but its repercussions ran deep. The Kronstadt uprising began on March 7, 1921, about 20 miles west of Leningrad in the Gulf of Finland. Kronstadt was one of the major naval bases of the Russian north. Its garrison of troops had originally welcomed and supported the revolution of 1917. But when the revolutionaries' promises turned sour, they rebelled along with other workers.

Under the slogan, "Soviets without Bolsheviks!", the Kronstadt sailors and workers demanded greater economic and political freedom for workers and peasants alike. When the sailors refused to relent, Trotsky ordered them to be "shot like partridges." The uprising was quelled and the survivors of a garrison of almost 14,000 were shot or imprisoned. This uprising forced Lenin's regime to grant concessions in economic measures, but at the same time it solidified the regime's military might.

Resistance to the regime was short-lived once Stalin followed Lenin to power. Stalin masterfully played one faction against another, liquidating individuals and masses alike, the most drastic being the man-made famine in the Ukraine where thousands were wiped out.

The last dramatic opportunity for widespread uprising, and indeed, the overthrow of Communism, came at the beginning of World War II. When Hitler's troops forced their way into the heartland of Eastern Europe, many natives were ready to greet the invaders with open arms.

The Germans, however, took an ill-advised strategic stance. They had imprisoned in their own country Lt. General Andrey Andrevich Vlasov after wiping out his command, the Soviet Second Shock Army. He soon became the symbol of Russian resistance to Stalin. As such, he afforded the Germans an excellent opportunity to sweep through Russia, especially the Ukraine and the Baltic States.

As late as 1944, thousands applied daily to join the Liberation Army, but Hitler's aides hedged their bets and kept Vlasov immobil-

ized. Meanwhile Hitler cruelly manhandled his captives in Eastern Europe, kept scandalous prisoner of war camps, and thoroughly alienated those who had at first greeted his armies as their liberators from Stalin.

Today after 50 years of Communism, oppression in the Soviet State is as great as ever. The secret police is stronger, though less visible than formerly; dissent is stifled and little freedom is allowed under the system proposed to free man. Freedom under Communism means the acceptance of necessity—akin to the concept of oriental despotism.

The grounds for the flaws of Communism, so visible today worldwide, were apparent a century ago to both Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Engels candidly remarked that "A people which oppresses another cannot emancipate itself. The power which it uses to suppress the other finally always turns against itself. As long as Russian soldiers remain in Poland, the Russian people cannot free itself either politically or socially."

Later Marx himself came forward with other telling remarks about Russia. He referred to the strong stand of Oriental Despotism existing in Russia for centuries. In his words, "Muscovy (the early Russian kingdom) was raised and educated in the vicious and miserable school of Mongolian slavery. It won its strength only by becoming a virtuoso in the arts of slavery. Even after having liberated itself, Muscovy as conqueror played its traditionally slave-like role."

Marx and Engels referred to the "timeless stupor" of the masses of Russia's past. Marx saw the makeup of Russia dominated by the "yellow peril" or Mongol tradition.

Lenin himself feared that a new Asiatic restoration might take hold of the Russian scene by means of the revolution. His "fears" have become realized. Due to the managerial economy and tight control over the body politic, the masses are still, in effect, as dispersed, fragmented, and powerless as they were before the revolution. The forces of continuity are indeed powerful, almost overwhelming in Russia today.

In many respects Marx's own devastating critique of Russia is far more poignant, more relevant than in his own day, especially in regard to his concept of oriental despotism.

THE CASE OF ROYBAL

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues, ED ROYBAL, has recently been noted in the California Journal as the leader of the emergent Spanish-speaking political force in the State of California. He has come to be known, both in the House and in his district, as the spokesman for a powerful young movement. In the 10 years that he has spent in the House he has worked devotedly to secure and safeguard the civil rights and liberties of all groups of Americans. As a tireless and articulate representative of many Spanish-speaking Americans, he serves as an inspiration to his colleagues, as a true spokesman for his constituents.

I would like to insert for the benefit of my colleagues, a tribute paid to ED ROYBAL in an article of May 1973:

A VIEW FROM WITHIN: "YEARS OF SHOUT" SEEN OVER IN CHICANO POLITICS

(By Juan Manuel Hererra)

"THE CASE OF ROYBAL"

Where we are going can be seen in the example of Edward Roybal, a United States Congressman, who over the last 10 years has risen steadily in the congressional hierarchy. He is typical of the practitioner of hard, realistic politics, always building and investing in the political process. And it is this type of leader, particularly, that has been forced off-stage in the continuing dramas of "El Movimiento". Indicative of change is the fact that a few months ago in Los Angeles, Chicanos of many persuasions discussed seriously the possibility of organizing behind Roybal as their candidate for Mayor. They realized that he was their biggest political asset. That meeting was symptomatic of the processes at work off center-stage in the movement: it illustrates, once again, the waning of those forces that formed over the last 10 years within this movement.

Roybal's comeback is no minor development. Looking back, it is clear that his kind of thinking and his kind of building have laid the foundation for the emergence of Spanish-speaking people as a political force in California.

WOMEN IN UNIONS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, recently the Official Journal of Communications Workers of America published an article concerning women trade unionists and their first statewide women's conference held in San Francisco in July. In an effort to underline the significance of women laborers' political activism, I wish to draw this article to the attention of my colleagues.

During the conference, 300 women demonstrated their support for the AFL–CIO United Farmworkers Union. Panel discussions were held on the topic of women in the labor movement. Also, many resolutions were adopted by the conference calling for such things as better working conditions for women, a closer analysis of union pensions and welfare, and continued support for the United Farmworkers Union in its struggle against the growers and the Teamsters Union.

By so organizing and stating their position, women in unions become a strong voice in the constant struggle for social justice and equality. Women unionists create a direct impact on the feminist movement itself, and will continue to develop needed leadership and social reform. The article follows:

WORKING WOMEN'S WIRE

CALIFORNIA WOMEN TRADE UNIONISTS MEET

More than 300 women working from AFL–CIO unions throughout California interrupted the opening session of their own conference on women's rights in San Francisco last weekend to demonstrate their support for the AFL–CIO United Farm Workers Union which is fighting an assault on its contracts and membership in California's grape vineyards by the Teamsters' Union and a number of growers.

The conference, the first statewide women's conference sponsored by the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, recessed its opening session at noon to demonstrate at a nearby Safeway store, a target of the union's lettuce boycott.

The decision to demonstrate in support of the farm workers was taken shortly before Ann Ginger, a Hastings Law School professor, urged the conference participants to become more aggressive in fighting for women's rights.

"It takes an aggressive approach to protect the rights of working people, especially working women," she said.

A large number of CWA local members attended the conference. CWA Staff Representatives in attendance included Ken Croswell and Sharon Wilkes, who served on the Resolutions Committee.

Panel discussions were held on such topics as "Working Women and the Law," "Negotiating Women's Issues," "Organizing the Unorganized," and "The Role of Women in the Labor Movement."

Among resolutions adopted by the conference, which was charged by Edith Withington of Local 29 of the Office and Professional Employees International Union of Oakland who was elected permanent chairperson of the conference, were those calling for:

Establishment of a permanent women's conference on an annual basis;

Analysis of union pension and welfare plans in terms of sex discrimination and the drafting of model clauses to erase such inequities;

Development of more female leadership in the trade union movement;

Support for enactment of AB478, a California AFL–CIO-sponsored bill introduced by Assemblyman Willie Brown (D-San Francisco) which would protect working conditions standards for women by extending them to men;

Continue support of the Farah strike and boycott; and,

Continued support for the United Farm Workers Union in its struggle against the growers and the Teamsters' Union.

MICHIGAN CITY, IND., NEWS DISPATCH CONDEMNS SECRET BOMBING OF CAMBODIA

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of an editorial published July 26, 1973, in the Michigan City, Ind., News Dispatch condemning the Nixon administration's secret bombing of Cambodia.

The editorial follows:

SECRET BOMBING

There seems no end to revelations damaging to what remains of President Nixon's prestige and adding to alarm at the aggrandizement of power by the executive branch.

One of the latest is the Defense Department disclosure that B–52 bombers carried out at least 3,500 presidentially authorized secret raids over Cambodia beginning in March, 1969, at a time when we recognized the ostensibly neutral government of Prince Sihanouk.

According to one Pentagon spokesman, falsified reports were officially ordered after the raids to hide their number, frequency and objectives.

Hide from whom? Certainly the Cambodians knew they were being bombed. Surely they somehow leaked the word to the Russians and the Chinese and any other potential U.S. enemy. The only people who didn't know were 200 million Americans and most of their 535 representatives in Congress.

The President's penchant for secrecy, for the "loneliness of command," continued even in a situation where candor would have been most beneficial to the administration, not to mention America's image abroad. This was the Christmas, 1972, bombing of North Vietnam which outraged even staunch and longtime supporters of the President's (public) Vietnam policies.

Not until weeks after the war ended, when it was too late to do any good, did the Defense Department release photographic proof that there had been no such thing as "carpet bombing" of Hanoi and only minimal damage to nonmilitary targets.

Secrecy, with its implied distrust of the patriotism and contempt for the intelligence of the citizenry, is always self-defeating in a democracy, as Richard Nixon is so sadly finding out.

THOMAS P. JAHNIGE DIES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I inform this body of the death of Mr. Thomas J. Jahnige of Williamsburg, Mass., author, professor, student of government and a former congressional fellow.

Mr. Jahnige was a man of considerable accomplishment and great potential. He died last week following a long illness which he accepted bravely and calmly. He was only 35, but already he had established an outstanding reputation as an associate professor of government at Smith College, Northampton, Mass., where he taught since 1965.

I had the opportunity of working closely with him for several years, particularly during the 6 years he served as director of Smith's Washington summer intern program.

So impressed was I by his talents and his deep knowledge of government, that I prevailed upon him to become my special assistant here in my Washington office during the summer of 1969.

No stranger to Washington, Mr. Jahnige, as a congressional fellow, worked in the offices of my colleague from Ohio, Mr. MOSHER, and former Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas. He was the author of several articles and two books—"The Federal Judicial System," and "The Federal Courts as a Political System."

This sterling record in so short a time, however, is merely one measure of the man. Mr. Jahnige was much more than a man of public achievement. He was a loving husband, devoted father and involved citizen. He had great knowledge of, faith in and respect for the institutions of this Government—traits we so sorely need in this country today.

But most of all, Tom Jahnige was a warm and good man of quiet courage. I am proud to have had him as a friend, and I share the grief of his wife, Molly, his daughter, son, and all his family.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD, related articles from the Daily Hampshire Gazette of July 25, the Holyoke Transcript of July 26, and the Springfield Union of July 26:

[From the Hampshire (Mass.) Gazette, July 25, 1973]

THOMAS JAHNIGE DIES

WILLIAMSBURG.—Thomas Paul Jahnige, 35, of North Street, died Tuesday morning at Yale-New Haven Hospital. He had been an associate professor of government at Smith College where he has taught since 1965.

He was author of several articles on the federal courts and Congress and is co-author of two books, "The Federal Judicial System," and "The Federal Courts as a Political System."

At Smith he was also director of the Social Science Research Center and director of Smith-Washington Summer Intern program for six years.

This past year he has served as a member of the Census Bureau's Advisory Committee on Population Statistics, and since 1970 he has been on the executive committee of the International Survey Library Association, Roper Public Opinion Center.

Before coming to Smith he was in Washington, D.C. on a Congressional Fellowship from the American Political Science Association where he worked in the offices of Congressman Charles A. Mosher, (R-Ohio) and Senator Ralph Yarborough (D-Texas).

He also worked as a special assistant to Congressman Silvio O. Conte during the summer of 1969.

LOCAL ACTIVITIES

Locally he served on the Williamsburg Republican Town Committee and as its chairman in 1970–71, as well as serving on the Williamsburg Planning Board.

He is a member of St. John's Episcopal Church and served on its vestry.

He was born in Meriden, Conn., June 28, 1938 and received his B.A. from Yale University in 1960 and his Ph. D. from Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, Calif. in 1965.

He is survived by his wife, Molly (McCaslin) Jahnige; a daughter, Mary Katherine and a son, Paul John; his parents, Ralph and Elizabeth Jahnige of Meriden; a brother, Ralph of Ridgefield, Conn.

The funeral will be Friday at 2 p.m. in St. John's Episcopal Church.

Burial will be in Village Hill Cemetery, Williamsburg.

The Childs Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements and there will be no calling hours.

Gifts may be sent in his memory to the Chemotherapy Research Fund, Yale-New Haven Hospital or to St. John's Episcopal Church.

[From the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram, July 26, 1973]

THOMAS JAHNIGE, PROFESSOR AT SMITH, DEAD AT 35

Thomas P. Jahnige, 35, of North St., Williamsburg, author, associate professor of government at Smith College and a former special assistant to Cong. Silvio O. Conte, died Tuesday in Yale New Haven (Conn.) Hospital after a long illness.

Death was attributed to Hodgkins disease, according to a hospital spokesman.

A member of the Smith faculty since 1965, Mr. Jahnige was the author of several articles on the federal courts and Congress, and co-author of two books, "The Federal Judicial System" and "The Federal Courts as a Political System."

At Smith he was director of the social science research center and the Washington summer intern program for six years.

ADVISORY BOARD

In the past year he has served as a member of the Census Bureau's advisory committee on population statistics. Since 1970 he had been on the executive committee of the International Library Assn. and Roper Public Opinion Center.

Before coming to Smith, Mr. Jahnige was in Washington, D.C. on a congressional fellowship from the American Political Science Assn. He worked in the offices of Rep. Charles A. Mosher and Sen. Ralph Yarborough. He also worked for Conte during the summer of 1959.

In Williamsburg he served on the Republican Town Committee and as its chairman in 1970–71 as well as serving on the Planning Board. He was a member of St. John's Episcopal Church and served on its vestry.

Born in Meriden, Conn., he attended Yale University, graduating in 1960. He later earned his Ph.D. at Claremont, Calif., Graduate School in 1965.

He leaves his wife, Molly, a daughter, Mary Katherine and a son, Paul John, all at home; his parents, Ralph and Elizabeth Jahnige of Meriden and a brother, Ralph of Ridgefield, Conn.

The funeral will be held Friday in St. John's Episcopal Church, Williamsburg. Burial will be in Village Hill Cemetery there. Childs Funeral Home, Haydenville, is in charge of arrangements.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, July 26, 1973]

THOMAS P. JAHNIGE, AUTHOR, PROFESSOR

WILLIAMSBURG.—Thomas P. Jahnige, 35, of North Street, Williamsburg, author, associate professor of government at Smith College and a former special assistant to U.S. Rep. Silvio O. Conte R-Pittsfield, died Tuesday in Yale New Haven (Conn.) Hospital following a long illness.

Death was attributed to Hodgkins disease, according to a hospital spokesman.

He taught at Smith since 1965. He was author of several articles on the federal courts and Congress and co-author of two books, "The Federal Judicial System" and "The Federal Courts as a Political System."

At Smith, he was director of the social science research center and the Washington summer intern program six years.

In the past year he has served as a member of the Census Bureau's advisory committee on population statistics. Since 1970 he had been on the executive committee of the International Survey Library Association and Roper Public Opinion Center.

Before coming to Smith he was in Washington, D.C. on a congressional fellowship from the American Political Science Association. He worked in the offices of U.S. Rep. Charles A. Mosher, R-Ohio and Sen. Ralph Yarborough, D-Texas. He also worked for Conte during the summer of 1959.

In Williamsburg he served on the Republican Town Committee and as its chairman in 1970–71 as well as serving on the Planning Board. He was a member of St. John's Episcopal Church and served in its vestry.

Born in Meriden, Conn., he attended Yale University, graduating in 1960. He later earned his Ph.D. at Claremont, Calif., Graduate School in 1965.

He leaves his wife, Molly, a daughter, Mary Katherine and a son, Paul John, all at home, his parents, Ralph and Elizabeth Jahnige of Meriden and a brother, Ralph, of Ridgefield, Conn.

The funeral will be Friday in St. John's Episcopal Church. Burial will be in Village Hill Cemetery. Childs funeral home is in charge.

GRAND VENERABLE JOSEPH H. BILLECI

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Grand Lodge of California, the State's foremost Italian-American organization, recently concluded its 38th convention where Joseph H. Billeci was reelected grand venerable.

I am extremely proud to have Mr. Billeci as a close friend. He is a dedicated leader for an organization which has a long record of community service.

At this point, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a portion of the remarks made by Mr. Billeci during a

speech to full membership of the Grand Lodge in convention in San Mateo, Calif., last month. I believe it states quite eloquently and simply the fine goals of his organization:

SPEECH BY MR. BILLECI

What is it that makes so many of us work so hard for the Good of our Order? Certainly not monetary gain, for those of us who have activated ourselves within the Order, know the costs involved—Then it must be for other reasons, reasons that are much more meaningful. Reasons that sometimes are most difficult to describe. These reasons are certainly not a means of self edification, or self glorification, but rather a sincere and dedicated effort to always advance and to enhance the position of the Italian Americans, not only in our jurisdiction, but throughout the entire country. We look with pride on the contributions, achievements and accomplishments pertinent to our nationality and our goals.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY PACT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks, I have been continually pleased with the response shown by articles and materials relevant to the respect for Captive Nations Week.

At this time, I insert another article which is an excellent commentary by Dumitru Danielopol, the renowned international correspondent of Copley Press. The article very effectively addresses itself to the seriousness involved in the International Security Pact.

The article follows:

[From the San Diego Union, July 12, 1973]

CAPTIVE NATIONS SEE PERIL IN EUROPEAN SECURITY PACT

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Captive Nations Week has special significance this year.

Established by Congress in 1959 and observed during the third week in July, it is to remind the free world of the plight of so many less fortunate nations that have, since 1920, fallen under the domination of international communism.

"The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the peoples of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace . . ." said Public Law 8690.

The argument was that the honest aspirations of captive peoples constituted a spur that would goad the Communists to liberalize, and at the same time restrain them from new foreign adventures. The threat of an active underground is a powerful deterrent.

The annual presidential proclamation is a restatement by the United States that it recognizes the captive people's ultimate right of self determination. It has been a ray of light and hope for freedom-loving peoples. Just the knowledge that the great American democracy remembers their ordeal sustains many.

But each year the sustenance of words from Washington seems to grow more meager. This year Captive Nations Week comes at an ominous moment in the opinion of exile leaders.

The Russian-demanded European Security Conference has opened in Helsinki, and Moscow is bent on legitimatizing forever the boundaries Eastern Europe created by the Red army in 1944–45.

A position paper written by the Assembly of the Captive European Nations and the American Friends of the Captive Nations states:

"The European security conference . . . in Helsinki has long been sought by the Soviet Union for the . . . purpose of achieving formal Western recognition of the Soviet imposed regimes and frontier in Eastern Europe."

The paper appeals to the Western world and especially the United States to counteract Soviet efforts "to use the conference for the purpose of stabilizing their empire."

These men of bitter experience also are anxious about another part of the world.

A paper by Prof. Lev Dobriansky of Georgetown University, one of the initiators of Captive Nations Week, calls special attention to the vulnerable states in war-torn Southeast Asia where American force and American interest are waning rapidly.

"For the decade of the '70's the dominant question is 'who's next?' " Dobriansky says. His candidates for possible Red control are Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam and the Republic of China.

He points out that none of the Communist countries have ceased in efforts to subvert and conquer their neighbors.

Despite his smiles in Washington and San Clemente, Soviet Secretary Leonid Brezhnev has just reiterated his pledge of help to Hanoi and the Viet Cong and he has expressed faith in the "ultimate triumph of their cause."

The multiple violations by Hanoi of the cease-fire and the illegal buildup of forces in that area with Soviet and Chinese tanks, missiles and other material, Dobriansky says, must be viewed as a prelude to new Communist pressures.

It was Hanoi's Le Duc Tho who just restated his Communist philosophy:

"According to Marxist-Leninist theory, so long as imperialism exists there will be war. . . ."

When a war with communism is lost, the outcome is new captive nations.

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER FIREMAN'S DAY

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to announce that I am cosponsoring legislation to make January 17 of each year National Volunteer Fireman's Day.

The date of January 17 was chosen to honor volunteer firemen because that is the birthdate of Benjamin Franklin, who founded the first volunteer fire company in the United States.

The designation of this day as a day of gratitude and appreciation for the service and the courage of the Nation's volunteer firemen is certainly a sincere and enthusiastic gesture, but no such tribute can adequately repay the debt that we as American citizens owe to these gallant firefighters.

There is no higher degree of public service than that attained by the private citizen who forsakes the comfort and security of his home to risk injury and even death in the service of his fellowman. Such is the service, and such are the risks, which the volunteer fireman assumes without hesitation time after time.

In the Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina, which I am privileged to represent, the volunteer fireman is held in particularly high esteem, for we have some excellent volunteer companies which year after year perform with unusual skill and bravery in combatting fires that would otherwise be the cruel claimant of homes and businesses and ways of life—and life itself.

And so it is with pride and with sincere thanks that I join in this well-deserved tribute to the volunteer firemen of North Carolina's Fifth District, and their comrades throughout the State and the Nation.

TEAMSTERS PENSION FUND AND ORGANIZED CRIME

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the April issue of Overdrive magazine written by Jim Drinkhall.

The article follows:

SLANTED, HO-HUM COVERAGE BY NEWSPAPER AFTER CENTRAL STATES PENSION FUND LOAN

". . . Nevada has in great measure profited by the Central States, Southeast and Southwest (Areas) Pension Fund."

LAS VEGAS SUN.

It's business as usual at 8550 West Bryn Maur in Chicago, the headquarters of the Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Pension Fund: the number of federal investigations into questionable loans increases, those connected with past loans are in jail, on their way or on trial, and the money continues to flow in (and then out).

One recent occurrence, though, seems to indicate that officials at the Fund at least want to change their image, if not their method of operation. In February, Dan Shannon was appointed as Administrator of the Fund. Shannon, a young CPA with a well-known reputation for solid integrity, was formerly the president of the Chicago Park District. Although the title "Administrator" is a new one at the Fund, it is believed that Shannon actually replaced Francis Murtha, who for many years was the Executive Secretary. But even though Murtha hasn't been with the Fund since mid-December last year, it has been learned that he's still in the same building as the Fund, but receives his paycheck from the Central States Drivers Council.

As part of the face-lifting, according to one source at the Fund, the lease agreement for the $3 million jet plane, owned by Allen Dorfman's Union Casualty Company, has been cancelled. While that might sound good (the facts show another story: according to records of the Federal Aviation Administration, that plane is still in the name of the trustees of the Fund, fully two and a half months after it supposedly was returned to Dorfman (federal law requires a change in ownership to be reported to the FAA within 30 days).

Further, according to Shannon, the Fund hasn't made any new real estate loans since last June. While it is true that Fund loan activity has slowed down (probably because of the number of federal investigations being conducted), it hasn't stopped. Overdrive has discovered at least one new real estate loan by the Fund within the time period when supposedly no new loans were made. Additionally, the loan activity referred to is "new;" there have been a number of loans made to people who already have loans out-

standing with the Fund, including those who are in financial trouble and have had loans refinanced.

It is possible (though few are optimistic) that Shannon's employment by the Fund will signal an about-face from their past practices. As the activity of the Fund is monitored this year, it will eventually be possible to make an evaluation as to whether things will really change, or whether it will in fact be "business as usual."

On another front, the Fund's public image was promoted by a Las Vegas newspaper. The investigation into that campaign produced the following:

On each of the last five days of January, an article on the Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Pension Fund appeared in the Las Vegas *Sun*. Taken together, this 5-part series went into some detail concerning Fund loans in Nevada, and made general reference to loans made throughout the country. Overall, the series said, Fund loans in Nevada have been beneficial for the state as well as the Union membership; and the clear implication was that Fund loans elsewhere in the country were sound investments.

The author of the series was Jim Barrows, an associate editor of the *Sun*. In Las Vegas and in newspaper circles, Barrows is considered a digger when it comes to subjects that smell funny, and he is known for his fairness. But persons familiar with his writing said they were surprised at the series on the Fund. One comment was that it "doesn't look like the kind of thing he usually does;" a statement that was repeated by others. It should not be implied in the slightest that Barrows' personal or professional integrity was being questioned. What finally goes into a newspaper is subject to the publisher's views. In the case of the Las Vegas *Sun*, the publisher is Hank Greenspun.

A newspaper reader should expect that if he reads an article in the news section of the paper, the subject is being presented in as balanced and fair a light as possible. It would be unfair, for example, if a newspaper gave one political candidate more coverage than another, but failed to dispose that the candidate was related to the publisher. Perhaps that coverage would not be affected by the relationship, but at least the readers should be made aware of the fact. The same can be said of Greenspun's paper. Nowhere in the Fund series was it mentioned that Hank Greenspun is a long-time personal friend of Jimmy Hoffa, or that he has been the recipient of a Fund loan.

Among *Sun* staff members and others in Las Vegas, Greenspun's loan from the Fund seems to be common knowledge. But the reason he received it, they say, is that the *Sun* was in financial trouble, and the Fund loan saved it from bankruptcy. Keeping a newspaper alive, especially one that causes controversy (and the *Sun* has always been controversial), is certainly a laudable act; there are pitifully few left in the country. It appears, though, that no one has bothered to check into the claim that the loan was made to save the *Sun*. The facts are that Hank Greenspun borrowed the money to build a golf course.

In 1958, Greenspun received a loan for $250,000 at 6 per cent interest. Prior to the approval of the loan, employer trustee Fred Strecker complained that the interest rate was too low. Hoffa became indignant at that, and a discussion was held "off the record." In that discussion, Hoffa explained that he favored the loan because "this gentleman is an influential man in Las Vegas." The loan, of course, was granted, and a year later was increased to $500,000, still at 6% interest. By 1962, Greenspun was having difficulties repaying the money used to build Paradise Valley Golf Course. Satisfactory arrangements between Greenspun and the Fund trustees were made, though, and Greenspun eventually repaid the loan. Since receiving that loan, Greenspun has been an outspoken defender of Hoffa on the pages of the *Sun*. His remarks on the loan and his subsequent enthusiasm for Hoffa and the Teamsters would be highly relevant, but Greenspun has continually refused to discuss the matter with Overdrive. In addition to the Teamsters, Greenspun has developed other curious relationships in Nevada. At least one involves stock transactions, and that is apparently so interesting that, according to sources, the Justice Department's Organized Crime Strike Force in Los Angeles and the Internal Revenue Service are well into an extensive investigation of those dealings.

Equally intriguing are the *Sun* series on the Fund; not for what they say, but rather for what they omit.

According to Jim Barrows, he looked at the Fund from strictly the financial point of view. In other words, how profitable were the Nevada loans from a banker's point of view? In the first place, looking at them from a bank's viewpoint is not accurate because so very many Fund loans were originally turned down by banks or were the kind of venture they shied away from. Secondly, given the extensive history of known corruption involving Fund loans almost since its inception in 1955, and the dozens upon dozens of people who have gone to jail because of them, it seems that the premise of considering only their profitability is as sound as considering only the profit aspect of Hitler's slave labor camps. The conclusion in each case is that both probably were.

In order to research the articles, said Barrows, he merely contacted the Fund, and was given access to their records. Why Barrows would be given such quick and easy freedom to such information is something of a mystery because any number of reporters over the years—including those from Overdrive—have been just as quickly refused. Barrows said the Fund flew him to Chicago, and he was allowed any information he wanted. The *Sun* series, however, indicates that the information kept by the Fund is a constantly shifting commodity. The total amount of money loaned in Nevada, according to Barrows' records from the Fund, and those obtained by Overdrive, differ markedly to the extent that the variance is in the millions of dollars.

The *Sun* article on Fund loans to Circus Circus states that Fund records show a total of $18.3 million loaned to that casino/hotel. But records obtained by Overdrive, and documents on file in the Clerk County Recorder's office, show that $19.1 million has been extended. This discrepancy is not explained by the *Sun*. How did Sarno get the loans?, asks the *Sun*. There are many people who would like to know the answer to that question, but the *Sun* does not provide it. The Justice Department and IRS investigation into Circus Circus, its owner Jay Sarno, and organized crime figures from Chicago—detailed by Overdrive in January—are dismissed in one sentence by the *Sun* as a "smear."

Circus Circus continues with what appear to be serious financial problems, and rumors in Las Vegas are that Sarno wants to sell the business and build another hotel/casino in Las Vegas. When questioned about that, Sarno would only say: "I would sell anything I ever owned if I had the right price. It's as simple as that."

A source in the Fund's Chicago office has reported that Sarno has asked that his interest payments be set aside for one year, and that his loans be refinanced. Fund officials won't publicly comment on that, but Sarno stated that "I don't have any moratorium yet. I had a discussion, and there's no moratorium approved except on a lot of conditions."

Similarly, the involvement of organized crime in the Fund-financed Dunes, Landmark, Stardust, and Caesar's Palace gambling casinos, and the Sunrise Hospital, are all ignored by the *Sun*. This, in spite of the fact that it has become known that two federal agencies are conducting massive investigations into Fund loans in Nevada. The *Sun* lists the Fund loan to King's Castle outside Reno, and then shows the balance due. Missing from their account of this loan is that King's Castle went out of business in early 1972 and still has not been reopened. In addition, the former owner, Nat Jacobson, is being tried on kidnapping charges.

At one point, Barrows quotes Jay Sarno as saying: "All the loans (to Circus Circus) were 100% legitimate. They were approved by the Nevada Gaming Control Board . . ." The undeniable implication of this statement is that nothing can be amiss in these transactions because of the Board's approval. To draw such a conclusion is misleading in that it misrepresents the function of the Board.

In the past, the Nevada Gaming Control Board has had the reputation of being controlled by politicians, and issuing licenses on the basis of favoritism. According to Nevada law, the Board is supposed to investigate anyone wishing to operate or own a gambling establishment, as well as those who receive any financial benefit from it. The current Board, though, does not reflect these allegations. It is considered a tough one, and no charges of favoritism have been even suggested.

Before a person or corporation can buy into a gambling business in Nevada, an investigation must be made to determine whether approval of the transaction will be made. Generally, the Board must be satisfied that those who control gambling are in fact legitimate. The investigations—which sometimes stretch over a period of months—must be paid for by the applicant. If the Board asks a question about financial transactions or personal associations, and the person takes the Fifth Amendment, it is grounds for denial or revocation of the license.

The source of any funds used in the gambling operation must prove to be legitimate. In the case of the Pension Fund, the Board states that since the source of the Fund's money for loans is the employer contributions on behalf of the employees, the source is a legitimate one. The fact that organized crime figures may manipulate the Fund, or that kickbacks may be involved, is not within the jurisdiction of the Board. Recently, a Texas gambler could not identify precisely where he had obtained a large amount of money. He was, according to one source, simply an old-time gambler who actually couldn't remember where the money came from; he had simply won it gambling. The Board said that wasn't satisfactory, and the man withdrew his application.

During the approval of one of the loans from the Fund to Circus Circus, the loan agreement was submitted to the Board for their approval. It was noted that one of the provisions was that the Fund trustees could replace Sarno under certain circumstances. The Board passed the word to the Fund that if they insisted on having that in the agreement, the Fund trustees would have to undergo an investigation. That provision was quickly revised by the Fund.

The Board's concern about possible hidden interests and kickbacks involving Fund loans is apparent from an action taken by them in early 1972. Following the conviction of Allen Dorfman for fraud, the Board instituted a requirement that anyone connected with a gambling casino who obtained a Fund loan would have to sign a special affidavit swearing that no one other than the licensee has received, or will receive, a financial interest in the business without first receiving Board approval.

Throughout the *Sun* articles, numerous examples are given—in generalities, not specifics—to show that the Fund has made good

investments in stocks and bonds. Examples are cited to show that the Fund has invested $70.9 million in stocks and bonds which are currently worth $85.56 million. What the *Sun* doesn't show, however, is what rate of return these stocks and bonds are bringing in. Are they making a fair return or not? The *Sun* investigation does not show this.

Records of the Fund obtained by Overdrive—but apparently not disclosed to the *Sun*—show in some detail the profit or loss of Fund investments. These documents show that from 1969 to 1971, sales of stocks, bonds and real estate by the Fund resulted in a spectacular loss of over $13 million. Most interesting of these transactions is the sale of bonds for a huge $5,300,000 loss. Selling bonds for a loss means that they were sold for a price lower than their purchase price. And the reason such sales are made, it is assumed, is that the Fund was strapped for cash. A number of sources have tended to confirm this, stating that recently the Fund has loaned out the money so rapidly that money has not been available to pay the small number of pensions under its obligations, and that the Fund has resorted to this kind of money-losing sale as well as actually borrowing money from banks.

There are 42,000 Teamsters receiving pensions, according to the *Sun*, but Fund records only list 39,865. One article also states that the pensions are in the monthly amounts of between $90 to $350. How many are for which amount was not mentioned by the *Sun*, nor will Fund officials disclose the breakdown.

One entire article was given to a state-by-state list of loan totals made and balances due. They are next to meaningless, however, inasmuch as they don't show the interest rate, the identities of the borrowers and their current state of repayment. From what overdrive can determine from the information it has gathered, compared to the *Sun* list, there are a number of loans in which organized crime figures have an interest or exert control, as well as ones involving trustees of the Fund. Under the heading of New Mexico loans, the *Sun* shows original loans made totaling over $4 million, with a balance due of zero. The facts concerning these loans are that the amount loaned is a million dollars more than what the Fund records apparently show, and practically none of this money has been repaid.

Given the continuous investigations, trials and convictions (there are active federal investigations into at least 12 Fund loans which have not yet resulted in indictments) involving the Fund, it seems incredible that a newspaper would accept the Fund's information without checking it. But knowing Greenspun's relationship with Hoffa, the Fund trustees and a number of borrowers provides at least some insight into the *Sun's* actions.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF CLARK

Following Allen Dorfman's conviction on 6 counts of fraud, the Nevada Gaming Control Board decided that all persons connected with gambling who borrowed from the Fund would be required to sign affidavits like the one reproduced here.

——— being first dully sworn, deposes and states with respect to the loan commitment to ——— set forth in a letter dated ——— from the Teamsters Pension Fund, I hereby state to the effect that no individual or business entity, other than those described in the loan agreement, shall receive any proceeds from the loan or derive any benefits from the loan, and further that there are no agreements or understandings with any individual or business entity who may have been involved in the obtaining of this loan, (except as may be described in an attachment to the affidavit), whereby they are to receive anything of value, including but not limited to any agreement for professional services, options, service contracts insurance contracts, etc., resulting from the application for or the granting of the loan.

CARELESSLY TAPED DOORKNOBS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Ervin committee has uncovered more than simply the facts in its investigation of the Watergate and related White House activities. It has revealed for public view the attitudes which underlay the criminal activities allegedly authorized by Mr. Ehrlichman and Mr. Haldeman. The attitudes which infected the White House and Committee To Re-Elect the President's staff gave them an unfounded and unconstitutional license to create what Tom Wicker has likened to a secret police force. Mr. Wicker's commentary, which appeared in the New York Times on July 27, pinpoints a frighteningly plausible comparison of the White House "plumbers" who committed burglaries in the spurious name of "national security" to Hitler's SS.

The specter of another era of terrorism in the name of moral superiority is not to be frivolously dismissed. As Senator TALMADGE recognized, the line of reasoning employed by the White House could also give the President power to commit murder in the name of national security. The carelessly taped doorknobs which led to the discovery of Mr. Ehrlichman's "plumbers" barely saved the Nation from the institution of a police state.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this sad and dangerous aspect of the President's claim to so-called implied powers alarms the entire Nation. It is worth calling the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Wicker's incisive analysis, and I wish to insert the commentary in the RECORD at this time:

[From the New York Times, July 27, 1973]

MR. NIXON'S S. S.

(By Tom Wicker)

By late October 1971, Attorney General John Mitchell, exasperated by his difficulties with J. Edgar Hoover, had persuaded President Nixon to fire the elderly and cantankerous F.B.I. director. An appointment for Mr. Hoover was made at the Oval Office; unaware of what was in store, he went over to talk to the President.

All afternoon, Mr. Mitchell waited at the Justice Department for word that the deed had been done. But the word never came. Finally, the Attorney General called Mr. Nixon and asked what had happened.

"I had him in here," the President replied. "But I just couldn't do it."

That story, recalled by a former Administration official, takes on verisimilitude from the testimony of John D. Ehrlichman that "the Administration would have been better off if Mr. Hoover had been retired . . . he was fixed in his views and he had made operations very difficult."

At least two Presidents and three Attorneys General had reached that conclusion before Mr. Nixon and Mr. Mitchell. But no President did anything about it—all, probably, for the same basic reasons. Mr. Hoover was regarded as an icon of law, order and patriotism by so many people that firing him might have been politically unprofitable; and he might, or might not, for all anyone knew, have been willing to use whatever information he had in his files against a President who tried to force him out—or against that President's associates.

So far as is known, however, only the Nixon Administration took direct action to get around Mr. Hoover's "fixed views" and the frustrations they caused. Unable to face the political or other possible consequences of proceeding legally—by removing Mr. Hoover and bringing in a new F.B.I. director, whose nomination would have had to be confirmed by the Senate—Mr. Nixon created his own secret police, answerable only to the White House, not known to the public or financed by specific Congressional appropriation, and ordered these "plumbers" to do what he could not get the F.B.I. to do.

This secret Presidential police force then was given a highly charged "national security" mission—so much so that Mr. Ehrlichman quoted from Mr. Nixon's own admission of May 22 that he could understand "how highly motivated individuals" could feel justified in breaking into the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist to steal Mr. Ellsberg's medical records. (The same highly charged group of "plumbers" transferred intact to Mr. Nixon's re-election committee, where no national security matters had any place, later broke into Democratic party headquarters twice.)

Mr. Ehrlichman did not specifically order the burgling of the psychiatrist's office, he said, nor did Mr. Nixon. Yet they gave a low-level group of adventurers such latitude and urgings that Mr. Nixon later could "understand" how the plumbers decided on the burglary. In fact, Mr. Ehrlichman said that, even if specifically unauthorized, the burglary was well within Mr. Nixon's powers to guard the national security—as, indeed, was the creation of his secret White House police unit.

To hear Mr. Ehrlichman tell it in his condescending manner, Mr. Nixon had the power to do virtually anything he pleased, and by authority of Congress, because of a statute setting out legal limits on electronic eavesdropping. That statute adds that nothing in it is intended to inhibit a President's power to guard against foreign intelligence activities. So if the leaking of the Pentagon Papers by Daniel Ellsberg was linked, or possibly linked, to foreign intelligence activities, Mr. Nixon had a free hand in tracking down the matter, according to Ehrlichman.

But as Senator Ervin pointed out, what the statute in question seems to say in the "mother tongue" is that nothing in the specified wiretap limitations is intended to limit his capacity to guard against foreign intelligence activities—that is, by wiretapping or bugging, since the measure is concerned only with eavesdropping, and since the courts, so far, have left the executive free to eavesdrop without a court order on foreign embassies, agents and the like.

To stretch this, or even the "implied" Presidential powers of the Constitution, into authority to create a secret police force and send it out to commit burglaries, for whatever laudable purpose a President may think he has, is to assert an unlimited Presidential power to set aside the law when it inconveniences him and when he can find any slight possibility—never hard to do—of foreign intelligence activity.

As Senator Talmadge inquired, does this reasoning give the President power to order murders? Why only three or four or five "plumbers"? Suppose a President thought he needed fifty, a hundred, a thousand? Mr Ehrlichman has outlined the road to a White House S.S.; and he has made clear that, by the margin of a carelessly taped doorknob, the nation has escaped the beginnings of a police state.

MARINE CORPS LEAGUE

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Marine Corps has an illustrious history of patriotic, courageous and effective service to the Nation and to the cause of freedom. On the occasion of the 50th anniversary year of the Marine Corps League we are pleased to call to the attention of the Congress two splendid articles concerning the league:

MARINE CORPS LEAGUE CONVENTION SET FOR MIAMI

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 1, 1973.—The Marine Corps League will hold their 50th Anniversary National Convention in Miami Beach, August 19–24, 1973. Convention Headquarters will be the Marco Polo Hotel. This announcement was made by Gilbert E. Gray of Kingston, New York, National Commandant of the Marine Corps League.

On hand for some sun and fun, reunions with former comrades, and serious business meetings will be Marine Corps veterans and their families, ranging in service from World War I combat to the Vietnam Conflict, and numerous U.S. military campaigns and expeditions in between.

Taking note of the celebration of their half-century mark, President Nixon issued a special message saluting the efforts and contributions of the Marine Corps League for "preserving and supporting the ideals of the Marine Corps while offering guidance and assistance to young Americans."

One of the few veterans organizations chartered by the U.S. Congress, the Marine Corps League was established by a small group of predominantly Warld War I Marine veterans who met in New York City on June 6, 1923 to formulate plans for a national organization to perpetuate the Marine Corps spirit. Major John A. Lejeune, then Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, was elected the first National Commandant of the Marine Corps League.

His present-day successor as Commandant of the Marine Corps, four-star General Robert E. Cushman, Jr., will attend the Miami national reunion and will be the principal Convention speaker at the Grand Banquet on August 24.

The League's two highest awards, the "Iron Mike" Award, and the "Dickey Chapelle" Award will be presented this year to The Honorable John W. Warner, Secretary of the Navy, and Mrs. Donald Spicer, President General of the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution.

Warner, a former Navy enlisted man and Marine Corps officer, will receive the "Iron Mike" Award for his sterling contributions to the Navy-Marine Corps team. Mrs. Spicer, the daughter, sister, widow, and mother of Marine Corps officers, and national leader of the 195,000 member esteemed women's organization, will be honored with the "Dickey Chapelle" Award for a lifetime of exemplary patriotic service and community leadership.

Previous recipients of the "Iron Mike" Award have been Bob Hope, David Duncan, Howard K. Smith, Barry Zorthian, Ross Perot, John Wayne, and U.S. Administrator of Veterans Affairs Donald E. Johnson. Past winners of the "Dickey Chapelle" Award, presented annually in memory of the famed newswoman killed by an enemy land mine while on patrol with a Marine company in Vietnam in 1965, are Miss Martha Raye, Lucy Caldwell (USO), Marjorie Merriweather Post, Verona Devney (Project HOPE), Esther Clark and Betty Donovan Rentrop (newspaper columnists).

Preliminary convention activities start Monday, August 20 with a National Staff Meeting and a pool-side fiesta for early registrants. Business sessions begin Tuesday morning, August 21 with a Joint Opening Session of the Marine Corps League and the Marine Corps League Auxiliary. The busy pace for the balance of the week will include action on Resolutions and a substantial revision of the By-Laws, Committee Reports, Workshops, VA Hospital visits, a Memorial Service for deceased Marines, and election of new officers for the coming year.

The 1973 National Conventional Chairman is Mr. Larry Bassin, 101 W. 20th Street, Apt. 5A, Hialeah, Florida 33010. Telephone: (305) 888–8703.

THE MARINE CORPS LEAGUE—A HISTORY OF THE FIRST FIFTY YEARS—1923–1973

(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 genius of the Marine Corps League for 50 years has been the spirit of *Semper Fidelis*. It was at work from the first, moving the founders of our organization in setting down the great objects of our corporate being. Their motives were patriotic and fraternal, and they were very proud of their honorable service in the Marines, "the oldest branch of the nation's military service." With but minor modification in language the original Objects of the League are identical to those still in force half a century later. It may be said in truths that have stood, Marine-like, against the assaults of Time.

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. The only year no convention was held was in 1932, and that owing to the severe financial condition of the Country due to the depression. This period was devoted to "shaking down" the League, to adopting and refining the Constitution. By-Laws, rituals, and approving such items as the League colors (Crimson and gold), grave marker, and its lapel button.

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 Lations of Massachusetts, the seniormost Vice Commandant, to run the League in his stead. This Lations did, and he was subsequently elected as the first civilian commandant at the 1929 convention in Cincinnati. Among his accomplishment was to move the League headquarters to downtown Washington from Marine Corps Headquarters. Lations' 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 affected the welfare of the U.S. Marine Corps, the League itself, and of its constitutent or subsidiary organizations, and the rights, privileges and benefits which were based on military service of any member thereof.

The League used its legislative weight to back legislation favorable to Marines and other veterans, and to oppose that which was not. Its greatest weight of the decade, however, was felt when an attempt was made

in the early 1930's to abolish the Marine Corps under the guise of "economy." That this effort failed was due in part to vigorous protestations by the members of the League, led by National Commandant Carlton A. Fisher of New York.

New York Detachment No. 1, with Angelo John Cincotta, Milton Soloman, and Frank X. Lambert leading the way, secured donations from members of the League throughout the Country. They bought full page advertisements in daily newspapers protesting against any decrease or possible abolition of the United States Marine Corps. They initiated a drive to send letters of protest to the Congress and the President. Congressman Frances P. Bolton of Ohio speaking in 1953, attributed the "untiring efforts of the Marine Corps League in the 1930's" to the abandonment of efforts to disband the Corps as an economy move.

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. Ilich, gained greatly in national stature. (Before he was to pass away in 1972, Ilich 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 1938, Sylvester Corrigan, a wealthy oilman from Oklahoma, passed away, leaving a large sum of money to the Marine Corps League. The will was contested by relatives, and the League finally settled for $15,000. Of this sum, $5,000 was placed in the Corrigan Memorial Fund, an irrevocable trust, with the income going to the mother of Niles Huff, a Marine who died while serving in the Marines. Mrs. Huff died a few years later so that the interest on this trust now accrues to the League. $10,000 was put in the Niles Huff Memorial Fund with the income going to the League. For a time this money was given to the mother of a deserving Marine.

The Devil Dogs, the Honor Society of the League, was authorized as a subsidiary organization in Boston in 1939. Gerald L. Bakelaar of New Jersey was elected as first Chief Devil Dog.

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.

When World War II broke out, three of the League's first five civilian commandants returned to active duty with the Marine Corps. They were Past National Commandants Ilich, Fisher, and Lations. Hundreds of rank and file Leaguers followed their examples. Their actions gave visible proof to our slogan, "Once a Marine—Always a Marine."

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.

During this period the League sponsored several exhibit tours of enemy war materials with money accruing to the League's Welfare Foundation. Many thousands of dollars for this worthy cause were obtained in this manner.

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 contributions made to the League and 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 Capital. 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. Shamgochian 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 Marine Corps League. An estimated 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.

While in National Convention at Washington in 1950 the League received a surprise visit from Harry S Truman, President of the United States. The president came to apologize for earlier intemperate comments made about the U.S. Marine Corps being the "Navy's police force," and having "a propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's." The National Bugler, Herbert Baldwin of Florida, was so swept up by the unexpected visit he could scarcely sound the notes of "attention." The President's brief visit was well received by National Commandant Clay Nixon of Washington, and the delegates in attendance.

Under the leadership and inspiration of John R. O'Brien of New Jersey the Marine Corps League embarked on a "Free Beer for GI's in Korea" campaign. League detachments collected contributions from especially marked beer cans placed in taverns. General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur in answer to a letter of inquiry, wrote he would be glad to accept the free beer, and that the cans should be marked, "Gift—Not for Sale—For our Armed Forces in Korea from the Marine Corps League." The beer was purchased and shipped by Major General E. O. Ames of California. The Staten Island detachment of New York raised $2,350 for this cause, more than any other League detachment.

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 the vicinity of Washington on national 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.

In 1963, a proposal from the Lou Diamond Detachment of Ohio led to the reorganization of the National Headquarters of the League. A 15-member Board of Trustees was created consisting of eight Division Vice Commandants, four National Trustees, the National Commandant, Senior Vice Commandant, and Junior Past National Commandant. While the latter three each had one-year terms, the Division Vice Commandants and Trustees were elected to rotating three year terms with four up for election each year. The Board of Trustees system provided for stability and continuity in the handling of League affairs, and continues into our 50th year as the governing body of the League.

THE FIFTH DECADE, 1964–73

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.

In early 1966 the League corrected the perennial problem of bonding pay-masters and commandants through the purchase of a blanket position bond covering each of these officers automatically. Mid-West Vice Commandant James H. Shultz of Kansas was instrumental in arranging the bonding at a cost far below what the cost would have been if each individual detachment had procured its own.

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 staffs, 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.

On February 8th, 1967, after attending the Secretary of the Navy's briefing in Washington, League officials led by National Commandant Claude H. Downing, acting in response to a challenge from Marine Corps Commandant General Greene, to "do something besides talk," founded, in coordination with seven other national Navy-Marine Corps oriented organizations, the Navy-Marine Corps Council. The purpose of the Council was to further the collective efforts of the several organizations in areas wherein they had common interests and objectives in support of the Navy-Marine Corps team. The Council meets regularly, and may recommend actions and resolutions on behalf of the Navy Department to its members, but does not publish or implement such actions or resolutions in its own name.

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 Marine 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.

Out of concern for the wounded, Marines including James Merna of Maryland, Don Yeaman of Washington, Larry Bassin of Florida, and Joseph O. Pueschel of Hawaii, with their fellow Leaguers conducted special projects to entertain the hospitalized. Operations with names like Cheer, Hurricane, Appreciation, and Care and Recuperation did much to help our veterans forget their difficulties and see, at least for a time, that people really cared, and that there was a happier side to life.

Near the end of the decade the League, under National Commandant H. Lynn Cavin, adopted optional health and life insurance programs for the benefit of the membership, and voted to support the Marine Military Academy in Harlingen, Texas, by seeking out potential Cadets for admission.

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 birthdate 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.

CONCLUSION

Many of the events described above were highlights. Less spectacular were the day to day activities of the inidividual civilian and in-service Marine Leaguers. Always faithful to the purposes of the League they maintained true allegiance to our Nation, practiced Americanism in all its forms, engaged in programs which benefitted their communities, assisted the Marine Corps with quiet recruiting efforts and other activities, celebrated the birthday of the Corps each November 10th as well as other historical occasions of peculiar interest to Marines, basked in their Marine comradeship, visited the sick, aided the distressed, and, when the time came, buried their own.

Marines great and small have marched with John A. LeJeune in the ranks of the League, men like Ray Davis, Chesty Puller, Lew Walt, Smedley D. Butler, Harry Lee, Lou Diamond, J. C. Breckingridge, Clifton B. Cates, Mickey Finn, Len Chapman, John Glenn, Lou Wilson and many thousands of others who, in war and peace, have proudly worn the Globe and Anchor.

The Spirit of Semper Fidelis has moved many in the League to outstanding achievement. Marines like Jack Brennan, Merton C. Lowe, Jackie Steinquest, John Baker, Raymond Wilkowski, Orville Hubbard, Mason D. Wade, John P. Lester, Patrick J. Cody, Robert Blanard, Jack Davis, Harold Welsh, Hugh Maus, Charley Stone, Lucian J. Caldara, Lue Madsen, John S. Zak, S. Johanna Glasrud, Edward J. Bange, C. A. Boedigheimer, C. A. McKinney, to name but some of the dedicated Leaguers not previously mentioned. Their ranks are legion.

In its 49th year, the Secretary of the Navy in Washington, John H. Chaffee, paid a singular tribute to the Marine Corps League. In an open letter to all members, Chaffee pointed out that the League ". . . is providing outstanding leadership for our communities, in the same tradition that the Marine Corps has provided distinguished leadership on the field of battle."

He continued:

"The Marine Corps League will be 49 this June. During those nearly five decades, possibly the most valuable of the League's contributions—from my standpoint—has been its support of the Marine Corps. You have, indeed, helped to preserve the traditions, promote the interests and perpetuate the history of the U.S. Marine Corps. I appreciate that support.

"I urge your membership to continue, even to redouble, its efforts. The Marine Corps is strengthened by your support. The nation and its people benefit from the work of the Marine Corps League."

The 'Society of Leathernecks', as the League

was called in 1923, has come a long way in fifty years, from John A. Lejeune to his successor in office as Commandant, Gilbert E. Gray. Its headquarters in that time went from Washington to Albany, to Baton Rouge, to Philadelphia, and back to the Washington area, this time to stay. Today its potential membership is over 1,000,000, with its actual membership scattered all over the world.

The Marine Corps League is recognized as one of the leading national veterans organizations. It members speak of its history and traditions with pride, and they have worked long and hard to make the League, "second only to the U.S. Marine Corps."

And, like the Corps itself, its record is one of achievement.

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have often inserted articles in this RECORD on the mental health needs of the American people, particularly the children. This week, the Washington Star-News has printed two articles by Wayne King on the status of the mental health treatment of children. His report analyzes the great number of children who need treatment and are not receiving it. Over 10 percent of the children are estimated to suffer from mental illness to such a degree that they require professional treatment. In 1971 only 772,000 received treatment in an established facility.

The articles also summarize the types of treatment that the children are receiving. Play therapy is often used to establish communication between therapist and child patient. Often such therapy for the child can lead to introduction of one or both of the parents to treatment with the end result of a happier family.

For the information of my colleagues, the two articles follow:

STRESS PUTS KIDS IN THERAPY

(By Wayne King)

By most standards, 11-year-old Paula was a model child, a bit quiet and introspective by comparison to the other children in the well-to-do suburban midwestern community where she lived, but studious, obedient and never a bit of trouble—until the day she began looking at the floor and refused to say anything at all.

School officials, who were aware that there had been problems at home, quarrels, and an impending divorce, were nonetheless shocked at the diagnosis: Severe schizophrenic withdrawal.

A San Diego mother of a 3-year-old was more sophisticated. When her son developed violent hostile tendencies, she was certain she had the remedy. She simply laid down on the floor and invited the boy to kick her.

By the time he was 5, the boy had begun attacking his kindergarten teachers, and when he was 6 the mother finally agreed to professional help.

"He has been under treatment for two years now," says his psychiatrist. "And it's a long hard pull."

The two disparate cases are among the literally hundreds of thousands that come before child psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers each year in rapidly growing numbers.

They are unusual in their severity, but it is statistically clear that the age of analysis that has swept America for more than two decades now has a new component, the "kiddie on the couch."

The label is inappropriate—the couch is rare if not non-existent among child therapists—but it is clear that growing numbers of children are receiving some kind of psychotherapy.

In 1966, a survey by the National Institutes for Mental Health found that 473,000 children under the age of 18 were being treated through some established mental health facility. By 1971, the most recent survey, that figure had grown to 772,000—a 63 percent increase. The figures do not include a number of private patients and other children who did not visit clinics, hospitals or established mental health centers.

Moreover, Dr. Ner Littner, psychiatrist and director of the child therapy program of the Chicago Institute of Psychoanalysis, one of the best regarded training programs for child psychotherapists, estimates that 10 percent of all American children have sufficient emotional problems to warrant professional attention. And only a miniscule number are getting help.

Although some psychiatrists contend that the rapid growth of child therapy results from increased awareness of psychological problems among children—not more disturbed children per se—the more common view is that there is indeed more stress on children and thus a greater number of mental problems.

"My guess," says Littner, "is that both the rate and severity of mental illness are increasing among children."

"Why?" asked Robert Traisman, a psychologist in Skokie, Ill. "The answer is to pick up a newspaper. There is more stress within families, more uncertainty about values to live by, an increase in academic demands on the young, a more automated, less personal society."

Most child therapists agree with a Chicago psychotherapist who notes: "Psychotherapy sessions rely heavily on some form of communication. Adults rely on talking, verbal communication, and so most sessions are prolonged talking. But kids are less verbal and with them you are more likely to establish a method of communicating that relies on play or some other interest, like drawing pictures.

Such techniques are often used to discover a child's feelings. George, a 7-year-old Detroit youngster treated by Marjorie Wallon, a child psychologist, when encouraged to draw pictures, scrawled two figures—a very tiny father and a very large boy.

"Then he told me that the big one was himself and the little one was his father," related Mrs. Wilson.

"He said he wished at times that he could reverse the situations and be in control of his father, because he was angry with him," she continued. It developed that much of George's discipline problems resulted from jealousy of his father and competition with him for his mother's attention. Gradually he learned to deal with this.

The most prevalent approach to child problems is a technique called play therapy. As the name suggests, the child is encouraged to play, in some manner that causes him or her to interact with the therapist and, in a few cases, with the parents as well.

A child therapist's office will thus often look more like a basement playroom than a psychiatrist's office, filled with puppets, dolls, stuffed animals, doll houses, toy furniture, blocks, coloring books and the like.

These toys do several things: they help the child to relax and enter into a pleasant relationship with the therapist, breaking down barriers: They often induce the child to enjoy the idea of therapy, and, most importantly, they provide clues to a child's attitudes, emotions and relationships—thus the emphasis is on "people" toys, such as puppets and dolls.

Also, says another leading child analyst, "the stigma has been taken off mental illness and people are discovering that when Johnny wets his bed at 13 he might be sick emotionally rather than physically."

There is, moreover, a feeling that the earlier psychological problems are dealt with, the better. "The basic emotional problems suffered by adults practically all have roots in the first six years of life," says Littner.

The list of treatable problems—which many parents might ignore as both transient and insignificant—includes nailbiting, thumb-sucking, temper tantrums, bed-wetting and masturbation.

Then there are conduct disorders such as seclusiveness, worrying, apathy, submissiveness, shame, guilt, fighting, cruelty, defiance of authority, truancy and stealing.

There are neurotic traits—tics, spasms, stammering, phobias (of which fear of school is a prominent one), and hyperactivity.

Finally, there are the far more serious matters of psychosis such as schizophrenia and paranoia.

Treatment varies widely, from traditional individual psychoanalysis to supervised group play and general counseling. Parents may or may not be deeply involved, although it is generally agreed that their cooperation is essential and in many cases therapy is conducted on a family basis.

Dr. Harold Davidson, a child analyst in the wealthy Detroit suburb of Birmingham, Mich., has used traditional psychoanalysis on children as young as 6, although he now confines the practice to older children.

"A child can't lie down on the couch and tell you whatever comes to his mind. He just chatters, according to Dr. Davidson. He says, 'do you know what the teacher said in school today?' And this and that, and from that you glean what's going on in his mind. You teach him to be introspective by wondering about what he's saying. You might say, 'I wonder why you did that?' or 'I wonder why you made that slip of the tongue?' "

CHILDREN UNDER STRESS—2: PROBLEM CHILD—PROBLEM PARENTS

(By Wayne King)

In most cases, child therapists say, parents cooperate fully in treatments once the problems are explained to them. Some complain about approach—the father of an 11-year-old in San Francisco was taken aback to learn he was paying $25 an hour (actually 45 minutes) for his son to play chess with the analyst.

Cost is usually a major consideration. Fees for private treatment can range from $15 for group sessions to a normal high of about $60 an hour for an individual psychoanalysis—with occasional but rare higher fees reported. The average is $25 to $40 an hour.

Parents often erroneously reason that children should be treated at a reduced rate, something like half-fares at a movie. Generally, however, psychiatrists agree that dealing with a troubled child is even more difficult than with an adult.

In almost all cases, the child's difficulties relate to his parents. This usually means involving the parents, if not in treatment themselves, at least in a cooperative situation.

"It's probably impossible to treat children without getting parents to participate or cooperate," says Dr. Mortimer Blumenthal, chief of outpatient psychiatrist services for children at Mount Sinai Hospital.

"For one thing, children don't volunteer for treatment. They are brought in," Blumenthal notes, adding:

"In a few instances parents have brought

their child to a therapist for treatment only to find themselves on the couch—finding they created the problem themselves."

It is statistically clear that the age of analysis that has swept America for more than 20 years has a new component—the "kiddie on the couch."

A 1966 survey by the National Institutes of Health found that 473,000 children under 18 were being treated through established mental health facilities: By 1971, a 63 percent increase was noted, to 772,000 patients. And experts calculate that only a tiny portion of those needing help are getting it.

The mother of 9-year-old Carl asked for help at Mount Sinai because, she said, she "could not live with him any longer." He was aggressive, hyperactive and fought with his parents. He was preoccupied with violence and had no friends. The mother said that as an infant her son was "too big to hold" and "hurt her arms."

At six months he was, in her words, a "killer" who almost demolished his crib. A girl, three years younger, was no problem, the mother said, but she fought constantly with the boy. At school, however, inquiries revealed that teachers found Carl likeable, bright and he did very well, although he was occasionally mischievous. "So you can see the outlines of the problem," said Blumenthal. The mother—and, it turned out, the father as well—sorely needed counseling themselves. The whole family is being seen at Mount Sinai, and Carl is less aggressive at home.

There is significant difference of opinion on how much the modes and stresses of modern living contribute to emotional problems among children. Dr. Charles Casat, director of the San Diego Children's Health Center, insists that "this is not a sick society in terms of our young children."

However, Dr. Ebbe B. Ebbesen, associate professor of psychology at the University of California-San Diego, and Dr. Rosalind Feirabend, psychologist at San Diego State University, take a more qualified view, on the basis of a study they have made showing that "violence is becoming a way of life in America," and can be traced in part to children's upbringing.

Ebbesen says: "It seems to me that American society rewards aggression. Kids are trained to compete and, moreover to win. Even mothers teach their sons to get ahead even if it means taking something from someone rather than sharing. History is taught in our schools in the same way, with the emphasis on, in eras delineated by, wars. Even our heroes are violent people, not only our historical heroes but contemporary ones like Joe Namath or, for blacks, the George Jacksons and Soledad Brothers. The fact that violence seems to pay off makes the problem worse, for children as well as adults."

Dr. Morris Weiss, a child psychiatrist in suburban Detroit, notes: "A syndrome I see more and more of, especially in the suburbs, is the average child with a flat I.Q. of 100 who is suffering because he is in a classroom where the average may be as high as 120.

It depresses him, makes him anxious and hostile. this is not a simple problem; you have to help the parent accept realistic expectations for this child. In some ways, it resembles trying to tell parents about a retarded child. It's a blow to them."

In other areas, where there are large military bases, therapists are noticing another problem: difficulties among the children of military men, particularly those returning from long tours of duty abroad.

In San Diego County, for example, one psychiatrist estimated that nearly one-fifth of the children brought to family services centers and private psychiatrists were from military families.

Mrs. Anne Janda, who is in charge of the Oceanside-Carlsbad office of the family service association of San Diego County, serving the Marine Corps' Camp Pendleton, has been dealing with the emotional problems of military Children.

Johnny D., whose father had been a Marine for over 20 years, constantly heard that he should be "a good soldier," and his home was run like a boot camp, with rigid discipline. Two of Johnny's brothers accepted it. But Johnny, more sensitive, more reflective, resented it and rebelled. When the father returned from a second Vietnam tour, he ordered him to cut his long hair, to stop seeing a 13-year-old girl friend, and to "shape up and be a man for a change." Johnny ran away—and on his return was taken to a psychiatrist. After long sessions, Johnny's father—and the mother too—were convinced of a need to give Johnny more opportunity for self expression—they were won over, and now Johnny and his father are repairing an old motorcycle evenings in the family garage and, although the boy is still receiving weekly treatment, his resentment and hostility have largely disappeared.

Most child therapists say a substantial majority of their patients are boys—the reverse of the adult situation. In San Diego for example, boys outnumber girls about five to three among young children receiving psychiatric treatment. A major reason, therapists say, is that boys may tend to become more serious discipline problems and thus become more apparent to school authorities.

High visibility might also account for the large number of hyperactive children receiving treatment.

"It's easy to overlook a quiet, sensitive, withdrawn child who sits in the back of the room and never bothers anyone," says a New York therapist. "That child might be as seriously disturbed as the 9-year-old who's throwing a fit and trying to kill the teacher. But you can't ignore him."

Dr. Casat of the Children's Health Center in San Diego, estimates that up to 20 percent of the child population is hyperactive.

Treatment of hyperactivity—sometimes described privately by psychiatrists as "monster management"—varies according to the underlying cause.

Drugs, especially Ritalin, or Dextroamphetamine, are often used, although the practice remains controversial. The drug is a stimulant to adults but tends to calm overactive children.

"EDUCATION AND THE COMMONWEAL," AN ADDRESS BY JOHN H. FISCHER, PRESIDENT, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and perceptive leaders in American education over many years has been the distinguished president of Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. John H. Fischer.

I believe that Members of Congress will read with interest the text of the address delivered at the commencement day convocation at the Teachers College, Columbia, on May 16, 1973, by Dr. Fischer, and I insert his address at this point in the RECORD:

EDUCATION AND THE COMMONWEAL

(By John H. Fischer)

If a Commencement Day speech conforms to convention, it touches upon the virtues of the graduates, it describes the challenges awaiting them in the rough world beyond the campus, and it inspires them to venture forth with confidence and courage. I hope you will not mind if I depart somewhat from that customary pattern—somewhat but not completely—for there is a good deal to be said in praise of this Class of 1973. There are altogether 1,571 of you. You have earned 1,045 Master of Arts degrees, 70 Master of Science, 140 Master of Education, 25 Professional Diplomas, 220 Doctorates of Education, and 70 Doctorates of Philosophy. One of you will be the last in the long procession of our baccalaureates. In the number of doctorates you outrank every class except 1953, when the high tide that followed World War II swept through the College. Contrary to fears often expressed these days, you represent no surplus of overeducated and unemployed specialists. The vast majority of this class and virtually all who are graduating with the doctorate are either already employed in appropriate posts or have bright and active prospects.

You deserve a good reception for you have done good work. At your admission you met higher requirements than most of your predecessors. In your course work, in your essays and dissertations, in your field work, you have displayed high competence. A number of you have already made significant contributions in scholarship, in professional practice, and in community service and leadership. You have demonstrated in many ways your social commitment, your intellectual strength, and your personal integrity. The faculty and staff, like your fellow students, are proud of you and we are proud to be your associates.

NOT THE USUAL SCRIPT

I told you I would not follow the usual script which catalogs the dragons in the forest where you are to play St. George. Instead I want to talk about what is worrying me in those woods. If it turns out that some of you share those worries, I'll feel reassured.

Pondering what to say to you today, I was no more able than most of you to ignore the pervasive and persistent effect on my thoughts and emotions of the situation in Washington. The capital is not to be mistaken for the country, but what occurs at the pinnacle of the government necessarily carries a special significance. It is at the apex, however, that we expect our aspirations, our values, and our strengths to be symbolized and reflected. The shocking events of the Watergate affair, the Ellsberg trial and the successive revelations are not what concern me most. What really troubles me is how as a people we react to these events, how we appraise them, and what we do with what we learn.

In the 1950's one of our wisest and most esteemed colleagues, George Counts, published a paragraph so pertinent to this situation that it might have been written yesterday:

". . . we know that every civilization does rest upon a social and moral foundation. If the necessary loyalties are seriously weakened, if social consciousness or social conscience decays, if a spirit of indifference or corruption comes to pervade public relations, if essential standards of conduct and performance are seriously lowered, if the masses of population become pauperized through the concentration of wealth, if society is divided into bitterly contending classes and factions lacking a common conception of welfare, if a people loses faith in itself or hope for the future because of some terrible defeat or catastrophe—if such conditions appear and become chronic, then we may be sure that a civilization is facing evil days."

The Watergate affair and the other ugly reports that are coming to light daily may suggest a defeat of sorts but they do not constitute a catastrophe. They do disclose deep and serious flaws in the fabric of this democracy. The problem lies less in the failures of the individuals whose names are making headlines than in the underlying con-

ditions that make such failures possible. What is truly disturbing is that large numbers of Americans dismiss the entire sequence as relatively unimportant. That persons in high positions of public trust have deliberately violated the law, have callously overridden the civil rights of their fellow citizens, and invaded their privacy, have sabotaged and subverted the process of choosing candidates and electing a president—all that would be bad enough. But what is worse, because it is more ominous, because of what it says about us as a people, is that so many view this conduct as merely the sort of foul play one expects and tolerates in the game of politics. After all, as any sports fan knows, if the penalty is within the calculated risk, a well-timed foul can do a lot for a clever team. If we may judge from the survey findings, the symptoms of a serious malaise in our society disturb no more than a minority of our citizens. We seem unable to understand that more than a game plan has gone wrong.

LITTLE PUBLIC ATTENTION

What made it possible for us to get into such a mess or what should be done to correct it are questions that attract remarkably little public attention. Compare, if you will, our complacency now with our consternation when the Russians orbited their Sputnik ahead of our first satellite. A wave of embarrassment and self-recrimination swept the country as we tried to decide who had lost that first heat of the space race for us. Men who should have known better blamed the schools, castigating them for not producing physicists and engineers to match Russia's. Later, when revised federal budgets had enabled us to soar ahead of the Russians, few bothered to note that the people who produced the successful plans and hardware were products of the very schools that a few years earlier the critics had condemned.

Today, when questions about the part education should play in the political process would be very much to the point, almost nobody is asking them. And even when questions are raised, they miss the central point. Several days ago a friend suggested to me that we at Teachers College ought to be thinking about why the education of the principals in the Watergate affair did not develop in them more dependable character qualities. It's a fair question and an old one. In one form or another the relation between education and character has occupied philosophers and pedagogues for thousands of years. But a matter more fundamental than character weakness in a few dozen individuals is why our system of universal education has not engendered in our population as a whole a keener appreciation of moral values, a higher level of expectation toward our political system, and higher standards for judging our elected officials. Why do we so consistently expect mediocrity and accept mendacity in our political leaders?

Some find comfort in pointing out that the current unhappy disclosures demonstrate that our system does work. But even that assertation is doubtful. As John Gardner reminded us, the system very nearly didn't work. What did work was the sharp eye of a private security guard and the irrepressible persistence of two young Washington Post reporters.

To be sure, the checks and balances of our Constitution are there because our forebearers understood the hazards of unrestrained power and were acquainted with other human weaknesses. But our polity rests ultimately on the assumption that when ordinary men and women are suitably informed they may be expected most of the time to make political choices with intelligence, with reason, and in good faith. To support that assumption and give it continuing validity is one of the principal functions of popular education in a democracy. If our education has fallen short in performing that function, we had better know about it and we had better be doing something about it.

THE EDUCATORS

Harold Benjamin once wrote: "To know the education of a people it is necessary to know who all their schoolmasters are and in what disguises they operate."

The schoolmasters of the American people operate in many disguises. They speak with many voices. Some teach in familiar haunts and others offer instruction from the most unlikely places. They are called editors, producers, advertising managers, drill instructors, and vice presidents for corporate communications. They come as attorneys and archbishops, health commissioners and shop stewards, baby sitters, marriage counselors, and pilots of blimps with airborne commercials. Scoutmasters and stockbrokers; merchandisers and astrologers; pediatricians, pornographers, and policemen—all carry teaching loads in the common schools of our society. To all of them and countless more we owe the lessons that fill our days and nights and the curriculum that shapes our national character.

This network of public instruction is complex and far-flung. Within it, the competition for attention is as clever as it is endless. The teaching technology some of the schoolmasters employ is powerful beyond belief. And where, amongst all this talent and power, do you come in? School teacher, clinical psychologist, counselor, professor of philosophy, state administrator, or dean of a nursing school, what is there left for you to do? What is the professional educator's role in cultivating a heightened perception of the general welfare, a keener sense of personal responsibility, a morally grounded attitude toward public issues?

We who staff the institutions and agencies openly dedicated to education hold no commission to sanction what our countrymen may learn, what they believe, or what they choose to respect. We carry an obligation of a different order. It is to help those we teach to view every learning opportunity with discernment, to appraise their learnings in perspective, and put whatever they learn to constructive use.

We can do more. In our daily routines and as contributors to the policies of our institutions we can insist on a comprehensive conception of the public interest. An increasingly popular notion holds that when contending special interests have been accommodated through compromise or concession the public interest has been served. It happens to be a mistaken idea. If I may slightly twist an ancient fable: That the elephants have settled their differences is no reason to believe that the welfare of the ants has been protected. Due regard for articulate special interests is a necessary part of public policy formation, but by no means is that the whole process.

THE PEOPLE

Walter Lippmann's observation, now twenty years old, carries unusual timeliness today. The phrase "The People of the United States," meaning the authority that ordained and established the Constitution, Mr. Lippmann pointed out, should not be defined as the inhabitants of the country on June 21, 1788. In the course of that day some citizens of the United States died and others were born. In a century, the entire population had been altered.

"The People," Lippmann wrote, "are a corporation, an entity which lives on while individuals come into it and go out of it . . . Besides the happiness and security of the individuals of whom a community is at the moment composed, there are also the happiness and security of the individuals of whom generation after generation it will be composed."

The moral is easy to state but difficult to live by: Those who happen temporarily to hold responsibility and authority in government or, we may add, in an institution, are not owners but trustees. The terms of that trust make them accountable not only legally for the present, but morally to the past and to the future.

Good citizenship in such a society as ours includes, to be sure, self discipline and a commitment to civility in public affairs. But it demands also respect for what has preceded and a feeling of responsibility for what will ensue.

"The generations are," as Bernard of Chartres put it, "like dwarfs seated on the shoulders of giants" and enabled therefore "to see more things than the Ancients and things more distant."

BUSINESS OF EDUCATION

It is quite the proper business of education, and most particularly it is our business now, to remind the current generation of the appropriateness of humility and faithfulness in discharging our common social and political stewardship. A major part of our own stewardship as educators is to keep alive those principles of the good and free society that transcend personal preference and temporary expediency. Such principles Lippmann calls the Public Philosophy: regard for rationality, the tradition of civility, the assurance of due process, and so on through the familiar catalog that free men, when they are wise, cherish and cultivate.

Most of us are aware that our institutions still stand on foundations formed by those principles, but many who use the institutions do not understand the principles, they have not learned to value them, and they are ignorant of what is necessary to preserve them.

Civilization is no laissez-faire matter. A liberal democracy, like ours, is no open arena offering unfettered free play to every form of personal initiative. Maintaining a free and good society is intricate and demanding: it calls for discipline, intelligence, artistry, charity, justice. Unless the people and their agents alike share a constant concern for the commonweal, neither liberty nor equality can long survive. It is precisely the weakening of regard for the commonweal that threatens us, in the nation and in our neighborhoods. Unless we become aware of that threat and move to meet it, this country is in for trouble.

WATERGATE

No show in recent memory has enjoyed such advance notices as the one that will be opening in the Senate Caucus Room on May 17th. We may anticipate fascinating tales of malfeasance in federal office and stories of hidden treasure rivaling the legends of Captain Kidd. But as we watch and listen we had better keep clear what ought to be disturbing us. It is not the instances of arrogant illegality in high places that should worry us, but the far more extensive, if less dramatic, evidence that so many less prominent centers of power, so many individual hearts and minds, are motivated by the same selfish purposes, the same disrespect for decency and democracy. Watergate, we have been told, is but the tip of the iceberg. That may be true in a sense the investigative reporters never intended to convey.

Most educators long ago rejected the idea that the school's proper work is to mold students to a predetermined pattern of moral behavior. In the shifting lexicon of our profession even the term "character education" has become dated and dusty. Yet it remains undeniable that in every school some sort of moral climate prevails. That climate is determined in part by the social milieu in which the school exists, in part by the attitudes and assumptions teachers reflect in their own behavior, in part by the explicit attention teachers and students direct to issues touching on moral and ethical values.

Every teacher must determine how to deal

with these facts of educational life. Are we to accept the prevailing moral milieu uncritically? Will we examine our own assumptions and attitudes? Shall we purposefully design approaches to involve our students in considering moral issues?

Whatever we choose to do, every decision to commit or to omit is certain to have consequences. Those consequences, gradually and in accumulation, alter personalities and influence the evolution of a society. That our decisions should be respectful of each individual and his individuality hardly needs to be said. My argument today is that those decisions should also respect our moral and cultural heritage, the commonwealth of values that, being too often taken for granted, is commonly neglected. We can play a major part toward correcting that error. We ought to play it and I hope we shall, not only with feeling, but with conviction.

For the splendid accomplishments that already stand to your credit, I hail you. In whatever good work you want and mean to do in the years ahead, my wish is that you *fare well!*

NEW CITY GOVERNMENT FOR WASHINGTON, D.C.—A SUMMARY OF H.R. 9682

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the bill voted out 20 to 4 by the D.C. Committee will modernize the city government for the Nation's Capital. The main features of the bill are given in the following memorandum:

SUMMARY OF H.R. 9682—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SELF-GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION ACT

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, PURPOSES, AND DEFINITIONS

This title contains the short title, purposes, and definitions of the principal terms used in the bill.

TITLE II—GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

In accord with recommendations of the Nelsen Commission, this title gives the Mayor and City Council broad powers heretofore held by four major Federal or quasi-federal agencies—the Redevelopment Land Agency, the National Capital Housing Authority, the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Manpower Administration.

SEC. 201. Redevelopment Land Agency.

The RLA is established as an agency of the District of Columbia Government. Its corporate status and board of directors are retained but the District Government is given the authority to dissolve the corporation.

SEC. 202. National Capital Housing Authority.

The NCHA is transferred to the District Government.

SEC. 203. National Capital Planning Commission and Municipal Planning.

The NCPC is designated as a Federal Planning Agency for the Federal Establishment in the District and the Mayor is designated as the central planning agency for the District except for Federal and international projects. The Commissioner and the NCPC shall publish the comprehensive plan for the District, composed of the plan for the federal interest drawn up by the Commission and the plan for the District drawn by the Commissioner. This section changes the composition of the NCPC and sets out the procedure for submitting all comprehensive plans and amendments to the NCPC prior to their implementation and for a NCPC veto if it finds that the plans adversely affect the Federal interest.

SEC. 204. District of Columbia Manpower Administration.

This section transfers responsibility for the administration of the District's public employment program, unemployment compensation, apprenticeship training programs, and the workman's compensation program from the Department of Labor to the District of Columbia Government.

TITLE III—DISTRICT CHARTER PREAMBLE, LEGISLATIVE POWER AND CHARTER AMENDING PROCEDURE

This title delegates legislative power from the Congress to the District of Columbia Government.

TITLE IV—THE DISTRICT CHARTER

This title contains the charter for the District of Columbia, outlining the basic components of the new government. This title must be approved in a charter referendum and is amendable only in a referendum by the people.

Part A—The Council

This part establishes that there will be a 13 member council, with 5 members elected at-large, 8 elected from wards, in partisan elections, held in the even, non-Presidential years. No more than three at-large candidates may be nominated by any one party. The Chairman of the Council is to be elected by the Council from among the at-large members. This part sets the qualifications for holding office, compensation for members, the powers of the Council and the procedure for filling a vacancy.

Part B—The Mayor

This part establishes the Office of Mayor. The Mayor is elected for a four year term simultaneous with those of the Council members. This part also sets the compensation, qualifications and the means for filling a vacancy.

Part C—The judiciary

This part vests the judicial power in the D.C. Court of Appeals and the D.C. Superior Court, establishes a D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission and continues the D.C. Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure. Both Commissions shall be composed of 9 members, including appointments by the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate and by the Unified Bar of the District of Columbia. This part provides for the Mayor to nominate judges for 15 year terms from lists provided by the D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission. It also provides a process for the removal, suspension and involuntary retirement of judges.

This part is not amendable by Charter amendment. Also provided in Title VI is a section which prohibits the Council from changing Title 11 of the D.C. Code providing for the organization, administration and jurisdiction of the District Courts.

Part D—District budget and financial management

This part institutes comprehensive expenditure control systems for both operating and capital outlay activities, establishes the office of Auditor (responsible to the legislative branch), and authorizes the General Accounting Office to audit all accounts and operations of the D.C. Government. This part requires the Mayor to annually submit a budget to the Council and the Congress which shall include a multiyear plan and a multiyear capital improvement plan for all agencies of the District, a program performance report comparing actual performance of as many programs as is practicable, and an issue analysis statement. It also provides for the City Council to appropriate monies on a line item basis.

Part E—Borrowing

This part provides for the sale of non-taxable general obligations and revenue bonds.

Part F—Independent agencies

This part continues the existing status of 5 independent agencies. It changes the appointive procedures so that the Mayor shall appoint the members of the Board of Elections with the advice and consent of the Council. Those appointments to the Zoning Commission, the Public Service Commission and the Armory Board previously made by the President shall be made by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the Council. This part also states that changes in the zoning maps shall not be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan for the District and that all changes must be submitted to the NCPC for its comments. This part provides for the Mayor and Council to set the maximum amount for the annual budget for the School Board with the Board specifying the purposes for which such funds shall be expended.

Part G—Recall procedure

This part establishes the procedures for the recall of the Mayor or any member of the City Council or Board of Education by the voters of the District.

TITLE V—FEDERAL PAYMENT

This title authorizes an annual federal payment for fiscal years 1976–1977 "in such amounts as the Congress may from time to time appropriate." The Mayor is required to develop intercity expenditure and revenue comparisons based on certain specified criteria in preparing his recommendation to the Council for the amount of the federal payment. The recommendation of the District Government is submitted to OMB which transmits it to Congress.

TITLE VI—RESERVATION OF CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY

Congress retains the right to enact legislation for the District on any subject and to pass an act disapproving any action taken by the District of Columbia Council. The Council is also prohibited from doing certain things, including: imposing a tax on U.S. property, changing Title 11 of the D.C. Code providing for the organization, administration and jurisdiction of the Courts, imposing any tax on personal income of any person not a resident of the District, permitting the construction of buildings in excess of the present heights limitations set by Congress.

TITLE VII—REFERENDUM AND SUCCESSION IN GOVERNMENT; TEMPORARY PROVISIONS; MISCELLANEOUS; AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION ACT; RULES OF CONSTRUCTION; AND EFFECTIVE DATES

This title provides for a referendum on Title IV of this Act. It amends the Hatch Act and the District of Columbia Election Act. It authorizes neighborhood councils and provides for the continuation of the Court system and the Board of Education. It also establishes the powers of the President during the transitional period and gives the dates on which the various sections of this Act will go into effect.

THE HANDICAP TAX

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would grant an additional tax deduction to parents who have a disabled dependent child under the age of 19. Such

legislation is needed to help these families meet the extra financial costs created by the educational and health care demands of the handicapped child.

Each year the Congress approves funding for programs designed to aid the disabled child. Yet these programs, particularly the educational ones, do not reach two-thirds of the handicapped children who require such services. At present, there are more than 7 million disabled children in this country. Of these, there are 2,445,550 children with a speech impairment; 1,388,000 with emotional disturbances; 1,697,500 mentally retarded; 697,300 with learning disabilities; 348,600 hard of hearing; 52,300 deaf, 348,600 crippled; 69,800 visually handicapped; and 40,900 multihandicapped. Of this number, only 2,857,551 are being served; the other 4,225,949 remain unserved. This is a national disgrace.

In Massachusetts alone, more than 88,000 disabled children are helped though State schools and special private schools. Tuition costs at these schools depend on the severity of the disability, but costs generally run between $4,000 and $10,000 a year. Many parents simply cannot avoid such high expenses. I have received many letters from parents who have a handicapped child, but the financial burden is destroying the family. Here are some examples:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HARRINGTON: As the mother of an autistic boy, I am finding it very difficult to pay for his medical and dental care without aid. My son is non-verbal. Because of this handicap when he is ill, I have no way of knowing what or where he is having pain. I cannot afford to guess. This always results in a visit to the hospital.

With normal children an accident requiring stitches can be done quite quickly and simply. The mentally-ill child needs to be asleep; therefore, there is the added expense of operating room, anesthesia and an overnight stay in the hospital.

Recently we had a dentist bill of eight hundred dollars ($800.00) due to hospitalization. We are struggling to hold on to our home and keep up with all the other financial obligations.

Your kind interest in this vital matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————.

———

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am the parent of a severely emotionally disturbed fifteen year old daughter. Her condition has also been described at various times as autistic, both terms being a form of mental illness. She has been so afflicted since birth.

The Association for Mentally Ill Children (AMIC) has informed me that you are sponsoring a national health insurance plan and that you would be interested in knowing of the needs of these children and their parents in connection therewith.

As you may know, these have been the "forgotten children" of America. Their parents have struggled almost alone in attempting to better their lot in life. Although not counting the cost, in an effort to aid them we have found that like most unfortunates, the attempted cure has been expensive, very often to the detriment of the remaining children. I believe that these expenses should be included in a bill such as yours. It would seem that such a bill is justified only if costs such as these are reimbursed.

The following are several examples of what I mean. She was unable to attend public school and our only choice was to keep her at home or send her to an institutional school out of state. We felt she was an integral part of our family and only we could offer her a chance at a normal life. We prevailed on a nursery school-kindergarten in Roxbury to accept her at age 6 and allow her to spend the day with normal children and develop as much as possible. This went on for only six years at a cost of approximately $1,000.00 per year. She was on expensive medication during this time (and since) which could be tallied. I suppose into the thousand(s) dollars bracket. We have been able to find only one dentist who will treat her but this requires an anesthetist and other attendants leading to a bill of $200.00 or $300.00 each time she requires work. I could go on with other examples but I think enough is included to show that in addition to unmeasurable heartbreak, a great financial burden is imposed on the patients.

I appreciate this opportunity to communicate with you and thank you for your kind consideration.

Very truly yours,

———— ————.

———

MICHAEL HARRINGTON,
Representative, State House,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. HARRINGTON: We are the parents of a four-year-old daughter, who has been diagnosed encephalographic, autistic, mentally retarded, and emotionally disturbed.

Our trips to the neurologist and pediatrician are quite frequent, and at one time she was taking four prescriptions a day.

We were also sent to the Putnam Childrens' Center for psychiatric evaluation, and our insurance company paid a grand total of $10.00 on a $350.00 bill.

We are also forced to send her for nursry and therapy at the Cerebral Palsy Center in Lawrence (they are also equipped to handle other handicapped children) because there isn't a state program for her at present. Without assistance, we are paying approximately $130.00 per month for this education. We feel this is necessary until another appropriate program is available. She had been refused at the state program at the Fernald School.

We are also having to send her to a special dentist dealing with children who do not communicate. I do not have facts regarding this expense whereas she is having her first appointment on Nov. 4. But, I know that our insurance company, which is Washington National will not cover such dentistry.

As you can see, the expense of having a handicapped child is great, and the insurance program we have does not help us with this special type of coverage. We are beginning to feel the pressures of financial burden, and we wish you much success in obtaining insurance coverage for children with such special needs.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

———

GENTLEMEN: I am writing in regards for Health Insurance for Emotionally Disturbed Children. Children of this nature involve quite an extensive medical and dental expense. A regular dentist will not take him so I have to take him to the Children's Hospital Dental Clinic which charges more per visit. When he had to have fillings he had to go to the hospital and stay two days.

He has more white corpuscles than red so he has to get blood tests every year. He also has to have evaluation tests, E.E.G.'s and attend Seizure Clinic.

Yours truly,

———— ————.

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON,
The Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HARRINGTON: Like so many parents of children diagnosed as suffering from early childhood mental illness, I have known the burden of large medical bills which have run into thousands of dollars, and which have ranged from frequent psychiatric visits and regular therapeutic day care programs to expensive dental care to comprehensive evaluations including neurological exams and EEG's to bills for medication.

I don't know how many other families have had our experience of being unable to get any kind of health insurance coverage for their mentally ill children, but this was a worry and expense for six or seven years. When our Army health insurance was terminated because of his father's discharge from the service, we tried to arrange for coverage through Blue Cross, Continental Casualty and others. He was rejected by all; he was not even considered for partial coverage because of his disability. His case was reviewed every few years but always with the answer "No." Two years ago I was able to have him included under a group plan of Blue Cross because I worked for a large company and there were no questions asked. However, I am never quite sure about the validity of his coverage. Should his disability be questioned, after a medical crisis, as grounds for denying him coverage, we would be in serious financial trouble. We have been fortunate that he has had no prolonged physical illness or serious injury that would require hospitalization, or we would have been wiped out financially.

Although it sometimes seemed unfair to my other child to deny him in order to pay his bills, I had no choice. I had to do what was medically prescribed for my handicapped son, but how I wished there was some kind of aid to help with the bills!

I hope that the health problems of those who have chronic illnesses, mental or physical, will receive the careful consideration of Congress in developing a national health care program, so that families burdened by the care and worry of a handicapped child, need not be burdened by excessive financial hardship.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

———

GENTLEMEN. It has come to my attention that the proposed federal legislation providing for a National Health Insurance Plan does not, at present, include full coverage for treatment of mental illness. This is, in my view, a serious flaw that will only serve to compound the most grievous failure in the present practice of American medicine. Anyone familiar with the National Health Programs of European countries (Sweden, Denmark, Germany, for instance), can surely attest to you from experience that financial coverage for mental illness is of critical, social and medical importance.

The fact of mental illness alone has a destructive effect upon the family unit. The prognosis is usually uncertain and with it comes the kind of despair that drains confidence and hope and makes one fear the future. And it is at that time of distress, when one is least able to cope with it, that our system places on the family a huge and almost intolerable burden of expenses. The emotional shock, in other words, is compounded by a prolonged threat to the material resources of the family. I cannot imagine that this is medically defensible and the social destruction caused by this depressing burden is, as you must be aware, very severe.

You may perhaps have sensed that I am speaking here from personal and very painful experience. Because of unsuspected and undetected injuries at birth (we could not afford private medical care at that time), both of our boys are afflicted by severe emotional and speech impairments resulting from brain damage. They cannot live in a regular social setting and need special

schooling. When they were less than three years old we began to seek treatment for them. The costs of private therapy, extending over a period of years, were so great that I could not even begin to defray them from my salary. My wife was thus compelled to work full-time, even at highly irregular hours, in order to pay the bills from clinics and psychiatrists. And she had to do this at a time when she herself was suffering from serious fits of depression and needed medical attention and therapy. We spent well over ten-thousand dollars on psychiatric therapy alone.

After waiting for many years, we were finally fortunate enough to find a residential children's clinic that would accept our boys and offer them treatment and schooling during the week. But with this the financial problems did not end, of course. The State of Massachusetts bills us for $80 a day for these services. Since my daily income is less than $40, I cannot possibly hope to meet these expenses. My debts to the state are rising steadily and must by now amount to $60,000. Fortunately, the Department of Mental Health, has charity enough not to enforce payment. But the laws clearly state it could do so and could thus lay claim to whatever assets I have or may have in the future. This, gentlemen, is a miserable way to live, especially when one is used to paying one's bills and feels guilty when one cannot. And when and where will it end? I may still have to provide for these children twenty or thirty years from now unless they do recover.

I therefore urge you to include the coverage for treatment of mental illness—diagnosed as such by a certified medical board—in your projected health plan. What a relief it would be to pay a premium of let us say, $150 a month and then feel entitled to medical care without incurring a burden of financial guild. And as far as potential abuse is concerned (upper-class couch psychiatry, for instance), I am sure that any competent physician can tell genuine mental malfunction apart from social or emotional affectation.

I beg you earnestly to consider my plea.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

DEAR REP. HARRINGTON: The following is a list of expenses we have had for Health Evaluations:

Dr. Dodge, St. Louis	$1,500
Dr. Scholl, Boston	200
Dr. Yerkes, Brookline	2,400
Emerson special therapy	200
Dr. Lofgren, Boston	400
Prescription Ritalin	50

——— ———.

ASSOCIATION FOR MENTALLY ILL CHILDREN, REGION III CHAPTER,
Arlington, Mass., November 13, 1971.

Hon. MICHAEL HARRINGTON,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. HARRINGTON: I have recently been informed of your interest in the problems of emotionally-disturbed children. As president of the Region III Chapter of the Association for Mentally Ill Children I would like to convey to you some ideas of the problems which parents in our group have consistently faced. Although I speak in general terms only, I can assure you that my comments are supported by personal knowledge of many specific cases. I believe that these comments are, therefore, generally applicable to most such children throughout the state and the country as well.

Children who are in the categories that are referred to as severely emotionally disturbed or mentally ill comprise a relatively small group whose needs are both poorly understood and great. A very large portion of these children have a basic mental capability that is either normal or near normal (some may be above normal); however, for a wide variety of reasons they are functioning at a level of performance considerably below their potential. The reasons for their difficulties are in most cases poorly understood and difficult to diagnose. In a recent survey of parents within our chapter it was revealed that eighteen (18) different diagnoses have at one time or another been applied to a sample of nineteen (19) different children, in some cases as many as six (6) different diagnoses being applied to one child. An examination of this survey also reveals that there are large differences both in the degree and nature of the problems among the nineteen children involved.

The complex, poorly-understood nature of these problems and the relatively small number of children involved (which results in poor public understanding of them) are the roots of our current problems. These are that this group of children, with a very few exceptions, is not getting an adequate level of care and training properly planned to meet their needs. As a consequence our current expectancy must be that the majority will never make significant progress and will end up in custodial care in institutions. The price of such a situation in terms of lost potential, of long-term cost of sometimes unnecessary custodial care, of parental frustration, and of knowledge that we as able American citizens have not provided an opportunity for full participation in the joys of life to this unfortunate minority of children, is indeed very great. For the reason it is my belief that these children need and deserve very special consideration in planning any program for general public health care, such as the various proposals now being considered by Congress.

Over the past few years there has been great progress in improving our capability to help these children. New schools and new classes using innovative techniques have been established which are beginning to yield very encouraging results, sometimes with children who had previously appeared to be hopeless. Some of these programs involve use of behavior modification techniques; many involve very intensive levels of instruction with a high instructor/pupil ratio; most involve a careful programming of instruction to fit the individual needs and capabilities of each child. Only a small number of our children is currently receiving the benefits of such programs; however, their existence provides a ray of hope for all. Possibly more importantly, a considerable reservoir of professional personnel skilled in new techniques is beginning to accumulate.

There are currently two principal obstacles to providing adequate care for these children. The first is lack of funds to provide the necessary facilities. The second is the need for effective management of the process of providing care and training for them. The first and foremost is the financial aspect. The cost of training and education for these children varies widely dependent upon the nature of each child's problem and the type of facility into which he is entered. Representative programs and approximate costs are illustrated below:

1. Special education class for emotionally-disturbed children—$2,000/year.
2. Class in private day school for emotionally-disturbed children—$3,000/year.
3. Residential schools for emotionally-disturbed children—$8,000 to $10,000/year.
4. Intensive day school program for emotionally-disturbed children—$8000/year plus.
5. Intensive residential school program for emotionally-disturbed children—$20,000/year.

These rates are representative of actual situations in Massachusetts when available financial help can be obtained from the 750 program. Most of this help is in categories one (1) to three (3) described above and the availability of such help is limited by budgeting considerations, bureaucratic inertia, etc., so that only a portion of our needy children can obtain that care. In addition, because of the variations in causes and the lack of precise diagnosis it is often difficult for parents to establish that their children are eligible for these programs. For children who are to any extent seriously disturbed the very intensive programs illustrated by categories four (4) and five (5) above are needed for a period of two to three years to upgrade their performance to the point that they can benefit from the less intensive programs.

It is quite apparent that very few parents can afford programs in categories three (3) to five (5) above and many, probably most, cannot afford the less expensive ones in categories one (1) and two (2). For those that can there is normally a financial sacrifice that causes hardships for all other members of the family. Thus we see a situation in which only the erudite relatively wealthy minority of people are in positions to provide proper care for their emotionally-disturbed children. The poor, the uneducated, the members of underprivileged classes cannot hope to be able to provide adequate care and training for their children.

The best way to provide for our mentally-ill/emotionally-disturbed children is by considering them as being a special class of people suffering from "catastrophic illness" who are placed in a special category to be funded entirely by the government under the national health program expected to be legislated into law in the coming session of Congress. Having been assured that funding is available when needed the existing school capacity will expand rapidly to meet the need. By establishing a special category the second major obstacle to providing adequate care and training can also be overcome. A small unit within the administrative structure supervising the national public health programs can be created to run this program. It would hopefully be manned primarily with professional personnel who are especially qualified to handle these children. They could therefore see that children are provided care and training on the basis of need and not of diagnosis.

With the type of program described in this letter our emotionally-disturbed/mentally-ill children should be able to get the training which will permit them to perform up to their full potential. This should reduce the case load in our mental institutions in the long run, thereby realizing net economies. In addition our society would benefit by the efforts of the "useful citizens" who are the successful products of this program. Lastly, our national conscience would be satisfied by knowing that we have fulfilled our moral obligations to our unfortunate children.

I and all members of Region III Chapter appreciate your interest and receive encouragement from your efforts.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES E. HARRISON, *President.*

Below is a list of approximate costs incurred during the last six years in caring for our seriously disturbed child.

Evaluations:	
Boston Floating Hospital	$100
Kennedy Memorial Hospital	100
Benhaven School	100
Putnam Childrens Center	25
Framingham Youth Guidance Center	25
Parmenter Health Center	15
Tuitions per month:	
Putnam Childrens Center (2 years)	70
Benhaven School	35
In-patient treatment per month: Kennedy Memorial Hospital—80 percent covered by insurance—forced to remove our child when insurance payments reached $10,000 (8 months)	1,500
Out-patient treatment: Orthopedics, Neurology-Kennedy Memorial (1 year)	200

Therapies:

Boston Floating Hospital—2½ years (per month plus transportation, parking)	70
Robbins Speech Clinic—2 years (per year plus transportation and parking)	225
Vitamin program (1 time cost)	50

Medications.—Tranquilizers and anticonvulsants: variable costs.

Dental work.—All work except examination and cleaning requires overnight hospitalization.

Medical costs of the families for their disabled children are met by the Federal or State government only if the parents are on welfare. Health insurance costs are high and many families with a disabled child cannot afford the insurance. In addition, insurance does not cover the cost of special education and training and only rarely covers the costs of mental illness.

Under present law, a person can claim an additional exemption for a blind spouse. There is no reason why this cannot be extended to include all handicapped children. The rationale is the same for each, but in the case for the children, the expenses incurred by the family is far greater. Many families depend on the additional income of a working teenager, but when the youth is crippled, it is harder to find work at all, much less work that pays a decent wage.

Many families with a crippled child do not make enough to pay taxes. They, of course, would not be affected by this legislation. However, I have introduced and cosponsored other legislation to provide health care and education to all handicapped children. This legislation that I am introducing today will provide direct assistance to the families that need the financial break. It would be a major step in recognizing the needs of the family. For it is not just one person who is affected when a child is handicapped but it is the entire family unit. It is this family that we are trying to aid, while alleviating the additional financial burden.

Since I have no computer, it is impossible for me to give an accurate cost figure at this time. However, I have asked the Internal Revenue Service to provide me with that information which I will make available as soon as it is received.

The Ways and Means Committee, to which this bill will be referred, is in the process of considering tax reform legislation. I urge the committee to give its most careful attention to this proposal.

PUBLIC POLICY AND GRADUATE EDUCATION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of Members of the House a speech recently delivered by our distinguished colleague from Washington, Mr. MEEDS, before the Council of Graduate Schools.

Although Mr. MEEDS, who made such significant contributions to the development of the Education Amendments of 1972, makes several illuminating points, I want to cite, in particular, his view that the current apparent oversupply of Ph. D.'s has been artificially induced by the Nixon administration's unwillingness to fund elementary and secondary education programs, as well as medical research programs, at anything near the levels that are needed.

Concludes Mr. MEEDS:

What I'm trying to suggest is that a significant part of this . . . oversupply is a self-fulfilling prophecy on the part of the Nixon Administration. The White House is dictating a paucity of professionals because of an absence of aspiration.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD, Mr. MEEDS' cogent analysis of the current state of graduate education.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN LLOYD MEEDS

At the outset let me express my gratitude to your co-chairmen, Dean Joseph L. McCarthy and Dean C. J. Nyman, for inviting me to discuss graduate education with you. With the large number of Deans present, this may be one of the few occasions in the nation where one can refer to the "Dean business" and mean something other than the Watergate. It does seem, however, the White House has become the ultimate isolated ivory tower.

Whatever the term used when graduate deans deliberate, there are several quite serious issues to be discussed here. The Nation's future is in large degree dependent on the work in which you are involved. Graduate education is not the solution to all our problems but it can provide people with the means through which solutions can be found.

GRADUATE EDUCATION IN TROUBLE

There is at the moment considerable debate over whether graduate schools are part of the problem itself, rather than a gateway to solutions. There is no better way to awaken the sleeping or to galvanize those listening than to repeat the opening sentence of the Newman report: "Graduate education in the United States is in trouble." As you know, the report then describes the decline and fall from a golden age of growth. The strong implication is that unless drastic measures are taken, this sort of "golden age" may be of the type that precedes senility and death. That is a severe judgment, a heatedly disputed judgment, but one that cannot be ignored.

The bases for that judgment are well known: charges of oversupply, failure to plan properly, education for education's sake, academic prejudices, the PhD glut, training out of tune with national needs, etc., etc. All these assertions have at least some validity. But I am convinced the major contributing factor is something else—a failure of national leadership.

The rapid expansion of graduate schools—particularly in the early and mid-1960's—was a sign of national vitality and concern. Education was a prime national priority and so were concerns about the human and social needs of this nation. I fully believe—and I expect to be disputed on this point—that graduate schools at that time proceeded with considerable concern for our national priorities. It is also my feeling that the current downturn in graduate education is merely symptomatic of the lack of commitment by the current administration to those same national priorities. There is no longer a commitment to solve the problems we attempted to deal with in the early and mid-1960's. The result is a malaise not only in graduate education but in all education . . . and indeed in most other areas of social concern.

UNMET COMMITMENTS

It is true that graduate enrollment growth has stalled. It is true that there are more Doctors of Education than we presently can use. And it is true that grave dislocations have resulted in proverbial cab drivers with doctorates. But I think the situation would be entirely different had we fully met those commitments we made back in the early and mid-1960's. If we had met that commitment to the children of this nation by appropriating more than one-third of the authorized funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. And think about this. What would be the demand right now for educators with advanced degrees, cross-disciplinary education and training if President Nixon had not vetoed the Early Childhood Development Act?

Those are just two aspirations in which I have been heavily involved where there has been a recent failure of nerve—and conscience—in the White House. There are many others.

I helped write the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I'll never forget the hopes many of us had that we were extending the American dream to the educationally disadvantaged. But the Vietnam war got in the way and we have not yet attempted this dream at the scope we envisioned.

I also recall the great expectations when we launched the Early Childhood Development Act from committee. Here we were finally beginning to deal with children at an age when a difference could really be made. But that dream foundered on a veto by Mr. Nixon and an intemperate veto message smearing the program as a bone tossed to the right wing.

If we had met our commitment to just those two programs, I submit that far from a surplus of advanced degree holders in education, we would probably be in a state of shortage right now.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

And what if we were really meeting our needs in the field of medical research and manpower? Nowhere is there a clearer contrast between aspiration and performance. Budget cuts of $20 million, $18 million, or $10 million research and training grants are dismissed with the rationale they are no longer needed. I think the following quotation from the budget message of the Secretary of HEW speaks for itself:

"In previous years, as support for biomedical research increased, the need for additional researchers was clear, and research training received federal funding. Research budgets, except in special areas, are now being stabilized, and the general need for a greater number of trained biomedical research scientists has passed. In this sense, the Federal role in the support of massive increases in trained research manpower has been fulfilled. A continued Federal push to train researchers may well lead to an oversupply of scientists who will be unable to find appropriate employment."

The administration's cuts in the Federal budget have certainly done wonders to create an oversupply in areas where research grants were eliminated . . . such areas as stroke, kidney disease and mental health . . . just to name a few that are eliminated or drastically reduced.

And I'm having a little trouble assimilating the notion that we are approaching a proper level of health care for our citizens. On the contrary, I think we've got a long ways to go before every citizen of the United States has the opportunity for decent health care. How many research positions would there be if we had some kind of universal health plan . . . as we should?

We don't have enough physicians right now to cover the small towns in the second congressional district. That's why the regional medical program started the Darrington Clinic with nurse-practitioners. But the Nixon administration wants to eliminate the RMP efforts as well.

SELF-FULFILLING PROPHECY

What I'm trying to suggest is that a significant part of this health field oversupply is a self-fulfilling prophecy on the part of the Nixon administration. The White House is dictating a paucity of professionals because of an absence of aspiration.

And oh yes, the lowly graduate student. We are told graduate degree seekers can now make their own way, subject to the largesse of shrunken scholarship funds and . . . as sometimes happens . . . the local welfare authorities. As for science students, again I quote from the HEW budget message: "the incomes of doctoral level scientists are such as to make it appropriate to expect them to bear the cost of their training themselves. Amounts secured through loans can be repaid from adequate salaries after training is completed." You'll be happy to know that—I'm sure some of you didn't know until you were told by HEW.

What this all seems to amount to is a perverse puritan ethic: If you really deserve a graduate degree, obviously you are worthy enough to be able to pay for it yourself. If you need assistance, then you obviously aren't worthy.

Meanwhile, the administration has requested a $4.7 billion increase in the Pentagon budget—which is almost the exact amount they ask be cut from the health budget.

SELF-INFLICTED WOUNDS

But I didn't come here just to damn the perfidious administration and call for a retaliatory strike on the office of management and budget. There are some real problems in graduate education besides fund cuts . . . and there is a real political lesson to be learned. I'm not an educator and I lay no claim to academic expertise. But as a practicing politician I can tell you that the recent reverses suffered by graduate schools in the political arena were at least partly self-inflicted. These proposed budget cuts are hard to restore on Capitol Hill because of a lack of support from the graduate schools. Most Members of Congress are simply unaware of the havoc in research and intellectual progress that could result. And the reason they are uninformed is because you haven't told them. The simple, short and unpleasant truth is that national policy will not be changed just by a lot of griping at faculty meetings. Let me give you an example.

Last year, I served on the Conference Committee that wrote the final version of the Higher Education Act of 1972. That was one of the most important Federal laws affecting higher education in this century. Some observers compared it to milestones such as the creation of land-grant colleges. That conference lasted for months, and during that entire time I do not recall being contacted by a single graduate school dean.

But during the same period, my office was nearly overrun by jobless political science PhD's and social scientists. So empirically, on the basis of available evidence, I could have concluded one: the graduate schools must not have any problems with this legislation, and two: they're so heavily funded the market is glutted with doctoral candidates.

You know and I know those are cruelly distorted generalizations. But the reason I know it is because I serve on the Education and Labor Committee and try to follow higher education issues. Most Congressmen don't have the time. All they may see is those stranded jobseekers and a continuing pile of mail complaining about Federal spending.

The only education news they may receive is the latest student activity sufficiently bizarre to titillate the news media.

So when the administration points to graduate overproduction and says cut here, well, somebody better be there to defend graduate schools. We're all getting a lot of heat on Federal deficit spending, and unprotected budgets get cut. Its as simple as that, as those of you who follow interest group theory know.

ACADEMICS AND THE POLITICAL PROCESS

The solution? I'm going to make what to many of you academicians may regard as a horribly improper suggestion. It's called get into politics. For many years educators stood back, shook their heads and accepted the dashing of aspirations as a flock of sheep lead to the inevitable. As late as 1961, a poll by the National Education Association of its own members showed that 51% felt it was improper to be involved in politics.

Any reordering of national priorities will be achieved in the same manner it occurred initially—by the political process. You may not like this process which is, as Winston Churchill put it, "The worst form of government, except all others." The alternative is the priority imposed by the Nixon administration and the current Federal budget.

By getting politically active I am really asking more of you than punching doorbells, writing letters and informing your elected Representatives. The key phrase in the Newman report, in my view, is: "The root of the problem is that there is little constructive debate on what the Federal role in graduate education really should be."

APPROPRIATE FEDERAL ROLE

All too many of the letters written, articles published, and testimony presented protesting the changing pattern of Federal support has focused on money alone. Too little effort has been spent in making and clarifying the appropriate Federal role. You can help clarify that role.

The administration's position, as outlined in the budget request, is that the pattern of higher education should follow an Adam Smith supply-and-demand theory. Graduate enrollments and specialties should correspond to the job market, with little or no planning ahead.

I believe our Nation is too complex, its needs are too great and its people too dependent on one another to produce scientists and top educators in random priorities.

The Federal Government, simply as supplier of money, is in a position to put some coherence into where we are going, meeting our need for social scientists, guiding the drift of biomedical research or starting out into complete, basic unknowns and cross-disciplinary explorations.

I believe we are going to need an educated infrastructure to prepare for needed social change in this Nation—to make good on our commitments to ourselves and our children. That's my goal—or at least one of them. But ours is not a government designed to unilaterally impose priorities or pathways upon graduate schools or anything else. And that brings us back to the political commitment I am asking of you today.

A PUBLIC DISCUSSION

I am asking that you commit yourselves, as educators and deans, to join in public discussion on the course of graduate education in this country. The public and the Congress needs your expertise and your opinions on such questions as what fields of inquiry should be stressed, how graduate education should be financed, how post-graduate study can be linked to our social and humanitarian needs, how we can avoid some of the shoals detected in the Newman Report and . . . perhaps most importantly . . . how to increase public understanding and encouragement of our intellectual and social progress?

Frankly, I don't have any pat answers. No single person in that room, on that campus, or in the Congress is likely to have all the answers. But together, if we can open up this discussion to include academicians, politicians, and thoughtful citizens throughout the Nation, we may be able to wrest graduate education from the limitations of happenstance, overspecialization, erratic funding, and insufficient planning into the foundation for the future progress of this society.

Now I'd like to hear your views.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN FINANCING ACT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a Federal Campaign Financing Act which would provide for the substantial public financing of Presidential primary and general elections. It would also severely limit the size of private contributions to such campaigns.

Most of my congressional colleagues are deeply distressed about the way in which campaign funding now occurs. The Watergate scandal has revealed to us and to the public the degree to which it is possible to abuse an electoral process which depends heavily upon private financing and which has few legal controls. There can be no doubt today that large donations given secretly cause a lack of confidence in Government when they are ultimately discovered and a corruption of Government when not discovered. In fact, it is reasonable to state that any large campaign contribution, no matter how "clean" its source or its purpose, now raises doubt, justifiable or not, in the public about the honesty of the recipient official.

Government means little unless it has the confidence of the people. It is the duty of the Congress to insure that this confidence is maintained. One of the most important duties of the Congress is to establish guidelines or standards which will protect the public interest. In the case at hand, the most reasonable standard is one which prescribes limits for private funding of political campaigns, and which clearly sets forth the public interest by establishing a system for providing public financing.

A Campaign Financing Act such as the one I propose offers a dual set of protections, however. Not only does it advance the idea that the public should be as free as possible from doubt about the influences which affect its officials, but it also frees the current large contributor from his fear that if he does not come in with a large gift there will be retribution against him from an offended President or one of his minions in the Executive Establishment. The great corporations in the United States should not have to feel that they must purchase fair treatment for their interests. Their products, serv-

ices, and needs should receive governmental consideration on their merits, and there should be no Federal official waiting in the shadows for a campaign contribution which will insure that this is the case.

Of course, the great pressure on all political figures today is the cost of campaigning for any elected office. The Presidency is only the most extreme example of cost escalation. Last year campaign costs for all candidates for public office totaled at least $400 million—one-third more than was spent 4 years before. The governorship of a large State may cost the winner $3 million or more in campaign funds, but that is only a fraction of the total spent by all the candidates in any one of those races. Many candidates have to drop out because they are "financially unqualified" to hold high office, not because their programs and plans lack merit. We know that this is true in the extreme for prospective Presidential candidates during the primary election phase, and that both major parties, have been left in debt because of the system of campaign financing.

The bill which I am introducing will make it possible for any viable candidate to get a running start at a campaign without compromising his principles or coming under undue influence from big money sources. It will tend to force candidates to concentrate on small income sources, and thereby to attend more carefully to the interests of the public at the grassroots level. Most important of all, my bill would go far toward restoring the faith of the public in the integrity of the Government, and would thereby make the Government more effective.

CONGRESSMAN PIKE'S REFLECTIONS ON MATTERS MILITARY

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, one of the benefits of serving on the House Armed Services Committee is the opportunity we committee members have to enjoy the quick mind and the quick wit of our colleague, Congressman OTIS PIKE, of New York.

Congressman PIKE is invariably probing, witty, and occasionally unorthodox. This combination encourages you to pay attention and if you listen you are rewarded with some shrewd observations and analysis.

The July 1973 issue of Armed Forces Journal carries a characteristic Pike performance.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the article follows:

THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX REVISITED

(By Representative OTIS G. PIKE)

Representative Otis G. Pike (R-N.Y.) presented this very timely and provocative speech to the Armed Forces Management Association in Washington on 7 June.

Pike, a veteran member of the House Armed Services Committee, is a cantankerous friend of the military. He fumes at some of the Pentagon's maneuverings but basically supports military budgets and is a proponent of a strong defense. Recently he took the forefront in getting the Navy to stop practice firing on the Puerto Rican island of Culebra where for thirty years the less than 1,000 American citizens living there have been harassed by U.S. Navy's weapons training. Despite his serious demeanor, Pike retains a sense of humor. His periodic press releases are read regularly by non-constituents who appreciate biting satire with serious overtones.

By way of setting the stage, I would like to read an extract from what I am sure is the favorite newspaper of this distinguished audience. "The President has boldly and courageously committed this Nation to a great power role in Asia. It is a role for which many of his countrymen may not be prepared. It is a role from which most of them surely would like to escape. It is a role that history would have compelled them to disavow or embrace sooner or later . . . The President's paper is simply a declaratory statement describing the task we have already undertaken—and one that we undertook, if we had rigidly understood it—the moment that World War II compelled us to assemble the greatest military force in world history. That force and power deprived us of the luxury of indifference toward or isolation of events anywhere in the world."

Incredious as it may seem that was a verbatim extract from an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post.

Not yesterday's edition, obviously, but rather the one that came out July 13, 1966, not seven years ago.

Perhaps the secret of remaining abreast of the "Times"—or the "Post"—and garnering all those Pulitzer Prizes is not to become overly-rigid in one's thinking.

Four years ago in presenting to Congress his views on the threat which American military power must be prepared to withstand, Secretary Laird described the threat thus—

"While we do not consider aggression by the USSR likely in the present political climate, the fact remains that the Soviets have a vital interest in preserving the status quo in Central Europe and to retaining their hold on Eastern Europe. A crisis that could lead to a conflict could arise if the political situation substantially changed in a way that threatened the USSR or its hegemony over Eastern Europe, or if a Soviet government saw opportunities for other ways to apply critical pressures on the cohesion of the Alliance. Such a crisis could escalate to hostilities."

Tremendous changes have taken place since that time. A year ago in February the President of the United States accompanied by a full brigade of reporters and television cameramen exchanged toasts of hospitality and friendship with Mao Tse Tung and Chou En Lai. One year ago last month with another brigade of reporters and cameramen, President Nixon visited Moscow and signed an agreement which allegedly limited strategic arms. Soviet basketball teams play ours all over America. Chinese gymnasts have replaced Chinese ping-pong players as a stellar attraction. Russian diplomats lounge in their Embassy and Chinese diplomats lounge at the Mayflower.

These fantastic breakthroughs in our international relations have caused such a tremendous re-evaluation over at the Pentagon that this year the Secretary of Defense said:

"While we do not consider aggression by the USSR likely in the present political climate, the fact remains that the Soviets have a vital interest in [illegible] preserving the status quo in Central Europe and in retaining their hold on Eastern Europe. A crisis that could lead to a conflict could arise if the political situation substantially changed in a way that threatened the USSR or its hegemony over Eastern Europe, or if a Soviet government saw opportunities for other ways to apply critical pressures on the cohesion of the Alliance. Such a crisis could escalate to hostilities."

I can't tell you which Secretary of Defense said it, for I don't remember which week it was said, but it's as if the Rip Van Winkles of the Pentagon had not heard about anything which has happened in the past four years.

Our defense planners really ought to be launching a new talent search for a more likely villain to portray in their annual analysis of the military threat.

Russell Baker, the joker-in-residence with the *New York Times,* may have inadvertently come up with a likely candidate. In a recent column he speculated on the choices open to the President to distract the media's obsessive attention away from Watergate. His inspired first choice was that the President should bomb France.

Considering the wariness with which Presidents Pompidou and Nixon faced each other on neutral ground up in Iceland last week, this may not be as funny as Baker intended. Even the codfish swimming offshore held promise of doing what France had failed to do, that is, break up the NATO alliance, the cornerstone of all U.S. foreign policy.

The trouble that a lot of us seem to be having in rethinking a coherent defense posture for this great nation, I suspect, really stems from the trouble we're having shaking off the spell of Camelot. Who in this room, for example, can forget the exhilaration on hearing John F. Kennedy's great declaration: "We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

But that was in 1961, and the ensuing decade has made it abundantly clear that we will *not* pay *any* price.

We will *not* bear *any* burden.

We will *not* meet *any* hardship.

And most certain we will not oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty, at least as liberty is defined and practiced in Vietnam, Cambodia, or for that matter, Greece.

In 1970, the new doctrine was articulated by President Nixon thus:

"(My) central thesis is that the United States will participate in the defense and development of allies and friends, but that America cannot—and will not—conceive all the plans, design all the programs, execute all the defense of the free nations of the world."

So we begin to talk about "fly before buy" and "design to cost."

If top management in defense industry is confused and whiplashed by the contradictions in our defense policies, it's probably because, at bottom, our defense policies don't accord with our diplomatic initiatives and, indeed, as time goes by seem to be diverging ever further apart.

But what's a joint chief to do when he doesn't know from one day to the next on what continent he's to be fighting in defense of what kind of liberty, whether it will be in a jungle swamp, frozen tundra or high sierra, against sophisticated mechanized armies supported by nuclear weapons, or guerrilla bands armed only with AK 47s? He's going to ask for more, that's what he's going to do.

And so words like "back-up" and "redundancy" crop up in the jargon emanating from the Pentagon. "Redundancy" has a nicer lilt to it than "duplication" which, as everybody knows, is wasteful. So's "back-up" of course, but if you can remove the customary connotation, with any luck and a good P.R. staff you can convince civilians that it's actually a military virtue.

Ergo, to assure nuclear deterrence we need a "triad of forces." That is, if the Minuteman missile fails, for some ungodly reason to exit its silo when the button is pushed, we need a Poseidon submarine at sea to go after the same target. And if both fail, we need to send a manned strategic bomber to do the job.

If all three work as planned, however, which even I concede is possible, we need a special staff of high-ranking admirals and generals to keep the same target from being eliminated not twice over, but thrice over. And that, of course, is what we've got in the Joint Strategic Targeting and Planning Staff situated in a deep hole out in Nebraska.

Industrial management feels the backlash of all this in responding to Requests for Proposals ("FRP's) which issue from the Pentagon from time to time for super-sophisticated hardware. And even if it's for an air defense missile system that will engage 50 targets simultaneously on the move and throw rocks when it runs out of missiles, some contractor will bid on it. And even though the missile performs superbly in user tests, when the rock ejector jams, there is consternation, recrimination and hard feelings all around—and the Congressman who reads the GAO report and rushes to expose the foul-up gains another headline.

I admire the fortitude and endurance of contractors who persist in the competition. In my own district I have had a case in which the plans, specifications, and assorted forms given to a prospective producer of a very simple *flat felt washer* weighed 7½ pounds—and a lot of it was microfilm.

The problem, of course, is not exclusively of the Pentagon's own making: we in Congress and you in industry share culpability in the unwieldy, cumbersome and inefficient structure which has been achieved. So where do we go from here?

I do not believe we can or should greatly reduce defense spending.

I do not believe that our active duty military establishment is too large.

I do not believe our active duty military establishment is too strong.

What I do believe is that it is too fat and that it is high time that we consider not only the cost of our military establishment but also *where* the money is being spent and the relationship of this spending to today's realities, not those of Camelot.

First, in the strictly physical sense, the entire United States military establishment is larded—and I use the word advisedly—with both officers and enlisted men whose personal physical condition is such that their presence in our military establishment contributes to its weakness and not to its strength. We have air-conditioned them and inner-springed them and foam rubbered them and ice-creamed them to the point where a 10-mile hike would be an insurmountable burden for far too many of our military.

The fat in our military is, of course, demonstrated in another way, and that is in our grade structure. It is too large in generals and admirals, lieutenant generals and vice admirals, major generals, brigadier generals and rear admirals, colonels and Navy captains, major and lieutenant commander. It is not too large in captains, first and second lieutenants, lieutenant j.g. and ensigns in the Navy. And the same imbalance holds true in the enlisted ranks.

The ratio of officers to enlisted men was one officer for every 7 and one-half enlisted men only five years ago. Today it is one officer for every 6 enlisted men. That trend will continue until someone with the authority to make it stick says "no."

Perhaps the greatest mistake Congress has made has been in lacking the intestinal fortitude to say "no" to the all volunteer Army when it was proposed by the Administration and when we believed it wouldn't work. You are all familiar with what we have done in increasing military pay to attract volunteers and to keep him in the service.

This is why there isn't any money left for research, and this is why there isn't any money left for development, and this is why there isn't any money left for procurement, and this is why there isn't any money left for operations, and this is why our military is drowning in fat as well as in paper.

It is time—it is long past time that we changed our thinking. We have looked backward for our threats and it's time we looked forward. If we are going to look backward anywhere, let's look backward to the toughness and leanness and meanness of the military establishment we used to have and can have again if only some tough mean people in the Pentagon and some tough mean people in industry and some tough mean people in Congress would only have the guts to say "no" once in a while.

INTRODUCTION TO INDIAN FINANCING ACT OF 1973

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Indian Financing Act of 1973. This bill is identical to S. 1341 as it was amended by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and is intended to supply financial assistance for the development of Indian affairs and organizations.

At present, there is a desperate necessity to provide financial aid for the economic development of Indian communities. The poverty and high unemployment which surround most minority groups is particularly evident in the native American communities, a situation rightfully leading to increasing frustration and despair.

The present need for providing financing for economic growth is a matter which cannot be ignored. The creation of more jobs and the improvement of the average standard of living are essential if the Indian is ever to receive the equal status for which he is striving and is most deserving.

THE ALASKAN OIL PIPELINE

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor of final passage of the Alaskan oil pipeline legislation; but I did so with grave reservations. I am concerned about the action of this body to exempt this major project from the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act; but, more important, I am dismayed that the trans-Canadian pipeline alternative which might have brought oil directly to the energy-poor midwest was not given serious consideration.

The key to the so-called energy crisis is not that oil does not exist, but that in the future we will be forced to rely on untrustworthy sources. Most notable of these is the Middle East which may be providing 35 percent of our oil needs in 1980. The threat, then, is not that the Earth may run dry, but that the international supply of goodwill may run dry.

Although some countries in the Middle East can be counted on now to supply us with our short-term needs, future wars and international extortion may be serious threats to our national supply of oil. We must act positively to avoid a situation in which foreign oil magnates could direct American foreign policy.

The trans-Alaskan pipeline does not effectively address this problem. Oil would be delivered to a region which is not seriously threatened by foreign oil dominance. The addition of 2 billion barrels of oil a day to the west coast will result in a surplus of oil which most likely will be exported. Meanwhile such attractive alternative sources of oil as western South America, offshore California, and the Gulf of Alaska would be underdeveloped. In fact, the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve guarantees that the west coast is the one region of the country which cannot be the victim of international oil blackmail.

The real threat of foreign pressure is east of the Rockies, in the area which accounts for more than 80 percent of the Nation's oil consumption and which may be over 50 percent dependent on non-Canadian foreign oil by 1985. Oil cannot be efficiently transported over the Rocky Mountains, so a surplus on the west coast will be no consolation to oil-starved Easterners in the event of an international crisis. The only relief that trans-Alaskan pipeline will offer to consumers east of the Rockies might be the diversion into the Midwest of a few hundred thousand barrels a day of Canadian oil presently being piped to Seattle, while even more may be shipped to other countries. So, my constituents in the Midwest do not stand to gain very much oil from an Alaskan pipeline.

But natural gas is another story. A trans-Canadian gas pipeline could supply the Midwest with a regular supply of much-needed natural gas. Unfortunately,

it is becoming clear that the forces which fought for an Alaskan oil pipeline are interested in an Alaskan natural gas pipeline. The scheme whereby gas would be piped to Valdez, liquified and shipped to the west coast is surfacing regularly in the press. If such a plan were adopted, the Midwest would be cheated out of an essential source of natural gas.

I voted today for final passage of the Alaskan oil pipeline legislation with two considerations firmly in mind.

First, I did so with the clear understanding on my own part that the trans-Alaskan route is not the only way to get oil from the North Slope to the waiting markets of this Nation. As a matter of fact, the trans-Alaskan pipeline, by itself, most certainly will not provide the relief that consumers in most of the "lower 48 States" need in the face of the present energy crisis.

I believe consideration should be given immediately to planning a second Alaskan oil pipeline—this one cutting across Canada to bring oil to the Midwest, where it is so urgently needed.

Second, I voted for this legislation because I know that tapping the oil reserves is the necessary first step to getting at the vast supplies of natural gas which also exist beneath Alaska's North Slope. To bring this natural gas to market, I intend to fight for a trans-Canadian gas pipeline.

The energy problems which this Nation faces will not be resolved simply by building a pipeline across Alaska. More oil for the densely populated areas east of the Rockies, and more natural gas for middle America, will still be required—and these can best be brought to the consumer with a second oil pipeline and by a natural gas pipeline, both of them from Alaska directly into the Midwest. I hope my colleagues will join me in seeing that these two projects receive the highest priority.

NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS AT WHICH CASH VOUCHERS FOR EDUCATION COULD BE USED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Hampshire is considering a unique federally aided experiment to insure freedom of choice and diversity in its public and nonpublic schools.

In participating districts selected for the 2-year program, parents will receive a voucher equal to the cash value of the annual per pupil cost in the district that they can present to the public or nonpublic school of their choice to pay for their children's education. Parents also will be able to supplement the voucher with their own funds.

State, local, and about $3.3 million in Federal funds would be used. All Federal, State, and local laws would have to be obeyed. Control of the project remains with elected State and local officials, with a minimum of involvement planned from Washington, D.C.

In this program, parents will be able to shop for the school they believe will best educate their children, regardless of race, color, creed, religion, or socioeconomic status, without having to pay more taxes than they already do for that right.

A table listing available nonpublic schools in New Hampshire, their tuition and related data, developed by Dean Hansell of my staff, is presented below.

If the voucher value is placed at about $1,000, as has been discussed, parents could apply to at least 16 nonpublic, private schools to educate their children. Other schools would be available to parents who could supplement the voucher. All but one parochial school in New Hampshire sets tuition below $1,000.

The table follows:

NONPUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, NEW HAMPSHIRE

School and headmaster	Tuition		Enrollment	Grades	Affiliation	Phone (area code) 603
	Day	Boarding				
PRIVATE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS						
Proctor Academy, Andover, David Fowler	$750–$1,200	$3,700	200	9 to 12	Nonsectarian	735-5124
Kellogg School, Bedford, Mrs. Jean B. Macewan	1,400		50	1 to 8	do	623-8718
Children's House, Bethleham, Mark Downing	600–720		15	K to 1	do	444-2867
Cardigan Mountain, Canaan, Norman Wakey	1,850	3,700	150	K; 6 to 9	do	523-4321
Horizon's Edge, Canterbury, William Meeh	1,000	3,200	30	1 to 8	Friends	783-4388
St. Paul's School, Concord, William A. Oates	1,400	2,800	490	8 to 12	Episcopal	225-3341
Calvary Baptist Christian Day, Dairy, William N. Garvin	250		37	K to 3	Nonsectarian	432-8261
Children's Workshop, Dover, Janet Carrico	(1)	(1)	25	K to 2	do	868-2920
Dublin Christian Academy, Dublin, Leon M. Moddy	1,840	3,730	76	9 to 12	do	563-6131
Dublin School, Inc., Dublin, Michael L. Cornog	1,840	3,740	75	9 to 12	do	563-3331
Marathon House, Dublin, Bruce A. Shaw			17	1 to 12	do	563-7581
Highview Church Farm, East Lempster, Thomas B. Odgen	(2)	(2)	50	1 to 12	do	863-1775
Pioneer Elementary, East Westmoreland, Russell W. Havens			24	1 to 8	do	399-4803
Palmer House, Eaton Center, Sarah J. Anderson	2,700	3,950		1 to 12	do	447-2863
Child Garden Country Day, Exeter, Mildred G. Carson	(2)	(2)	90	K to 6	do	772-4621
Phillips-Exeter Academy, Exeter, Richard W. Day	1,600	3,000	960	9 to 12	do	772-4311
Christian School, Gorham, Pastor Vondel Allen	300		8	1 to 6	do	466-2325
Crotchett Mount School for Special Education, Greenfield, J. Phillip Boucher	3,935	[4] 6,640	225	Varying	do	547-8311
The Van School, Hancock, David H. Brogden			12	9 to 12	do	525-3728
The Harrisville School, Harrisville, David Sobel			35	K to 1	do	827-3033
Appleton Academy, Ipswich, Charles Markham	1,450	3,960	30	9 to 12	do	878-2420
Keene Learning Community, Keene, Michael Franklin	(2)	(2)	20	9 to 12	do	446-2238
White Mountain School, Littleton, E. Charles Sanborn	1,800	3,600	80	8 to 12	Episcopal	444-2928
Rivendale School,[3] London, Loren Puffer		3,600–6,320	20	9 to 12		783-4314
The Dairy Field School, Manchester, Ralph J. Scozzafava	1,500–1,575		187	7 to 12	Nonsectarian	660-4524
Easter Seal Rehabilitation Center, Manchester, Larry Gammon	(2)	(2)	80	Varying	do	622-6438
Miss Jacques Private School, Manchester, Alliette Jacquettes			125	K to 8	do	623-6051
Manchester State Industrial School, Manchester, Norman K. Morgan			150	6 to 12	do	625-5471
Kimble Union Academy, Meridan, John P. Cotton	1,600	3,750	185	9 to 12	Gospel Ministry	63580
Our School, Milford, David Craft			10	1 to 2	Nonsectarian	878-2678
Mount Hope School, Nashua, John Gale	(2)	(2)	85	Varying	do	889-2442
Mautobon, Nashua, Macy E. Morgie			25	9 to 12	do	889-7861
Bubbling Brook, Nashua, Hugh R. Devries	(2)	(2)	5	7 to 12	do	888-1537
New Hampden School, New Hampden, Louis Gnerre	1,800	3,600	228	9 to 12	Baptist and Free Will Baptist.	744-5571
Great Day School and Training Center, Newington, Phillip Eward, Jr	[5] 1,800	[5] 2,340	215	Varying	Nonsectarian	436-2014
Boynton School, Orford, Arthur J. Boynton, Jr	1,250		10	9 to 12	do	353-4784
Witch Hazel Farm School, Nottingham, Leslie B. Bryce			9	K to 4	do	924-7362
The Well, Peterborough, James A. Garland			56	1 to 10	do	924-6908
Happy Valley Day School, Peterborough, Mrs. Donna Cole	(2)	(2)	10	K to 4	do	924-7362
Holderness, Plymouth, Donald C. Hagerman	1,850	3,900	215	9 to 12	Episcopal	536-1257
Hampshire Country, Rindge, Mrs. Margaret M. Raundal	(2)	(2)	90	9 to 12	Nonsectarian	899-3325
Meeting School, Rindge, Mrs. Margaret Knotts		3,000	40	10 to 12	Friends	899-3366
Colin Blakeney Memorial, Rochester, Jean O. Schnererhorn			22	1 to 8	Nonsectarian	332-1177
South Eastern, N.H., Christian Day, Somersworth, Rev. Galen M. Robertson (acting)			50	K to 6	do	692-3043
Austin-Cate Academy, Strafford, Nelson A. McLean	1,795	3,100	17	8	do	664-5555
Pembrook Place, Suncook, Ernest L. Freeman		3,500	25	3 to 8	do	485-7141
Pine Haven Boys Center, Suncook, Rev. Bruno Schiavon	(2)	(2)	25	3 to 8	Catholic	485-7141
Spaulding Youth Center, Tilton, Alvin R. Carter			35	1–8	Nonsectarian	286-8901
Tilton School, Tilton, John F. MacMorran	1,700	3,600	165	9–12	Methodist	286-4342
Estabrook School, West Lebanon, Robert C. Quillin			37	1–10	Nonsectarian	298-9898
High Mowing School, Wilton, Robert H. Pittman		3,500	80	9–12	do	654-2391
Shiloh Christian Day, Wilton, William C. Marshall			6	2–10	do	654-9985
Pine Hill Waldorf, Wilton, Ann Pratt	(10)	(10)	18	K–4	do	654-6003
Brewster Academy, Wolfeboro, C. Richard Vaughan	1,950	3,500	100	9–12	do	569-1600

School and headmaster	Tuition: Day	Tuition: Boarding	Enrollment	Grades	Affiliation	Phone (area code) 603
PUBLIC APPROVED ACADEMIES						
Pinkerton Academy, Dairy, Ivah A. Hackler	830		1,520	9 to 12	Nonsectarian	432-2588
Coe-Brown Academy, Northwood, G. Scott Darling			150	9 to 12	do	942-5531

[1] $400, kindergarten, ½ day; $600, kindergarten, full day; $665, grades 1-2.
[2] No charge.
[3] $400 to $900 depending upon income.
[4] Ward with nurse, $7,200.
[5] For hard case juveniles.
[6] Negotiable according to income.
[7] $600 full day, $200 ½ day, no boarding.
[8] $9,610 to $12,360 boarding only.
[9] No day student; $960 under age 14; $1,000 to $1,200 age 14 and over.
[10] Kindergarten, $425; grades 1 to 2, $475; grades 3 to 4, $525.

Note: Data reflects status through May 1973. Information was not available from some nonpublic schools closed for the summer.
Source: New Hampshire State Department of Education Voucher Project Office; New Hampshire Archdiocesan Schools.

CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

School and headmaster	Tuition [1] day	Enrollment	Grades	Phone (area code) 603
Catholic, East Berlin, Sr. Irene F. Comptosis.	$175 family	280	1-5	752-1176
Catholic, West Berlin, Sr. Mary Claire Hennessy.	do	330	1-5	752-7413
Catholic Junior High, Berlin, Sr. Margueritte Rousseau.	do	320	6-8	752-2243
St. Mary, Clairmont, Sr. Julius M. Dolloff.	$40 1st, 2d; $10 3d, 4th	260	1-8	542-6341
Our Lady of Grace, Colebrook, Sr. Hazel M. Fortin.	$65 1st, 2d; $45 3d; $25 4th	125	1-8	237-4420
St. John, Concord, Sr. M. Claude Souza.	$60, 100 family [2]	230	1-8	225-3222
St. Thomas Aquinas, Dairy, Sr. Lorainne Trombley.	$75 family	160	1-6	432-2712
Dover Catholic, Dover, Sr. M. Bernadine Smith.	$100, 150, 200 [2] family	490	K-8	742-3299
St. Mary, Franklin, Sr. M. Victorine Kean.	No charge [3]	320	1-8	934-5739
Villa Augustina, Goffstown, Sr. Rachel Croteau.	$220 1st; $200 family (sic)	230	K-8	497-2361
Sacred Heart, Hampden, Sr. Mary Frances Trudeau.	$50 family	240	4-8	926-9152
Presentation of Mary Academy, Hudson, Sr. Doris Rajotte.	$275	235	K-8	883-6362
St. John the Evangelist, Hudson, Sr. Vivian Plante.	$100, 130, 150 [2]	440	1-8	882-5941
St. Patrick, Jaffrey, Sr. Catherine Feeney.	$50-250 1st; $25-100 2d; $25-50 3d.	210	1-8	532-7676
St. Joseph, Keene, Sr. David B. Morrison.	$72 1st; $108 2d	280	K-6	353-2720
Holy Trinity Sacred Heart, Laconia, Sr. Fernand A. Joyal.	50 1st, $100 family	200	5-8	524-4155
St. John, Laconia, Lucille McDonald	do	230	1-4	524-3156
St. Rose of Lima, Littleton, Sr. Dorothy Mary Lord.	$60 family in parish; $65 child nonparish.	130	1-6	444-3361
St. Marie Hillcrest Parochial, Manchester, Sr. Alliette Angers.	$60 1st student; $20 2d; $10 3d, 4th.	280	4-8	624-0801
St. Patrick's (Hillcrest), Manchester, Sr. M. Marietta Laporte.	$60 1st; $20 2d; $10 3d, 4th	190	1-3	669-1052
Northeast Catholic, St. Catherine, Manchester, Janet Bellcourt.	$55 student; $75 to $100 family. [3]	430	1-5	622-1711
St. Joseph's (Northeast Catholic), Manchester, Sr. Cecilia Oldfield.	$180	275	1-5	624-4811
South Catholic, Manchester, Sr. M. Thomas Norris.	$60 family; $60 1st, $40 2d [3]	500	1-6	627-7547
Southeast Catholic, Manchester, Sr. Rachel Jette.	$60-75 1st; $25-60 2d; $10 3d. [3]	500	1-6	622-0414
Holy Cross Kindergarten, Manchester, Sr. Irene Gaumont.	Not available	34	K	668-0510
Mast Mary Day, Manchester, Sr. Roseanne LaBounty.	$300 1st; $250 2d; $200 3d	220	K-8	627-1971
Sacred Heart, Manchester, Sr. Marie-Marth Courture.	$120 1st; $110 2d; $100 3d	300	1-8	622-3312
St. Anthony Junior High, Manchester, Sr. Pauline Labelle.	do	315	7-8	627-2413
Augustine, Manchester, Sr. Pauline Plante.	$60 to $80 pupil; $35 1st, 2d; $20 3d; $10 4th.	455	K-6	623-1995
St. Casimir, Manchester, Sr. Florita Biedron.	$30 1st; $20 2d; $10 3d	150	1-8	623-6411
St. Edmond, Manchester, Sr. Yvette Boucher.	$80 pupil; $80 family (sic) [4]	165	1-6	623-6028
St. Francis of Assisi, Manchester, St. Mary Chisholm.	$75 1st; $100 family	260	1-8	669-2069
St. John the Baptist, Manchester, Sr. Irene Blanger.		420	1-8	624-1853
St. Rafael, Manchester, Sr. Mary Monaco Marchi.	$55 1st; $105 family	240	1-8	669-3932
Holy Infant Jesus, Nashua, Sr. Mariette Charron.	$60	355	1-8	882-0553
Sacred Heart, Nashua, Sr. Mary Farcina Morrin.	No charge; $183 [2]	270	1-8	889-0212
St. Aloysius, Nashua, Sr. Marguerete Fortier.	$60 to $135 pupil; $200 family. [2]	410	1-8	882-7011
St. Christopher, Nashua, Sr. Mary Leon Pennell.	$150 to $300 child [3]	860	1-8	882-7442
St. Francis Xavier, Nashua, Sr. Lilian Perreault.	$50	295	K-8	882-7232
St. Joseph's, Nashua, Sr. Lorraine Berrthiaume.	None; $250 [3]	550	1-8	883-2441
St. Patrick Convent, Pelham, Sr. M. Gregory Pickford.	$60 child; $120 family	275	1-8	635-2941
Lady Isle, Portsmouth, Sr. Dorothy McLaughlin.	$460 1st; $330 2d; $280 3d; $220 4th.	150	K-8	436-2167
St. Patrick, Portsmouth, Sr. M. Anastasia Smith.	$250 to $400 family [5]	360	1-8	436-0749
Holy Rosary, Rochester, Sr. Rochelle Traham.	$75 to $210 1st student; $25 2d; $15 to $50 3d. [5]	385	1-8	332-4803
St. Mary, Rochester, Sr. Joseph Miriam Sheehan.	$90 family	265	1-8	332-1884
St. Joseph's Salem, Sr. Kathleen Dumphrey.	$175 to $330 per pupil	360	1-8	893-6811
Somersworth Catholic, Somersworth, Sr. Corrine Hebert.	$100 family	475	1-6	692-4523
John the Baptist, Suncook, Sr. Louise Auclair.	$52 1st; $32 2d; $22 3d; $12 4th.	258	1-8	485-7050
St. Albert, West Stewartstown, Sr. Rita Marie Proulx.	$60 family	122	1-8	246-8631
Holy Cross Pre-School, West Franklin, Sr. Muriel Florent.	$2 1st [6] (sic); $1 2d	56	K	934-5153
Bishop Brady, Concord, Sr. M. Neri Burrows.	$260 1st student; $236 2d; $212 3d.	450	9-12	224-7418
St. Thomas Aquinas, Dover, Sr. M. Raymunda Smith.	$380 1st; $570 family	700	9-12	742-3206
Lasallette Seminary, Enfield, Rev. Robert J. Plante.	$1,700, boarder only	140	9-12	632-4324
Presentation of Mary Academy, Hudson, Sr. Mariette Plante.	$375	162	9-12	883-8192
St. Marie, Manchester, Sr. Eunice Fluet.	$100 1st; $150 nonparishioner; $75 2d; $75 each additional; $50 3d nonparishioner.	240	9-12	622-8215
Manchester Trinity, Manchester, Br. Michael Griffin.	$250 1st, 2d; $200 3d, 4th	750	9-12	668-2910
Bishop Guertin, Nashua, Br. John L. Collignon.	$500	600	9-12	889-4107
Mount St. Mary's Seminary, Nashua, Sr. M. Eleanor Finn.	$400 1st; $300 2d, 3d	345	9-12	889-2741

[1] Tuition does not reflect contribution of parish.
[2] Different rate depends on parish.
[3] A weekly collection is held.
[4] St. Edmond will not reopen in fall of 1973.
[5] Larger numbers are those paid by nonparish members.
[6] Fees are paid per session.

IN HONOR OF BILL BAGGETT, COMMANDER, AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF OKLAHOMA

HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADDEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the youngest of 56 department commanders of the American Legion, an organization chartered by the Congress of the United States.

Bill Baggett, a 29-year-old newsman of Tahlequah, Okla., served during the Vietnam era, in the Army from 1966 to 1968. He helped form the new American Legion Post, Blackfox-Hartness 135, in Tahlequah in 1970 which, at the time of its organization, was composed of 100-percent Vietnam veterans. Since that time, I am told, they have let some of us older fellers in.

Bill Baggett, to me, Mr. Speaker, exemplifies the opposite to the polarization of those who fled from their country rather than answer the call to serve. When his call came, Bill served, and following his honorable service, returned to Oklahoma to continue his service to the community, State, and Nation. The past year he served as department—State—

vice chairman and just the past weekend, was elected to the highly exalted post of department commander, following in the footsteps of such notable Oklahoma Legionnaires who were department commanders before they rose to national prominence. I refer to the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, the Honorable Preston Moore, and more recently, J. Milton Patrick, all Oklahomans and all national commanders.

Bill Baggett is the first Vietnam wartime veteran to be elected department commander of Oklahoma and I am told, by American Legion National Headquarters in Indianapolis, is one of the youngest veterans to be elected to head any of the American Legion's 56 departments.

To Bill Baggett, his wife, Donna, his daughter, Shannon, 2, and their second child, which is expected this month, I offer congratulations and hope that he may receive Divine Guidance in helping to perpetuate a part of the Preamble to the Constitution of the American Legion:

To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America.

To maintain law and order.

To inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, state and nation.

To combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses.

To make right the master of might.

To promote peace and good-will on earth.

To safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that those words could be used as a guideline for us all in these perilous times. Mr. Chairman, it is the young men like Bill Baggett, who will follow in our footsteps, who in fact are pushing into leadership, who can and will bring an end to wars and rumors of wars, and eventually, achieve the goal of the American Legion: no more veterans or veterans' organizations because there have been no more wars.

PRIVATE PENSION SYSTEM

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is anticipated that the House will consider legislation during this Congress to overhaul the Nation's private pension system. Reform in this area is long overdue. It is time that some order, stability, and reliability was introduced into this virtually unregulated sector of our economy.

Mr. Nicholas Raimo, secretary-treasurer of Teamsters Local 843, Springfield, N.J., knows firsthand the shortcomings of the present pension system. I commend the following statement by Mr. Raimo to my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY NICHOLAS RAIMO

In December of 1971, I was elected to the office of Secretary-Treasurer of Teamsters Union Local 843 for a term of three years and officially took office on January 24, 1972. Previously, I had been employed at the Ballantine Brewery since 1949 in the delivery department. At the present time, I am one of the trustees of the New Jersey Brewery Pension and Welfare Trust Fund.

The American public has a great stake in a private pension system that offers greater reliability and a better coverage than what exists in America now. In 1971, the true situation was summed up very well by Assistant Secretary of Labor, Thomas R. Donohue, when he told the House Sub-Committee on Labor that:

"In all too many cases the pension promises shrinks to this; If you remain in good health and stay with the company until you are 65 years old, and if the company is still in business, and if your department has not been abolished, and if you haven't been laid off for too long a period, and if there is enough money in the fund, and if that money has been prudently managed, you will get a pension."

Therefore, my remarks in pension reform is directed to members of the 93rd Congress requesting their support in the passage of Senate Bill 4, the Retirement Income Security for Employees Act, and the passage of the companion bill submitted by Congressman Joseph G. Minish.

In light of the intensive study of pension and welfare funds conducted by the subcommittee on Labor headed by Senator Harrison A. Williams in 1972, one of the top priority issues left hanging over from the 92nd Congress was pension reform. A promising drive to enact such legislation came to naught in the last session when the bill for pension reform was sidetracked to the Senate Finance Committee.

The Senate Finance Committee regurgitated the bill without its major features. Killed by the committee were sections on: Vesting, Portability, Funding, and Re-Insurance.

I concur with the Senate Labor Committee which in its report on the bill had said that "there can be no compromise with the obligation that working men and women have a right to live their retirement years, not only with human dignity, but with freedom from financial insecurity."

With the increasing trend to corporate mergers and bigger conglomerates and runaway plants, which has shown to be No. 1 reason for the loss of pension protection for millions of workers in America, it is very important that the friends of working men and women in the 93rd Congress resume the fight for the passage of this legislation on pension reform.

In New Jersey, a pension bill was approved that would impose a special tax on companies that leave the state and deprive their workers of pension benefits. Assemblyman Herbert J. Klein (D-Passaic) said he hoped the bill would lead to other, more general legislation in the field. "It has become apparent that legislation is sorely needed to ensure pension benefits promised to an employee at age 35 or 40 will actually be provided to him or her upon reaching retirement age."

35 million American workers have their eyes focused on the 93rd Congress regarding the passage of the Retirement Income Security for Employees Act of 1973. This should be the number one priority during the current congressional session. Help correct deficiencies in the private pension system by supporting and voting for the passage of this bill.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, according to last Sunday's New York Times, the Department of State is very much concerned about a provision in the Department of State Appropriations Authorization Act of 1973 providing to certain congressional committees a wide range of State Department information heretofore unavailable. There are, of course, valid arguments on both sides of the question as to what information relating to national security and foreign policy can safely be dispatched to the legislative branch. Also, the use of misclassification of documents to safeguard departmental errors is a point in favor of wider access.

I can cite one case, dating back to the end of World War II, in which foreign policy and national security objections were finally removed as a bar to disclosure to the public of out-of-date information. This case involves the Operation Keelhaul files relating to the forced repatriation of hundreds of thousands of Russian and other refugees and displaced persons in allied hands who were shipped back to the Soviet Union. The third objection to the release of the Keelhaul information was the necessity of obtaining the concurrence of the British Government as this was a joint American-British operation. I understand the British Government has yet to give their approval.

In a second case, more controversial from a historical standpoint, it is claimed that both the British and the United States have files relating to the possible escape of the Imperial Family of Russia in 1918 from Ekaterinburg, Russia, where, historians generally claim they were murdered. I need not stress the unique and controversial nature of this claim, yet recently a member of Parliament and leader of the Liberal Party in Britain asserted that the British Government had such a file and asked to have it made public. In the United States there are similar assertions that the State Department has similar information on this issue which to date has not been released.

The question arises as to why this outdated information in both cases cited above, if it indeed exists in the second case, should not be made known to the public. These are certainly not current cases where the handling of sensitive information on foreign policy should be as restricted as possible. In these cases, any information either clarifying or disproving various allegations on both issues should be released.

Perhaps the only solution to this problem is to require by law that Congress have, with realistic restrictions, wider access to State Department information.

I insert at this point a letter to the Secretary of State concerning the access-to-information issue:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your attention is directed to the enclosed conference report on the Department of State Appropriations Authorization Act of 1973 and especially to Sec. 13(a) entitled "Access to Information." As indicated in the New York Times of last Sunday, State is very much concerned about this Congressional attempt to gain access to

information heretofore unavailable. As I understand it, this proposal is an effort to greatly expand that section of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 which grants to certain Congressional Committees access to efficiency records of Foreign Service officers.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of the proposal, it must be conceded that there is a definite need for the public to know the facts of political life as soon as possible, but within the limits of national security and foreign policy but free of misrepresentations concerning such limits.

Because of selected disclosures and omissions, the learned community and representative political leaders are concerned that they do understand the importance of recent political events. This realization has led to a great deal of reservation and disquiet regarding the understanding of recent events and the willingness to accept current governmental actions without direct access to pertinent data.

There are two subjects dating back several decades which currently "agitate" historians and scholars of international affairs, not to mention some Members of Congress. One is "Operation Keelhaul", the code name for the forced return of hundreds of thousands of refugees and displaced persons to the Soviet Union. According to reports many of these persons tried to commit suicide, even prior to their return, and others died in concentration camps run by the NKVD. I believe it is in the national interest that the Department of State no longer bear the onus of helping to cover up this operation.

Another matter concerning the Soviet Union dates back to the Communist Revolution. This is the fate of the Imperial Family. Although it has been generally accepted that the family was assassinated, there is considerable scholarly and public discussion of reports that in fact the Russian Imperial Family was rescued through a joint operation in which American citizens participated.

Allegedly, the rescue of the Imperial Family took place with the knowledge of the British and Japanese Governments. In this connection, I invite your attention to a London Times article which reports that Jeremy Thorpe, a Member of the British Parliament and leader of the British Liberal Party, asks Her Majesty's Government to disclose all information which it possesses regarding British participation in the fate of the Imperial Family. Mr. Thorpe specifically asked Her Majesty's Government to confirm the authenticity of the so-called Hardinge Report to King George V detailing the route of the Imperial Family from Odessa to Breslau via Bulgaria and Austria.

Mr. Thorpe also asked the British Foreign Office to disclose the correspondence between the British and American Governments regarding the contents of all archives relating to the fate of the Russian Imperial Family.

I should hope that the Department of State would take the wise decision of removing these two subjects from the area of public speculation by disclosing immediately all the facts regarding these two issues.

Regarding Operation Keelhaul, the communication from Mr. Thomas Huston, then a White House advisor, to Mr. Julius Epstein, who will shortly attempt for a second time through the courts to have the Keelhaul files made public, indicated that the British Government's concurrence on the release of the files to the American public and that the previous objections based on national security and foreign policy considerations had been removed by this Administration.

I believe you would be serving the U.S. national interests, as well as the interests of the British Government, if you would impress on Her Majesty's Government the harmful effect further delay in disclosing publicly the facts in these two matters will have in the academic world and that you will take every step to persuade the British Government to agree to such disclosures.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
Representative to Congress.

AS OTHERS SEE US

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the Watergate affair has attracted worldwide attention, and it is quite possible that some of the views in the foreign press, being more detached, are more objective than those expressed here at home.

The following commentary by Angus Maude, a Member of Parliament, appeared first in the Sunday Express in Scotland and was subsequently reprinted in the Pensacola News on July 10, 1973. I am inserting it in the RECORD so that my colleagues and others can have an opportunity to see a somewhat different view of the whole case.

VIEWPOINT: UNITED STATES TAKES LEAVE OF ITS SENSES

(NOTE—How do the Scots view Watergate? Pensacola businessman Burney Henderson, vacationing in Scotland brought home this editorial from the Sunday Express of Scotland.)

(By Angus Maude)

Have the Americans taken leave of their senses? Looking objectively at the handling of the Watergate affair and its ramifications, one is almost forced to the conclusion that they have.

It is pretty horrifying to watch the way in which supposedly responsible Americans in the higher echelons of politics and public affairs are going about the business of discrediting not only their President but the whole system of government in the United States.

The Press and the other media are enthusiastically urging them on, and revelling in the resultant mess. Every accusation against President Nixon and his staff, however untested and however tainted its source, is given the widest publicity. Every possible innuendo is used to slant the impression given to the public, apparently in the hope of fixing the people's verdict before half the evidence has been heard.

Perhaps the most nauseating feature of the campaign is the self-righteous pretense of the smearers that they are only "acting in the public interest" and "helping to get at the truth."

The only facts that they are interested in are those that can be used to discredit the President; and the way the campaign has been handled is not in the public interest at all, but deeply damaging to the United States and to all the best things for which America stands.

All the half-forgotten elderly whizz-kids of the Jack Kennedy era have been writing articles—many of them syndicated over here—viciously venting their traditional hatred of President Nixon, but adding sententiously that the whole horrible business is really a blessing in disguise which will lead to much-needed reforms in the system of government.

Clearly they see it as a heaven-sent bandwagon on which they can hitch a ride towards the ultimate triumph of Senator Edward Kennedy.

That victory for this deplorable man would be for them and for most of the Eastern American Liberal Establishment, a desirable consummation of the present campaign is sufficient guide to their sense of values.

Of course, the Watergate Affair is a sorry mess. It is at least obvious that the President appointed some pretty strange people to his personal and political staffs. But the widespread assumption that he himself is guilty of corruption and illegal practices is still unsupported by convincing evidence.

In default of this, his detractors have resorted to the argument that if he were not guilty he would have proved himself innocent, which is a typical inversion of the principles of fairness and justice for which they purport to stand.

The important point, however, is this, Watergate truth emerges at the end of the inquiries, whether the President is vindicated or brought down, the whole business is being handled and exploited in a way calculated to do the most, not the least, lasting damage to America and to the true interests of its people.

Mr. Nixon's enemies, of course, are saying smugly that it is his handling of the affair that is doing all the damage, but even a cursory study of the American Press coverage makes it clear that this is not true.

They are out to destroy him, and they do not seem to care who or what suffers in the process.

Of course, I do not know what, if anything, the President has to hide, but at this critical juncture for both the American economy and his own foreign policy, he carries a burden of responsibility that must make him hesitate to become personally involved too deeply in the comparative irrelevancy of the Watergate inquiries.

Any responsible householder is more concerned about an imminent threat to the fabric of his building than about a temporary smell in the drains.

You would have thought that any educated American can foresee the desperate consequences of a major constitutional crisis at this time. And that any responsible commentator over there would hesitate before light-heartedly handing out more ammunition to America's enemies in this country. Yet the B.B.C. seems to be positively revelling in it.

Why have the B.B.C.—and ITV news and current affairs men been playing up the Watergage business so assiduously? They cannot really believe that the British public find it all that riveting.

They, like their American counterparts, seem to be actuated by a compulsive hatred of Mr. Nixon. Everything is slanted against him. Often they refer to him contemptuously just as "Nixon"—a familiarity they would never resort to with, say, Mr. Brezhnev or General Amin.

Is this just a fixation of intellectual liberals? Or are our media, too, so deeply infiltrated by anti-American Leftists that they feel compelled to attack the one man who seemed likely to save America and restore its influence in world affairs?

Let us remember one or two things about President Nixon.

He won his landslide election victory because the American people recognized his practical achievements and wanted him to complete the job.

He seemed to be halting the hopeless drift towards anarchy and violence in which the country was involved.

Peace has returned to chaotic university campuses. A stand was at least being made for law and order. He was getting to grips with the problem of inflation.

Mr. Nixon brought to its only possible end the hopeless bloody struggle in Vietnam, a struggle to which Kennedy and Johnson had committed America at the wrong time and on the wrong terms. He has laid the foundations of détente with Russia and China.

America, and indeed the whole Western world, aleady owes him quite a lot. If he survives we may yet come to owe him a great deal more. No possible successor is likely to be a statesman of anything like his calibre.

Above all, let us pray that if Mr. Nixon is brought down by the rabble now pursuing him, the damage to America and its friends may be less than they seem determined to inflict.

Perhaps they will at least have the grace to stop appearing to enjoy it all so much.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO NEPA

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation which will make the U.S. Postal Service subject to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act. This legislation is necessary in view of the special status which the Postal Service has enjoyed since its reorganization.

Under the terms of the Postal Reorganization Act, the Postal Service was defined as a government corporation. Because of its governmental affiliations, it was permitted to retain several exclusively governmental powers such as the right of eminent domain and exemption from local zoning ordinances. However, because of its corporate aspects, it was exempted from many of the statutes which limit the power of Federal agencies. Thus, in its present position, the Postal Service is not legally bound by the restrictions which apply to American businesses, nor is it bound by the laws which govern Federal agencies.

Although the Postal Service claims that it complies voluntarily with Federal statutes, exceptions do occur. And when they do, the people who are hurt by postal activities have no real legal recourse. Such an instance has recently occurred in my own district.

Cincinnati postal officials decided to shut down three neighborhood post offices and to build one very large consolidated facility. They then chose a site in a residential community, away from existing bus lines. Many citizens raised objections. People living near the proposed site objected that construction of the facility would alter the face of the neighborhood and violate local zoning ordinances. People living in the outlying areas claimed that their service was being taken away and that the new site was too distant for them to use. In general, postal officials refused to litsen to the problems stated by these citizens. Only by strong and continuous pressure have the residents been able to get the postal officials to reassess their position.

If passed, my legislation would require the Postal Service to file a detailed environmental impact statement containing a full discussion of alternative sites before proceeding with construction. Then, citizens who do not feel that a Postal Service decision is wise can challenge it. Alternatives can be discussed. Communities will be better served.

SWEDEN: THE WORLD'S MOST UNNEUTRAL NEUTRAL

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a resolution has recently been introduced in the Senate urging the United States to resume "normal friendly relations" with Sweden. I would like to take this opportunity to express the strongest opposition to such a move. It was so-called neutral Sweden, not the United States, that was responsible for the disruption of relations, illustrated by the absence of a U.S. Ambassador to Sweden since August 1972, and the indication of the U.S. Government in January 1973 that an Ambassador from Sweden would not be welcome in Washington. In December of 1972, the Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr. Olof Palme, culminated a long series of acrimonious attacks on the United States by falsely and vindictively comparing our actions in Vietnam to the Nazi massacres during World War II. This accusation is bitterly ironic and insulting, since during World War II, when the lives of American soldiers were being sacrificed in the struggle against Hitler's forces, Sweden's policy of moral "neutrality" permitted German troops to use Swedish railroads in order to invade Norway, but prevented French and British troops from entering Swedish territory. Sweden was an essential supplier of iron ore to Germany, and it was not until 1945 that trade between moralistic Sweden and Nazi Germany ceased.

Abusive and strident denunciations of U.S. policies cannot disguise the basic hypocrisy of Sweden's self-righteousness. Our feelings of resentment and indignation are entirely comprehensible and justified. Nor can Sweden's vociferous moralizing hide the fact that her "neutrality" actually favors our enemies. For instance, over the years Sweden welcomed with open arms approximately 600 deserters and draftdodgers from the U.S. Army, but Swedish generosity did not extend to the unhappy Asian refugees expelled from Uganda by General Amin. Sweden could accept only 200 or 300 of these unfortunate victims of barbarism.

Worse, Sweden has given over $50 million in aid to North Vietnam, but barely $3 million to South Vietnam. Sweden has an Ambassador in Hanoi, but has no diplomatic representation at all in Saigon. This is a strange form of "neutrality," which favors relations with American enemies but not with American friends, and voices only faint objections to Vietcong atrocities or to the use of North Vietnam or Russian tanks to invade South Vietnamese villages.

Sweden consistently lends support to national liberation movements, even the Vietcong and the Palestinian terrorists, and denounces colonialism, discrimination, and racism. However, not a word is ever said about the slavery currently practiced by tribal groups in a number of African states. Nor does Sweden's moral and material support of revolutionaries and third world countries deter a very lucrative trade relationship with South Africa.

In fact, economic factors, not morality, are one reason for Sweden's noisy anti-American pronouncements, despite the pretense of neutrality. Sweden stands to profit by expanding trade with the developing countries and with the Communist bloc.

Sweden's supposedly objective and impartial moral position is also in reality a response to domestic economic and political conditions. Radicalism and anti-Americanism are stylish these days. Swedish television programs and schoolbooks are biased and distorted in their treatment of life in the United States. They emphasize only our problems and gloss over our great achievements.

It is very shocking but very revealing that, according to the New York Times, Mr. Jerome Holland, our last Ambassador to Sweden, was the only U.S. Ambassador in Europe who required a bodyguard. And we all remember that when Mr. Holland who is black, first arrived in Sweden he was greeted by a hostile egg-throwing crowd screaming racist insults. I can only say that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

Mr. Palme's Social Democratic Party depends on Communist support to stay in power, and this is an important motivation for the Prime Minister to cater to the radical Left with his crude ideological diatribes—especially since his words do not cost Sweden anything. The United States has and will continue to protect Swedish "neutrality" with our European defense system and our strategic deterrent. This makes Sweden's reliance on "neutrality" even more ironic.

Sweden is much more careful of the feelings of its powerful neighbor, the Soviet Union. When Alexander Solzhenitsyn won the Nobel Prize in 1970, Sweden was afraid to give him the award in a public ceremony.

Mr. Palme had best look to his own affairs rather than meddling in those of other nations. Sweden will hold elections this September, and the outcome for the Social Democratic government is very uncertain.

In light of Sweden's adolescent and hypocritical behaviour, her pretentious piety that prescribes answers for all countries except her own, and Olof Palme's sensational provocation, it is completely proper and fitting that the United States maintain its attitude of dignified reserve. The United States is completely justified in silently protesting Sweden's abusive extremism. Resuming friendly relations with Sweden would only encourage Mr. Palme's sanctimonious blustering. The disruption in Swedish-American relations was not "needless," as the Senate resolution terms it. Rather it was the logical response to a Swedish policy of two-faced neutralism.

AN UNPUNISHED DOUBLE MURDER

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, 5 months ago, eight Arab terrorists cold-bloodedly murdered two American diplomats in Khartoum, capital of the Sudan. As of today, they reside in semidetention in that city, confident that their eventual fate will be swift release and acclaim as heroes throughout the Arab world. All indications point to a fulfillment of their expectations, as they have yet to be brought into court for a preliminary hearing.

The Sudanese Government obviously has no desire to offend the terrorists, giving further substantiation to claims that these international assassins could not function without the aid and comfort provided by unofficial actions of the country involved. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the case of the murder of Ambassador Cleo Noel and his chief deputy G. Curtis Moore.

In this case, Sudanese Cabinet ministers have been quoted regarding the entire story, and their comments are intriguing reading. According to these sources, chances of severe punishment for the murderers is minimal at this point. In the eyes of the Sudan Government, Al Fatah has been absolved of all blame.

Many of us will recollect that at the time of the crime, President Nimeri took to the air and accused Al Fatah and Yasser Arafat, its leader, of perpetrating the crime from start to finish. Now he has reversed the tone and factual content of his original speech of blame. Now, it seems, Al Fatah had nothing to do with it at all. So bereft of blame are they, in fact, that Nimeri is considering allowing them to reopen their Sudanese office.

Recently, there was an indefinite postponement of the preliminary hearing on the murder charge. Now this might cause some people to believe that a little backstairs collusion was transpiring. Perish the thought, soothes the Sudanese Minister of Information, pooh-poohing the accusations of a deal guaranteeing the murderers of the American diplomats a light sentence after a show trial.

Sudanese criticism of the terrorists has evaporated. In fact, a love feast seems to be taking place between the terrorists and the Sudanese Government. Also of interest is the fact that although all eight of the murderers immediately confessed to the deeds, their confessions will not be admissible at any trial, should one eventually take place.

Meanwhile, the United States continues to stand by its commitments to make available significant economic assistance to the regime. We have pledged some $20 million in cash and food for the war-ravaged southern Sudan, where the Arab north waged genocidal warfare against the black south for a number of years.

Another $11 million in low-interest loans has been committed this year for a major Sudanese irrigation project.

This is about the total equation as it stands today. I wonder how many of the State Department's committeed Arabists will plunge forward, palpitating with eagerness to serve in the Sudan? I wonder how the families of the two slain diplomats feel over this appalling state of affairs? Has their Government done anything to gain justice in this affair? Where are the apologists, who are willing to downgrade any attempt to reveal this network of terror?

I am not surprised by this sequence of events, although it saddens me to see American diplomats butchered and their Government stand by and not make a meaningful move to have their assassins brought to justice.

One obvious alternative would be for the U.S. Government to simply withhold all assistance of any kind until justice of a sort is done. Certainly the majority in Congress would support such a move. However, we shall await such a move in scant expectation of its emergence.

Our official attitude seems to be:

"What's a double murder between friends?"

NEENAH-MENASHA, THE BEAUTIFUL TWIN CITIES, MARK CENTENNIAL

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the Nation's 200th anniversary, all of us are becoming more aware of the richness of our heritage. Though the national celebration is still 2 years away, the same justifiable pride in heritage is exhibited this week in the twin cities of Neenah-Menasha, on the northwest shores of Lake Winnebago in east-central Wisconsin.

I want to pay a well-deserved tribute to the two cities now celebrating their 100th year of cityhood. A century ago their forebears elected to establish their futures along the waters of Lake Winnebago, Little Lake Butte des Morts and the Fox River. As the Oshkosh, Wis. Daily Northwestern said on July 25, that decision was wise "esthetically, economically, and recreationally."

Neenah-Menasha, with some 39,000 people living within their boundaries, are an industrial giant in Wisconsin. Only Green Bay offers more industrial jobs in the Fox River Valley than does the Twin Cities area. Paper products from the two cities are known all over the world.

The 9-day celebration in Neenah-Menasha is a benchmark in Wisconsin's history. An editorial in the July 29 Appleton, Wis., Post-Crescent describes the event as follows:

NEENAH-MENASHA CELEBRATES

The industrial twins on the northwest shores of Lake Winnebago, bisected by hard-working rivers and separated by a tree-lined boulevard and a century of tradition, are jointly celebrating their 100th year of cityhood this week.

Actually, Neenah already is a centenarian. Menasha, which was first as a village, became a city a year later in 1874. But few, especially outsiders, think of two communities; rather, they call them Neenah-Menasha with hardly a pause for the hyphen.

The Twin Cities' 9-day centennial celebration got off to a booming beginning yesterday as 60 aerial bombs, one a minute, church bells and sirens signaled the start of the second century.

Before the festivities are over next Sunday, Twin Citians as well as thousands of visitors will have new insights into the history, culture, education and industry that have spelled progress and the good life in Neenah-Menasha over the years. And they should have a lot of fun, too.

The Twin Cities, since their infancy, have been closely allied with industry. The waterways first meant flour-power to the pioneers but when Minneapolis took away that claim to fame, papermaking took over.

And as the major paper firms grew, especially Kimberly-Clark Corp., the communities gained a spot on the world-wide marketing map.

Today, the industrial efforts of the Twin Cities are still mainly directed toward paper products, although publishing and foundry firms also get national as well as local attention.

The Twin City area boasts more industrial jobs, about 12,000 of them, than any other place in the Fox Valley outside of Green Bay. The workers' paychecks consistently rank among the top in the state.

Thousands of employes commute daily to Neenah-Menasha's mills and plants from throughout the Fox Valley. They, and the 39,000 people who live within the Twin City boundaries, are well aware of the outstanding working and living conditions there.

So are the lake enthusiasts who fish, sail and race, in winter as well as summer, at the northern gateway to Lake Winnebago.

The centennial theme, "Together we grow," reflects the oneness of the twin communities. It also points to the challenges of cooperation as the cities gird for the second century.

THIRTY DAYS IN JAIL FOR LEAA

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the Denver District Attorney has called my attention to another example of government waste, disguised this time as a report entitled "Local Jails: A Report Presenting Data for Individual County and City Jails From the 1970 National Jail Census." The report was issued by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, a branch of the Department of Justice.

This is a 481 page, 2-pound, compilation of the 1970 status of every minor city and county jail in the United States. Included are institutional, inmate, expenditure and employment data for each jailhouse. In the opinion of this District Attorney, it does not have sufficient merit to justify its cost.

Not only was the production of this report a waste of valuable time, effort and money, but its distribution was also prodigal. The D.A.'s office received sev-

eral of these when only one—if that many—would have been enough. Many of these were addressed to deputies, he said,

Who have long since gone into private practice or in one case died.

In a time when the public screams because of high taxes and agencies cry because of lack of funds, it is a tragedy that the LEAA uses its money on such a useless publication.

U.S. COAST GUARD ANNIVERSARY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment to say a few words on behalf of the U.S. Coast Guard, which is celebrating its 183d anniversary this Saturday, August 4. As you all know, the Coast Guard is the smallest of our armed forces and it does not get a lot of coverage in our national media. But it is a proud service—doing a fine and important job.

Each year, the Coast Guard responds to over 50,000 calls for assistance—saving over 2,000 lives. The value of property saved far exceeds their budget. Along the coastline of my own State of Massachusetts, they are particularly active.

Aside from rescue work, they enforce many laws dealing with pollution and safety of our ports. Coast Guardsmen have been working around the clock to help solve the never-ending problems with respect to foreign fishing interests working off our shores.

The first Coast Guard cutter was built in Newburyport, Mass., many years ago and it was aptly named the *Massachusetts*. So we, in Massachusetts, are especially proud of the Coast Guard.

My personal connection with the Coast Guard has extended over nearly the entire 15 years I have served in the Appropriations Committee in this House. First, when the Coast Guard's budget was handled by the Treausry-Post Office Subcommittee and, more recently, when jurisdiction switched to the Transportation Subcommittee, I have been involved in studying the operation and efficiency of this service.

From this experience, I can say that, man for man, the Coast Guard takes second place to no other service.

Since its inception in 1790, the Coast Guard has played a vital role in every conflict our country has faced. The skill and bravery of its officers and men, down through the generations, are legendary. And it has paid the great price always demanded of those dedicated to defending this country. In World War I, for example, the Coast Guard suffered greater losses, in proportion to its strength, than any of the other U.S. Armed Forces. But it got the job done, just as it did in World War II, in Korea and, most recently, in Vietnam.

While it is justifiably proud of its wartime record, the Nation's dependence on the Coast Guard never relaxes during times of peace because of the great variety of important roles it plays in such areas as search and rescue, combatting pollution, enforcing the maritime laws, safety and transportation operations, and exploring the resources of the seas.

It is a diversified and demanding service requiring every conceivable kind of skill and knowledge to handle the range of tasks it faces.

For 183 years it has handled those tasks in a magnificent manner and all Americans can be thankful that the Coast Guard has served, and continues to serve, our needs. I congratulate all the men of this proud service and wish them many happy returns on this anniversary.

TWENTY-YEAR PURSUIT OF TRUTH

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Information Agency begins a third decade this week, its young life having spanned four Presidential terms.

The minority leader, GERALD R. FORD, yesterday inserted in the RECORD a letter from President Nixon noting the Agency's milestone. It is significant, I think, that Mr. Nixon's predecessors similarly recognized the importance of our worldwide informational effort.

President Eisenhower stressed the need for "bringing the truth to peoples of other nations." President Kennedy emphasized the importance of the Agency's support for U.S. foreign policy. President Johnson, speaking in 1965, said:

In this era the USIA has the most valuable role to fulfill. It is a most important arm of our Government. There is no partisanship associated with it because the success of USIA is a success for all Americans.

USIA's efforts supplement and complement the important role of the private communications media. As a member of the journalism profession, I would note that the news media could not take on the job for which USIA was created. USIA must go deeper than the day-to-day news to provide official explanations of U.S. policies, including texts, and background information to foreign leaders and opinion makers. USIA films, exhibits, lecturers, and publications seek to portray the thrust of our society, going beyond the headlines to explain the often undramatic aspects of American life, culture, and history essential to an understanding of our country and its policies. The continuing efforts to explain the facts and underlying principles of our policies, to correct the willful or unintentional distortions about our country abroad—the daily tasks of USIA—are simply not the primary purposes or concerns of the private commercial media. Nor do they communicate with people in closed societies which USIA's broadcasting arm, the Voice of America, does so effectively.

The U.S. Advisory Commission on Information recently stated that "USIA is an ideal agency in a time of detente and dialog." The Commission said:

For just as crisis tends to feed on crisis, so detente can generate detente . . . (and) the communications of detente reinforce and help perpetuate atmospheres of detente.

As the U.S. Information Agency enters its 21st year, Mr. Speaker, its role in promoting better understanding among the world's peoples has never been more vital.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CHAIRMAN WRIGHT PATMAN

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, a tribute is in order on the occasion of the birthday August 6 of the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN. I offer my heartiest congratulations and extend my best wishes to him and his wife Pauline.

Chairman PATMAN has captured the respect and admiration of many of the country's top leaders and having served in the Banking and Currency Committee for almost 9 years, I can testify that it has been an inspirational experience for me to serve with this farsighted and humane man.

WRIGHT PATMAN has fought vigorously over the years to strengthen the credit union system in the United States, and as a result, he has come to be known as "Mr. Credit Union" in our country. His legislative efforts have helped develop a credit union movement which today totals 23,000 credit unions with 26 million members and $20 billion in assets.

During World War II, he was instrumental in establishing the Small Defense Plants Administration which later evolved into what we know today as the Small Business Administration. He has done more than any legislator I know to protect and encourage the small businessman in America.

WRIGHT PATMAN has fought to make the Federal Reserve Board answerable to the Congress of the United States, because it and not the Federal Reserve is comprised of lawfully elected representatives of the people. He has fought to end loan-shark and sharp-practice finance company abuses directed against our brave servicemen in the Armed Forces. He has fought for the maintenance of realistic and reasonable interest rates for the American people, and only this week has again come out strongly against the current high interest policies of the Federal Reserve which are severely damaging the interests of the vast majority of the working people of our Nation.

On the occasion of your birthday, Mr. Chairman, I wish you many, many more years of good health in order that you may continue your fight on behalf of the little people of America, who through your efforts have secured genuine representation in the Halls of Congress.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NO-FAULT AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 5448, a bill to provide a system of no-fault automobile insurance for the District of Columbia on March 8, 1973. Hearings and subcommittee markup have been held on this important legislation; consideration by the full District of Columbia Committee is anticipated in September. I would like to share with my colleagues, for their information, two of the many excellent statements received in support of H.R. 5448:

TESTIMONY OF RALPH E. "DUTCH" VANDERVORT, GOVERNMENT RELATIONS CONSULTANT TO CAR AND TRUCK RENTAL AND LEASING ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN FAVOR OF H.R. 5448, MAY 2, 1973

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to appear before you and the members of this subcommittee to speak out in favor of HR-5448. Our organization has maintained a position of active support for all *strong* no-fault automobile insurance proposals. This support comes as a result of the record of dissatisfaction experienced by the members of our industry, as citizens and as businessmen, in dealing with the tort-liability system.

I am sure that you gentlemen are aware of the myriad shortcomings of the current system, and I will not recount them here, However, I believe that it is safe to generalize that the current tort-liability system for settling automobile accident claims compensation is often untimely in paying even the most deserving victims.

Experience in states which have adopted no-fault automobile insurance plans has shown that the no-fault system can provide fast, efficient and equitable compensation at less cost than the traditional system. Careful analysis shows that no-fault insurance achieves these results largely through the elimination of administrative and legal costs inherent in the settlement of claims through tort actions. Thus CATRALA feels that the system adopted for this city should rightly provide a high level of first party benefits coupled with a high threshold for tort remedy for extreme disability or pain and suffering. Other factors which aid in streamlining the no-fault system are the principle of insurance following the individual, rather than the vehicle, and the elimination of subrogation. With insurance following the individual, each person involved in an accident will maintain a direct line of communication with his own insurance carrier. The elimination of subrogation helps to minimize the administrative and legal expenses which just increase the cost of insurance.

Perhaps the single most beneficial result of adoption of a strong no-fault insurance system is the reduction of the case loads of our various courts. With the drastic reduction in the number of automobile accident cases, the courts will have more time to devote to the ever increasing criminal court load.

This committee has the opportunity to bring to the District of Columbia one of the most meaningful and progressive innovations ever to appear in the field of insurance. CATRALA of D.C. hopes that you and the Congress as a whole can respond to the opportunity by enacting strong and effective no-fault insurance for this capital city.

EXCERPTS FROM THE STATEMENT OF CLYDE M. WEBBER, NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

In January 1973, the National Executive Council of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, representing over 650,000 Federal employees, officially adopted a resolution introduced at our last Convention favoring National No-Fault Auto Insurance. In light of this action and pending enactment of a National No-Fault program, our organization endorses in principle H.R. 5448, whose purpose is to establish a District of Columbia No-Fault Motor Vehicle Insurance Act, effective January 1, 1974.

One of the major attributes of this Bill, in our estimate, is that it will finally introduce a mandatory insurance program for all drivers in the District.

We are also impressed by the attempt of this Bill to provide a measure of equity for the poor as well as the rich. Under this Bill, those with potentially high wage loss, and with expensive vehicles—those with more to protect in terms of material value of the vehicle or loss of income—would pay higher premiums, while those with less to protect would pay proportionately lower premiums, since premiums will be based on loss-incurring potential. This plan also seeks to distribute benefits in a more socially desirable way by compensating each victim, regardless of fault, for his actual economic loss. This would decrease the wide gap which now exists between economic loss and compensation. Moreover, in light of its mandatory nature, this compensation is related rather directly to the premiums paid.

Among its other virtues, this Bill would reduce the time lag between injury and settlement of auto accident liability claims; thus the injured party can commence rehabilitation immediately. Moreover, unlike the present tort system, where victims of accidents often defer rehabilitation to increase claims, this Bill rewards early rehabilitation by penalizing any insured person who refuses to commence it. This is an important element in this Bill because it is socially desirable to encourage all injured persons to return to a productive life as soon as possible.

We realize that the specific details appearing in H.R. 5448 will probably be the subject of considerable review by the House D.C. Committee prior to the reporting of this Bill to the floor of the House. However, we are pleased to find in this Bill a basic consonance with H.R. 10, a Bill introduced by Congressmen Moss and Dingell intended to provide preemptive legislation as guideline for No-Fault Auto Insurance by the States. Because of this consonance, we are pleased to observe that early consideration of H.R. 5448 is practicable, since it is already highly compatible with H.R. 10.

In summary and conclusion, we urge early consideration of H.R. 5448, which we support both in principle and in most of the explicit provisions which it contains.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JACK KEMP SPEAKS ON THE REAL MEANING OF THE PRO FOOTBALL HALL OF FAME AT CANTON, OHIO

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, last weekend our colleague, the Honorable JACK KEMP, delivered an address at the enshrinement dinner preceding the enshrinement of Joe Schmidt, Jim Parker, and Raymond Berry in the Pro Football Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio. Guests included Red Grange, George Halas, Mel Hein, Cal Hubbard, Don Hutson, John McNally, Bronco Nagurski and Ernie Nevers.

This address delivered by a man who knows and played pro football, was one of the most thoughtful addresses I have heard on the importance of sports in our national life.

It was a great weekend, the dinner, the enshrinement and then the pro football game between the New England Patriots and the San Francisco 49er's. The speech of our distinguished colleague, JACK KEMP made it all the better.

I therefore insert the text of his speech for the thoughtful consideration of others:

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JACK KEMP SPEAKS ON THE REAL MEANING OF THE PRO FOOTBALL HALL OF FAME AT CANTON, OHIO

Thank you very much, Curt Gowdy for that very thoughtful introduction and ladies and gentlemen for that very warm welcome. Bishop Kearns, Mayor Stanley Cmich, Chairman Wade Norris and my good friend, director of the Hall of Fame, Dick Gallagher. I always knew I would make it to Professional Football's Hall of Fame, but of course, this isn't exactly the way I planned it. Nonetheless, I'm deeply honored to be your principal speaker tonight and to share with you in honoring the great middle linebacker of the Detroit Lions, Joe Schmidt; professional football's all-time great offensive lineman Jim Parker, of the Baltimore Colts; and certainly the most dedicated and able pass catcher in modern times, if not all time, Raymond Berry of the Colts. Coach Hayes, Coach Ewbank, and Mr. William Clay Ford captured, I think, the essence of this award by telling us about the years of sacrifice and dedication these football greats have manifest in their lives. Raymond, Jim and Joe are truly reflective of all the football greats presently enshrined and indeed of the highest qualities of pro football as played in the National Football League.

After thirteen years of quarterbacking in professional football and now serving my second term in the U.S. Congress, I find many parallels between football and government. I believe there are many lessons to be learned on the football field and on the playing fields of America that are of great benefit in the lives of our young people and which are collectively vital to the life of our country. I wish tonight, on this great occasion before this tremendous audience of more than 1500 people gathered here in Canton, Ohio, to honor these three great professional football stars, to make the point that there is more to athletics in our society than just the winning of awards or the winning of games or even the enshrinement of individuals in Halls of Fame. As important as these are, I think it would be a mistake tonight to focus attention only on this award without taking time to reflect on the qualities developed in their lives which have helped them to overcome so many obstacles in order to make the Hall of Fame. For to focus attention solely on the award, or the honor, or the success, is to lose sight of the many hardships and challenges that have been overcome and which seem to me the reason that I think the Hall of Fame really exists and it's for this reason I wanted my son, Jeffrey, to be here with me, not just to see the Hall of Fame and meet the stars, but to know the real purpose behind this award.

The real meaning of the Hall of Fame is to

serve an example, a symbol, and a beacon, by which young men and women around this country can gain inspiration and motivation to press on, despite temporary setbacks to their goals in life; and whether or not they reach the Hall of Fame—it is in the competition and in the striving that those qualities are forged that make for better people and better citizens of this great Republic.

Sports in general, and football in particular, are a microcosm of our society and our competitive way of life. I would hasten to add at this point that I do not mean the type of competition that is some type of a Darwinian biological struggle in which only the strong can survive by stepping on the weak. Rather it is the type of competitive society in which competition leads to productivity and requires cooperation, where not just the strong can succeed, but the weak as well. All are lifted up not only by their own efforts, but by the inspiration and help they receive from those who achieve the highest. As a microcosm of our competitive society, sports help teach the type of perspective that is so necessary if one is not to lose hope at the sight of life's many obstacles. In sports, as in all human experience, we win and lose, try and fail and try again, get knocked down, and get up, and learn, hopefully, to never give up or give in. Problems are not roadblocks but challenges.

Just as individuals are tested, so too are nations. And this Nation has always responded to challenge and it will do so again. For this is the testing time as in fact we have had many before. The metal of our nation is never tested under the easiest of conditions. It is always tested in the fiercest of fire. It is what we do when the going is toughest that adds to that dimension of America's life which determines whether or not we rise above our problems and build a better tomorrow. I am confident we can and indeed will.

We live in an age of great doubt and cynicism in which all of our institutions are under direct attack. It is an age of uncertainty when few people have the type of philosophy or perspective that allows them to really understand what is happening to us and how to address the real issues of our being, values and purpose.

The Spanish philosopher, Ortega y Gassett, said of his age, "We do not know what is happening to us and that is precisely what is happening to us." Sports, I think can help us understand what is happening to us and helps put in perspective this age of challenge.

What is being honored tonight here in Canton, Ohio, is that transcendent quality of the human spirit that unites us all, black and white, young and old, man and woman, spirit that derives strength from challenge. The spirit that never gives up. I believe that is the spirit upon which this country was founded, upon which it grew and upon which we must build even further if we are to have a better tomorrow. It has been said that if you lose your money you have lost nothing. If you lose your health you have lost something, but if you lose your spirit, you've lost everything. We must never lose our spirit, either as individuals, or as a nation.

Our prisoners of war who have returned from five, six, or even in some cases seven or more years of prison camp in North Vietnam had that spirit. It's the same spirit upon which America was forged. It's the spirit of American football. It's the spirit that is still alive not just in this room and in the Hall of Fame, but across our land in our schools, churches and synagogues and homes. It's the spirit that believes that no matter how down, no matter how far out, no matter how low or how much of a handicap he or she may have, will never give in. That's the spirit of competition; that win or lose, you keep trying, and as former President Theodore Roosevelt once said it is to that type of person to whom the real credit in life goes. He said, "The credit in life goes not to the critic who stands on the sideline and points out where the strong stumble, but rather, the real credit in life goes to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face may get marred by sweat and dust, who knows great enthusiasm and great devotion and learns to spend himself in a worthy cause, who at best if he wins knows the thrill of high achievement and if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that in life his place will never be with those very cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat."

Tonight as we look upon these outstanding and successful professional football players, Joe, Jim and Raymond, I think it would be a mistake if we did not realize the setbacks and defeats that each has faced in his life, along with the moments when each was knocked down, only to get up and to come back to the battle, even more determined to prevail. That type of spirit will succeed, not only in the lives of individuals but in the life of our country, not only in sports fields, but off the field as well. It is that type of spirit held by our POW's, by our Founding Fathers, by the American professional football players enshrined in the Hall of Fame here in Canton and by millions of other Americans from every walk of life, religion, and race. It is that spirit which we honor tonight and to me that is the real meaning of the Hall of Fame.

This is truly the testing time for America and I believe sincerely that just as those who we honor tonight have met that test, so too will our country as it has so many times in our past history.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great honor to bring to the attention of this assembly, the achievement of a young man from Connecticut, Mr. Gary Rosenthal. Gary was recently named the State winner in the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" contest.

It was my pleasure to speak with Gary at the Connecticut State VFW Convention banquet. His attitude and accomplishment truly reflect the fine ideals instilled in him by his parents and I am sure that his future endeavors will serve many who lack the great inspiration and confidence in our country.

The following is the complete text of Gary's speech:

Albert Adams lived and worked in a prosperous town in the United States in 1914. Three years later, his body lay cold and lifeless on a field in France. Edward Plocharozyck lived in the United States in 1940. Five years later, only twenty years old, he died in the South Pacific serving as a Marine. Father Maximilian Kolbe offered his life in service of those poor prisoners at Concentration Camps, in Germany, during World War II. What did all these men have in common? They all possessed a spirit, an idea, that beckoned them to give up their lives to retain a basic right. That spirit and that right was freedom.

Freedom is not a gift. No one will hand it to you on a silver platter and bid you to do with it what you please. It must be earned. Earned by the blood and sweat and the sacrifice of those who wish to possess it. I am blessed with freedom, because others before me have struggled to obtain it. I and others like me taste the fruits of freedom, which were won by those who sacrified in order to be free.

My responsibility as a free citizen and patriot is to be ready to give up my life if need be to preserve freedom for myself and others. I must be ready and willing to offer my services to my country if and when it calls.

It is much easier to understand my responsibility to preserve and protect the free nations and peoples if we think of freedom as a torch, and as its light the spirit of liberty. It is my duty to spread this light to the far reaches of the earth and to protect it from the dark orb of tyranny. I have an obligation to prove to the world that a free people can achieve and excel far beyond the capacity of those burdened with despotism and oppression.

One of the paramount tasks I am compelled to perform is that of rekindling the flame of liberty in the hearts and minds of today's youth. Many have forgotten the importance of the meaning of the word freedom and the effort and toil of those brave men, women and children who won it for them. But all it takes is one spark to set the flame of freedom burning in their souls once again.

But how do we produce this spark? One salient method is education. The youth of America should be instructed in the value of living in a free nation and the torment of living under tryranny; and the best form of education is an example. I must show by example what the responsibility of every free citizen is to retain the right of liberty.

To do this I must obey the laws. The laws were written for the people and by the people, to protect the people. We must always remember that the laws and the government are really extensions of the people. Therefore, it is up to us to take an active part in our community, state and national government. I must encourage my fellow citizens to respect the laws because they are necessary to enjoy freedom. I must work with the government, not against it. If it is necessary to improve the government by change, then it must be a peaceful change by the will of the people. It must be remembered that the government we form must ensure us of our freedom and protect us from oppression.

It is my responsibility to improve myself, my community, and my nation as best I can by demonstrating what it means to be free.

I must call out to the world the blessings of liberty as if I were a bell anouncing a great event; and truly, from every mountain side, let freedom ring.

To this young man we must offer our congratulations and very best wishes for success in the future.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1973

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the 15th observance of Captive Nations Week was a clear success. In almost all sections of the country the traditional week was observed. Forward-thinking Americans have well demonstrated that they cannot and will not forget the captive nations in central Europe, within the U.S.S.R., in Asia, and in Cuba. For a few illustra-

tive examples of the week's commemoration, I submit the following:

First. Proclamations by Govs. Dale Bumpers, of Arkansas, Kenneth M. Curtis, of Maine, and John J. Gilligan, of Ohio; and

Second. An article by Tom Littlewood on "Captive Nations Week, a Paradox"; and

Third. A characteristic letter of citizen interest written by Mrs. Claire M. Richert of West Palm Beach, Fla.

STATE OF ARKANSAS 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, Czecho-Slovakia, 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, Dale Bumpers, Governor of the State of Arkansas, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 16, 1973 be observed as "Captive Nations Week" in Arkansas, and call upon the citizens of our state to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Arkansas to be affixed at Little Rock, the Capital, this 7th day of July, in the year of our Lord, Nineteen Hundred and Seventy Three.

STATE OF MAINE PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Captive Nations Week provides Americans with the opportunity to show their concern for the plight of 100 million East and Central Europeans living under Communist rule; 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 for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Kenneth M. Curtis, Governor of the State of Maine, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15–21, 1973, as Captive Nations Week in the State of Maine and call upon the citizens of Maine 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.

Given at the office of the Governor at Augusta, and sealed with the Great Seal of the State of Maine, this Eleventh day of July, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the One Hundred and Ninety-eighth.

STATE OF OHIO PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Americans are no strangers to struggle and strife in the continuing battle waged against tyranny and oppression; and

Whereas, it is fitting that all Ohioans join with nationality organizations and other concerned citizens throughout our state and nation in speaking out against the suffering and oppression born by those who are forced to live in nations enslaved by the powerful tyrants of Europe and Asia; and

Whereas, on this annual observance, let all of us bow our heads in humble tribute to these men, women and children who continue to seek the freedoms which we enjoy and offer our assistance to someday assure the rights of peace, freedom and integrity for all.

Now, therefore, I, John J. Gilligan, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby designate July 15–21, 1973, as Captive Nations Week in the State of Ohio, and urge all Ohioans to recognize the significance of this event.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the Great Seal of the State of Ohio to be affixed at Columbus, this 13th day of July, in the year of our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy Three.

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, June 18, 1973]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, A PARADOX

(By Tom Littlewood)

WASHINGTON.—A few days after Soviet leader Leonid I. Brezhnev completes his visit to the United States, the White House will issue President Nixon's routine proclamation commemorating the observance next month of Captive Nations Week.

By resolution of Congress in 1959, the year of Nikita S. Khrushchev's visit to this country, the special week is designated annually. In addition the same resolution committed the United States, insofar as Congress is able to do so, to the objective of "liberating" the non-Russian people who have come under Communist rule.

Many ethnic Americans nourish the hope that the lands of their parents and grandparents will somehow be freed of Communist control.

In the intervening years, meanwhile, American foreign policy has been transformed. The President introduced an era of negotiation and understanding, containing a tacit acceptance of Soviet domination over Eastern Europe.

Radio Moscow declared last year that Captive Nations Week had become "a completely outdated affair."

Obviously, explained Henry A. Kissinger at about the same time, circumstances have changed and no longer is there the imminent expectation of violent upheavals or peaceful changes in Eastern Europe.

Last year the platform of the Republican party hailed Nixon's "new era of diplomacy" and friendship with the Communist powers.

Following Khrushchev's visit, the 1960 platform prepared for the first Nixon presidential campaign by saying that "our greatest task is to nullify the Soviet conspiracy," a task requiring that the nation remain "inflexible against every tyrannical encroachment."

Some of those in the captive nations movement consider it ironic that Jewish liberals who were ridiculing anti-Communists and the "devil theory" of communism not many years ago are now outspoken protesters against Soviet repression directed at Jews.

"Kissinger seemingly is concerned exclusively with the plight of Soviet Jews," remarked Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky. "But what of the mass arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals. Are they to be forgotten?"

An economist at Georgetown University, Dobriansky has been a leader of the National Captive Nations Committee for many years.

Rep. Edward J. Derwinski, R-Ill., a longtime congressional spokesman for the movement, said it would be easier to form coalitions with Jewish groups if they were striving for the principle of free immigration for all.

Derwinski said the rhetoric of the movement is more subdued now, most of the "Birchers and way-outers" have been weeded out, and "there has been an adjustment to the realities of the time."

Lithuanian, Rumanian, Czech, Polish and other organizations are devoting themselves to specific issues in Congress—the defense budget, the funds for Radio Free Europe (which Sen. J. William Fulbright would discontinue as "a relic of the Cold War.")

The realities of the time are that the United States is prepared to keep its nose out of Eastern European affairs if the Russians will do the same where they don't belong, especially in Latin America.

And so, too, have the domestic ethnic politics of resentment undergone a startling transformation since 1959. This is due to the concern of American Jews over restrictions placed upon their brethren in the Soviet Union.

Poles and Ukrainians from Buffalo and Detroit were expected to participate in symbolic protests when Brezhnev is greeted by the President today. Their national organizations are cooperating with the administration by stimulating no demonstrations, but some of the local committees are making separate plans.

The State Department is worried about the far greater potential for a disturbance among militant Jews organized as the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews.

The Jewish "establishment"—older organizations represented in the National Conference on Soviet Jewry—are appealing to their members to cool it. The conference is sponsoring a series of public "assemblies" that are not intended to be demonstrations.

Isaiah Minkoff, executive vice chairman of that group, pointed out that the Israeli government is anxious not to "irritate Mr. Nixon, the source from whom all Phantoms (jet aircraft) flow."

On his side, Brezhnev comes with increased commerce between the two economies on his mind. Living standards are a hot consumer issue in Russia, and the Soviets need American technology and grain.

Nevertheless, the influence of American Jewry in both political parties is such that legislation to grant most-favored-nation trade status to the Soviet Union is dependent upon the immigration policy of the Soviet Government.

American Jews were aroused by the refusal of the Soviet Union to permit emigration of Jews to Israel without the payment of a sizable fee.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia University, has observed:

"Latin America is likely to undergo in-

tense political-ideological conflicts, dominated by anti-American passions. The fact that their sharp edge will be directed against the United States will tempt Moscow to give some of these revolutionary activities its tacit or indirect support.

More demonstrative encouragement may may be forthcoming from Moscow for established anti-American governments in Latin America, with Soviet naval visits to Latin American ports becoming routine during the seventies.

". . . The issue of Eastern Europe will not be resolved until the Soviet Union learns the same lesson that the United States has learned in Latin America: Spheres of imperial hegemony can be maintained only at a very high cost."

It is precisely to avoid any negotiated freezing of the status quo that the representatives of the captive nations organizations have been directing their attention to Brezhnev's visit.

Aloyius A. Mazewski, president of the Polish-American Congress and the Polish National Alliance, called at the State Department recently with a reminder of the points that he thought should be raised anew with the Soviet leader.

The ethnic groups have an interest in another subject that will be high on Nixon's agenda next week: finding out whether the Russians are willing to remove troops from Eastern Europe in return for the mutual balanced withdrawal of American forces from West Germany and other parts of Western Europe.

Sentiment is growing in Congress for a reduction of American divisions in Europe. But the President has resisted until the Soviets are ready to do the same on their side.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA.,
July 11, 1973.

To the EDITOR.

DEAR SIR: Foes of communism, at home and abroad, are observing Captive Nations Week July 15th through July 21st. These seven days commemorate the billion living human beings whose nations have been enslaved by Communist Russia.

The long list of Captive Nations begins with Armenia which fell in 1920, and extends to North Vietnam (1954) and Cuba (1960). It is graphic illustration of Russia's dynamic goal of world domination.

It is timely for Americans to reflect upon their neighbors who exist without freedom or hope, because we, too, are on the schedule. It can happen here!

Moscow is annoyed at any public attention being drawn to the plight of the Captive Nations, because it belies its pretense, that communism is just another peace-loving form of government. It is trying to propagandize anti-communism sentiment as an out-moded relic of the "cold war." It cannot hide a billion slaves from sight, so desires the world to believe that those in captivity are not hungering for freedom and self-determination.

We must not be deluded that "detente" means peace. It is the nature of the bear to appear docile and cuddly as long as you are feeding it, and to kill without passion when you stop. The Russian symbol is quite appropriate for the amoral creed of communism, which is simply that anything that promotes communism is good and anything that does not is evil.

Communism must be rejected and opposed by everyone who believes that man has a soul and a destiny and that no government on earth possesses the right to reduce human souls to cattle.

Pray this week for those who have no freedom. Pray this week that your own freedom will not be given away.

Sincerely yours,

CLAIRE M. RICHERT.

WHAT DO I DO FOR THE NEXT 20 YEARS?

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times Magazine June 17 published an article by Susan Jacoby about a group of working-class women in Brooklyn, N.Y. The article, "What Do I Do for the Next 20 Years?," describes the women's individual and collective attempts to transcend their roles as wives and mothers and move into the labor market.

These women do not consider themselves feminists.

No group of women seems further removed from the worlds of Gloria Steinem and Betty Friedan, Ms. magazine, marriage contracts, "alternative life-styles," sexual experimentation and all of the upper-middle-class paraphernalia frequently associated with the feminist movement.

According to Ms. Jacoby.

Yet they are facing an economic and social problem a growing number of American women encounter at middle-age. Their children are grown, they are unemployed and undereducated and they have 20 or so years before reaching legal retirement age.

The women described in this article represent an impressive sector of our population. Their problems should not be dismissed as insignificant, nor should their potential as productive citizens be underestimated.

The article follows:

WHAT DO I DO FOR THE NEXT 20 YEARS?

(By Susan Jacoby)

"I'm short, fat and 45."

Rose Danielli digs her fork into a large piece of Sara Lee cherry cheesecake as she begins to describe herself at the first meeting of a women's consciousness-raising group last September. Twelve women are crowded into the living room of a small red-brick house in the East Flatbush section of Brooklyn; many are old friends who have shared senior proms, weddings, births, miscarriages, family deaths and all of the other minor and major events of life in a close-knit working-class community where neighbors still care about one another. Now they are supporting one another in a new experience: an effort to expand their middle-aged lives beyond the comfortable roles of wife, mother and grandmother. No group of women seems further removed from the worlds of Gloria Steinem and Betty Friedan, Ms. magazine, marriage contracts, "alternative life-styles," sexual experimentation and all of the upper-middle-class paraphernalia frequently associated with the feminist movement.

"My mother-in-law asked me the other day if I was one of those 'women's libbers,'" continues Mrs. Danielli, "and I told her I had always been something of a 'libber' even though I like being called 'Mrs.' She said she guessed I was telling the truth, because she remembered how hard I fought for my girls to go to college. My husband and I never went to college, and everyone in the family thought our three girls would go to work to help put my son Johnny through.

"Way back when the kids were in grade school, I told my husband, 'Joe, if one of our kids is going to college, all of them are going. Your girls aren't gonna have 10 children like your mama—they've gotta do something with their lives just like our boy.'

"Both of our families were shocked when our oldest girl went off to college—Joe's papa kept asking if we didn't need the extra money she could bring in working as a typist. We needed money, all right, but I never gave in—even when times were toughest and we were eating spaghetti without meat sauce three nights a week."

There is a note of solid satisfaction in Rose Danielli's voice as she finishes both her story and the cheesecake. The women have agreed to begin their first session by describing the most significant failures and successes of their lives; they will start to talk about the future after evaluating the past. The old friendship and neighborly bonds give their discussion a more comfortable aura than the sort that usually prevails in Manhattan consciousness-raising sessions, which frequently reflect the fragmented and transient nature of affluent high-rise apartment living.

"I was going to break the rules and interrupt," admits Alice Martino, a construction worker's wife who grew up on the same block with Rose in East Flatbush. "I thought Rose might go on and on about being fat, as though there were nothing more to her story."

The life stories outlined by the women have many common elements. The women are all in their 40's; most grew up in first- and second-generation Italian or Jewish immigrant homes. A few have lived in East Flatbush since they were children, and the rest came from nearby blue-collar neighborhoods. Most of the women graduated from high school, went to work for a year or two at poorly paid jobs, married by age 20 and quickly started having children. Only two of the 12 had any education beyond high school. Rose Danielli's background is typical; she worked as a telephone operator for a year before marrying Joe, a telephone installer, when they were both 19.

The husbands are blue-collar union men or white-collar workers employed by the city government; their general income range is between $9,000 and $14,000 a year. Most of the families have at least three children. Homemade soups and clothes are a necessary economy for them rather than an expression of the "traditional female role." Their houses represent the only important financial investment of their lives and are maintained with appropriate care—postage-stamp lawns raked free of leaves, living-room sofas glazed with plastic slipcovers and reserved for company, starched kitchen curtains, home freezers stocked with the specials the women unearth in numerous grocery stores on Saturday mornings. They worry in equal measure about the rising price of ground chuck, the fact that so many of their grown children are leaving the old neighborhood, and how to get along with the blacks who are moving into the area. A movie and dinner in a local Chinese or Italian restaurant is a once-a-month event. Manhattan is "the city," a place to be visited on wedding anniversaries for dinner and a hotel floor show.

Whatever their problems, the women love their husbands and are not about to leave them. They do not expect to liberate themselves by living alone, although they understand why some younger women find marriage an unsatisfactory state. They have neither the education nor the work experience to be tapped as token women for high-powered jobs in high-powered companies. One woman in the group says she is waiting breathlessly for the day when the local 6 o'clock news will feature a broadcaster who is not only black and female but over 40, thereby providing on-screen representation for three oppressed groups instead of two.

Nevertheless, the women are convinced that they can build a future different from the traditional path laid out by their mothers and grandmothers. The feminist movement is responsible in large measure for their be-

lief that they can change the course of their middle-aged lives.

The movement was gaining strength and national publicity at a time when the women who make up the East Flatbush group began to face the void most full-time mothers experience after their children grow up and leave home. Their comments in the group sessions indicate that two main concerns spurred their interest in feminism: the feeling that society in general, and their husbands in particular, no longer viewed them as sexually interesting or even sexually functioning women, and the realization that they were "out of a job" in the same sense as a middle-aged man who is fired by his employer of 20 years.

The idea of a formal consciousness-raising group was suggested last fall by Lillian Schwartz, the only one of the women with any extensive contacts outside the neighborhood. She had been active for many years in citywide organizations concerned with the public schools, and she was hearing more and more about the feminist movement from the women she met in the course of her volunteer work. At the same time, her three closest friends in East Flatbush were constantly mulling over the question of what to do with the next 20 or 30 years of their lives. They agreed that an organized group might help them figure out what to do and quickly recruited enough interested women to make up a manageable dozen. Lillian hunted down a copy of Ms. with advice on how to form a consciousness-raising group.

The most important decision at the first meeting was that the sessions would be held regularly on Tuesday nights. Except in emergencies, they would not be subject to interference by children and husbands who had other activities in mind. At the second session, several women reported with glee that the announcement of a regular meeting had caused a storm in their homes. "In our house, my husband expects me home every evening," explained one woman. "That is, unless he decides to go bowling. Then I can go to the movies by myself or out to a neighbor's."

Some of the husbands resented the decision to regularize the meetings because they had chosen to view the group as just another *Kaffeeklatsch*. The reactions of the men included bitter opposition, secret sabotage, amused resignation and quiet support. "My poor man asked what he should tell the neighbors if they called and asked for me on Tuesday night," recalled a woman whose husband is part-owner of a Jewish delicatessen. "I told him to tell anyone who called the truth, that I'm working out what to do with my life. He said the hell he would, he'd tell them I was doing something for the temple."

Sarah Thomas, the 40-year-old wife of a policeman, had the biggest problem: Every time she planned to leave the house for her women's group, her husband had a minor household accident requiring her attention. The women were appropriately sympathetic when she arrived an hour late for the second meeting because her husband's ankle needed soaking after he twisted it on the front stoop. Before the next meeting, Sergeant Thomas carved a deep slice in his thumb with a potato peeler. When he poured boiling water over his hand, Sarah and the other women began to suspect the accidents were not entirely accidental.

At the fifth meeting Sarah reported that "I told him since he was an experienced police officer he was used to dealing with emergencies and I was sure he could take care of a slight burn by himself. I figure if I just sail out of the house anyway, he'll stop having these accidents." (She proved a poor prophet, because she continued to attend the women's group meetings and, as of June, her husband was still chalking up at least two accidents a month.)

Most of the women spent considerable time talking about personal sexual problems during the early weeks of the group. In this respect, they resemble the younger wives, single women and divorcees who make up the membership of most consciousness-raising groups. But they are of a more reserved and modest generation than the younger feminists. No one mentions foreplay or sexual positions. If the East Flatbush women are worried about orgasms, they do not talk about it. An occasional mention of premarital sex produces flushes of embarrassment. But they are all acutely aware of the unfulfilled sexual desires that seem to be the lot of many middle-aged women in American society. To a greater or lesser degree, most of the women reported the same problem: The frequency of sexual relations with their husbands diminished drastically after they entered their 40's. For the unluckiest women, sex—like a night out in "the city"—became an event reserved for birthdays and anniversaries. "It's more like a monument than an act of love," one commented.

"I just want to be recognized as a woman," said Ruth Levine, a mother of five whose 100-pound figure and short black hair make her look a decade younger than her 46 years. Her husband is a cab driver who has worked 14- to 16-hour days throughout most of their married life.

"I'm going to be alive for another 20 or 30 years," she observed. "My husband and I sleep together maybe once a month. Oh, it's not that he wants another woman—I don't think that at all. It's just that . . . I'm familiar. Men really don't think of women in their 40's that way, in a sexual way. I know it isn't the way I look—I'm prettier now than I was when I had five children under the age of 10 to run after all day. I don't feel like having orgies, but I'm too young for this . . . this . . . it's almost an end to sex. I don't know how to make my husband realize this without hurting him. I don't want him to feel I'm making demands he can't meet. And I don't even know if I have the courage to talk about it with him, after all these years of letting the man lead the way. . . ."

Another woman sadly recalled a night when she put her arms around her husband while he was watching television and he pushed her away. "He said, 'Help, I married a sex maniac.' He made it sound like a joke, but I knew he was only half-teasing. Then he said, 'You know, Debbie, we're really getting too old for much fooling around. Our kids are going to be getting married pretty soon.' "

Alice Martino mocked the sex advice offered by conventional women's magazines. "They tell you to be careful to keep up your looks, don't walk around in front of your husband in rollers, go out and buy a new black negligee. But those little gems are stupid, because most women who like men have been following them for years. My hair is combed and my fanny is still pretty firm and I don't wear flannel pajamas to bed. It's the idea of settling into a new role after you get past a certain age that's so hard to fight.

"You know, when you were 20 the thing to do was make love and have children. Our eldest boy is getting married next month. The other night Rick said to me, "Well, pretty soon I'll be able to call you grandma.' I said he would over my dead body, that I would have murdered him if he'd called me 'Ma' while our kids were growing up. He laughed and said he was a fool, because he'd forgotten the time I shut him out of the bedroom after he gave me a new baby carriage for my birthday. A baby carriage. For *my* birthday!"

With the exception of Rose Danielli, who correctly surmised that losing 60 pounds would make a major change in her own sense of physical well-being as well as her husband's sexual behavior, the women agreed that spending money on "a new look" was not the answer to a lagging sex life. As a group, they were somewhat more tolerant of the sexual insecurities of middle-aged males than the younger women in consciousness-raising groups. Some of them compared the fatigue of their husbands with the exhaustion they felt when they were looking after small children.

"Life plays a dirty trick on women," said Ann Nussbaum, whose husband is a bookkeeper with the city Finance Administration. "The men think you're gorgeous when you're too young to know anything about life. How well I remember how hard it was to take any interest in my husband when I had been changing diapers all day. Now I have much more time and interest for sex, but my husband is the one who's beat. He does tax returns to make extra money on the side—I know he just feels like rolling over and going to sleep at the end of the day.

One of the things I feel I have to get across to him is that being physically affectionate with each other doesn't have to mean sex; he doesn't have to feel all this pressure that men seem to feel about performance. I agree with Ruth that it's hard to talk about these things after a lifetime of being silent, but I don't see how we can get anywhere unless we speak up about what's bothering us."

As the group sessions continued, most of the women reported considerable success in their attempts to talk about sex with their husbands. They began seeking out more sex information from medical studies and books on women's health by feminist writers. Several women said their husbands were especially impressed by the Masters and Johnson finding that normal men and women can continue to enjoy sex into their 60's. Said Rose Danielli: "Joe told me, 'You know, Rose, we were brought up in ignorance even if we did manage to have four kids. This Masters-Johnson thing you're telling me about—I thought a wife would think her husband was a dirty old man if he kept trying to take her to bed when they were 50 years old."

One woman who was going through menopause reported that her husband was greatly relieved to learn she could still function sexually. "Like most of us here, I never really talked about these things with my husband. When I finally got up the nerve to say something, I found out he thought the change of life meant that a woman would find it difficult—physically difficult, that is—to have sex. I told him I was looking forward to the change because it meant I wouldn't have to worry about getting pregnant anymore. He said he'd never looked at it that way."

Many members of the group linked their sexual plight with the more general emptiness of middle-aged women who have devoted their entire lives to their families. "My nights will take care of themselves if I have something to occupy my days," said one. By December—the third month of the group sessions—most of the discussions centered around the need to find some sort of work.

Ruth Levine, who had never worked outside her home, surprised the rest of the group by becoming the first to take the plunge into the job market. She applied for a job as a file clerk in a large advertising agency and was hired with a warning from the personnel department that "most of the girls on your floor will be 25 years younger than you are."

Feminist opponents of job discrimination are correct in their assertion that file clerking is a thankless, dead-end task reserved by large companies for women. However, the upper-middle-class, college-educated feminists often fail to realize that a woman with no training may look upon a mundane job as an opportunity rather than an insult. For Ruth Levine, who had rarely left her neighborhood for 25 years, the file clerk's job was an important step into a wider world.

"Well, I know it's not much of a job in the eyes of anyone else," she reported to her group after she had been working for a month. "Even the secretaries look down on file clerks—especially a file clerk in her 40's. And I agree with some of the stuff I read in Ms. these days—a man, even a dumb one, would never have to take one of these jobs. But to me the job is something. Someone has to do this kind of work. I never went to college, I never worked before I was married, and I don't really have the training for anything more. What do I get out of the job? For one thing, I get to meet a lot of different people who give me new things to think about.

"The young girls ask me 'Mrs. Levine, why are you working at your age when you have a husband and children? We're just waiting to get married and out of this hole.' I tell them I'm working because it's better than sitting home and being a vegetable, and that they should get themselves some more training or they'll be file clerks 20 years from now, whether they get married or not. I don't see any practical advice for girls like this in any of the magazines, including Ms. and Cosmopolitan. Cosmo tells girls how to put rouge on their breasts and Ms. tells you how to start your own business, but no one tells file clerks that life will stretch into a big zero unless they improve their skills."

The other important thing Ruth gets out of her job is money: She brings home more than $90 a week after taxes and Social Security withholding. "It makes me feel both that I'm independent and that I'm contributing something to the household," she said.

Sarah, the wife of the accident-prone police sergeant, broke in: "Whenever I talk about getting a job, my husband says I'm contributing something by staying home."

"I know, I know, I've heard it all," Ruth replied, "My Hal said exactly the same thing. He said it made him feel like a second-class man, that he couldn't take care of his family by himself. I said, 'Hal, our youngest kid is 16. What am I going to do with myself for the next 20 years?' I told him I'd feel like we were pulling together—the way we did when the kids were little—if I could bring in a little money to make our lives easier.

"At first we agreed the money would go into a special account in my name, so it would be clear he was still paying for everything. Finally Hal saw the money was piling up and it was crazy not to use it. We put part of it into the regular budget and are saving the rest for a vacation."

Ruth reported that her husband's attitude toward her job changed slowly but definitely. He became less concerned about the fact that she was making money of her own and began to cut down on his own 14-hour work days in his taxi. The most unexpected dividend was a significant improvement in their sex life.

"I can't believe it. We have a sex life again. For the first time in years Hal can go out with me once a week; he comes home at 7 o'clock instead of midnight. That little bit of extra money makes a big difference to us. We go to bed together more than we did for the last 10 years.

"Hal and I have never been much for talking about sex, but one night he turned to me in bed and said, 'You know, Ruthie, I was just too beat to pay attention to you this way. I didn't realize it until you went to work and took some of the money pressure off me.' I said, 'You know, Hal, I didn't realize it either.' "

Ruth is taking a shorthand course so that she can move into a better-paying secretarial job next fall. After she took the first step, four other women in the group found jobs. Two returned to the secretarial work they had done before they were married, one found an opening as a teacher aide in the Head Start program for preschool children, and another put her fluent Italian to work as an interpreter for older immigrants in their dealing with city agencies. Two women in the group decided they would go to college and were accepted in adult-education programs leading toward a bachelor's degree.

The women who plan to enter college are undergoing profound changes that have also made a deep impact on their husbands. "I don't think I could take file clerking," announced Alice Martino one night, "but I'm not prepared for anything else. I always wanted to go to college, and I think that's just what I'm going to do."

Unlike many of the women, Alice has no serious financial problems. Her husband, Rick earns more than $16,000 a year as a construction worker; they live rent- and mortgage-free in a house Alice's mother left them when she died. Their children are between ages 18 and 24, and are either currently attending college or have graduated.

Alice is enrolling in the highly respected adult-education program at Brooklyn College. After considering several possibilities, she decided on teaching as a career because she felt it offered the easiest entree for an older woman. She plans to make a specialty of speech and reading therapy because there is a shortage of trained personnel in those areas despite an over-all teacher surplus.

Contradicting the hard-hat stereotype, Alice's husband turned out to be more favorably disposed toward the feminist movement than the other women's husbands. In fact, he decided to follow his wife's example. "He confessed he was jealous of my plans to go to college," Alice said, "and then he decided he was being stupid because he could do it too. College was never a possibility for him when he was younger—he was the oldest son and his parents needed money very badly. He's thought about architectural engineering for years; he always said he knew more about putting up buildings than the engineers on the job.

"Anyway, he said he always assumed a man couldn't change his wife in midstream but he figured if women were trying to do it, why not him. It won't be easy for him trying to build a new career when he's over 40, but it won't be easy for me either. We have it planned. I'll be teaching before Rick gets his engineering degree, and he'll have a pension because he's been in the union since he was 18. We'll have plenty of money to get along on while he looks for an employer who doesn't think a man is a fossil when he gets to be 40. As far as my teaching goes, I'll be less of a fossil than the younger teachers."

One of the more conservative women in the group told Alice she sounded like a starry-eyed 18-year-old. "I feel like one," she replied. "I haven't been this optimistic about life since I was 18."

Joan Loewenstein, who is also entering Brooklyn College next fall, was equally optimistic. She hopes to become a statistician or a computer programer. "A lot of people have been telling me I'm out of my mind to be thinking about this big a change 'at your age.' Oh, they love to use that phrase—'at your age.' But I've been lucky like Alice—my husband has been wonderful. His partner in the deli started this business about my age, and he said, 'What do you think she should do at her age, buy a cemetery plot?' Abe is convinced I have a talent for math because I've always helped him keep the books for the store, done our income-tax return, that sort of thing.

"You know, we had a joint checking account all of our lives, but Abe always gave me the household money every week. I never wrote a check for anything unless it was something like the mortgage payment. I would never have bought myself a new dress without checking with him first. Abe has been doing some thinking on his own about Women's Lib. He says it suddenly hits him how stupid it was for him to be doling out household money to me when I keep the books better than he does.

"So, the other night he tells me, 'Joan, I'm not giving you money for the house anymore, you take what you need. Here I am, a man who's been letting a woman keep his books for 20 years, and still telling her what to spend each week. I know what I got out of it, but what did you get? I never really wanted to be cheap, it was just the way my parents did things.'

"You know, I was surprised at all this from Abe. Then I started thinking about that question—what *did* I get out of it. Well, I told Abe I was able to save some money from my allowance on the sly. He said, 'So, now you'll save on the open.' I guess it was sort of comfortable, acting like a little girl about money. Anyway, it sure won't do for a college girl—oophs, woman—who wants to program computers."

Not all the women have had as much success in changing their own lives or the attitudes of their husbands. Judith Katz, who worked as a secretary before her marriage 20 years ago, encountered stiff opposition when she went back to work in the counseling office of a Brooklyn junior high school. Her husband especially resents the fact that she wanted a job enough to take an opening in a ghetto school with a tough reputation. As an expression of his disapproval, he refuses to ride the subway with his wife in the morning. Another of the women, an accountant's wife who is already attending classes at Brooklyn College, did not speak to her husband for several weeks after he told her, "You're too feather-brained to finish cleaning the house, much less four years of college."

In general, the East Flatbush men who disapprove of feminism express their reactions more openly than the professional husbands of upper-middle-class women who are the most vocal and visible participants in the movement. College-educated men are often reluctant to attack women's liberation in principle, but their practical behavior is another matter. Judging from the wide variety of male reactions described by the Flatbush wives, Middle-American men who are no more or no less disturbed than other American men when the women in their lives try to break out of the traditional female pattern.

The East Flatbush women have considerable difficulty identifying with the widely publicized leaders of the movement. Said one: "I confess I don't feel much of a sense of sisterhood when I see pictures of Gloria Steinem with her streaked hair and slinky figure. I feel somehow that these people don't know how it is to be getting older with very little money and education. They have it a lot better than we do—it's not true that we're all in the same boat."

Another woman disagreed: "Well, there's one thing we all have in common—we're all afraid of muggers and rapists when we walk down a dark street at night. And that's something we have in common with the colored women who live right here in East Flatbush, even though most of us are better off financially than they are."

The women do identify with the movement on a variety of specific issues—child day-care centers, equal pay for equal work, the right to abortion and contraceptive information, the need to educate young girls to think of themselves as individuals in their own right instead of viewing themselves only as future wives and mothers. Several of the women now spend considerable time trying to introduce these reformist ideas into the conservative social environment of East Flatbush. One of their immediate goals is a health information service for girls and women of all ages; they feel that most East Flatbush

women are unlikely to use the referral services now available in Manhattan. Rose Danielli had hoped to organize such a service through her church but ran head-on into a clash with her priest over contraceptive information.

"My husband said, 'Oh, Rose, don't get into a battle with Father———.' Then he said, 'I give up. If you were willing to do battle with my mama you won't stop with the priest.'

"But Joe doesn't really mind the way I feel—in fact, I think he's kind of proud. This year our oldest girl gets her doctor's degree from Stanford, our boy gets his master's and our second youngest girl graduates from Hunter College. Joe told his parents the other night that sending all of this kids through college was the proudest accomplishment of his life, and that he wouldn't have done it if I hadn't insisted.

"We had to fight our girls, too, until they were old enough to have some sense. They used to remind me that I got married when I was 19 and their dad and I were happy. I just told them their grandparents never finished high school and they were happy too, but it's not progress if the next generation lives the same way. To me, that's what Women's Lib is all about—progress. In small steps, maybe, but still progress."

Next fall, the East Flatbush group will take in five new women because several of the founding members will be too busy with jobs and college courses. All of the women call that progress.

A FARMER'S VIEW

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared recently in the Coffee County Progress, a biweekly newspaper in Douglas, Ga. It was written by a Coffee County farmer who writes a weekly column for the paper. I think it does an excellent job of presenting the farmer's viewpoint concerning high food prices.

I deplore the high cost of food American consumers are faced with today, but I also feel that too often consumers do not see the other side of the picture. Although this article was written during phase 3½, I feel the ideas expressed are still applicable to our general economic situation in this country today.

The article follows:

A FARMER'S VIEW

(By Thurman Gillis)

"There is no mystery whatsoever as to why retail food prices have risen in the past year. The answer lies almost entirely in the rise of wholesale farm prices," says economist Arthur Okum.

"Profit margins in the food-processing business have been absolutely miserable all down the line. The farmer on the other hand has been enjoying considerable prosperity," stated Economist Walter Heller.

Thus the economist has waved his magic wand and determined the farmer is to blame for high food prices. Having done so, he can go back to drinking his High Ball in his total environment controlled Pent House.

The fact is that Americans today pay a smaller percent of their income for food than ever before. In 1950, a full 24 percent of disposable personal income went for food; last year, it was down to 16 percent. In no other industrial nation is the percentage so low.

The farmers share of the retail food dollar has steadily declined in the past 25 years falling from about 52¢ out of every dollar in 1947 to an all-time record low of 40¢ in 1972.

If the farmer gave his corn away a 32¢ box of cornflakes would cost 2.8¢ less. The box costs more than that. Do we hear people complaining about the high price of the box? If the farmer gave his wheat away, the price of a loaf of bread would be 2.6¢ less.

The average return on investment in farming is 5 percent compared to 15 percent in manufacturing.

Despite the above mentioned facts the President and his Economist say we must have cheaper food prices.

We now have a sixty day ceiling on food prices at the retail level. Wages, rents, dividends and interest rates are not frozen. Great effort was made to explain that raw agricultural product prices were not frozen. However one could not have been more effective in placing a ceiling on raw agricultural product prices. By reverse, prices will be rolled back to the farmer. It is clear that farmers were again singled out.

President Nixon now aims to phase out crop subsidies for wheat, feed grains and cotton over a three year period. In fact, the White House is cold bloodedly clear about its plan for the farm of the future. Of the 2.8 million farms still existing in the United States, the Agriculture Department considers that as many as 1.2 million may be too poor to survive. For these "displaced refugees" if their future does not include Agriculture, then what?

The Administration as yet sees no help for the farmers being driven from their land by a government that is forcing them to leave. It seems agriculture and the United States may well be destroyed by bureaucrats and politicians not capable of understanding.

LETTER TO PRESIDENTS OF THREE MAJOR TELEVISION NETWORKS

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, following is a copy of my letter of July addressed to the presidents of the three major television networks, with a copy of their respective answers. I felt my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might be interested in what they had to say:

JULY 11, 1973.

Mr. ELTON H. RULE,
President, American Broadcasting Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. RULE: Kindly give me your reasons of why you would alternate (one network per day) coverage of the Senate Committee Watergate hearings prior to the testimony of Mr. John Dean—then have simultaneous network coverage by all three networks during Mr. Dean's testimony—but then revert to alternating network coverage?

I will be most interested in your comments, especially in view of the fact that Mr. John Mitchell was a much higher official in the Administration than was Mr. John Dean.

Sincerely,

EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N.Y., July 26, 1973.

The Honorable EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ESHLEMAN: I am replying to your letter of July 11, in which you ask why CBS rotated coverage of the Watergate hearings before and after John Dean's testimony while offering "simultaneous network coverage by all three networks" when Mr. Dean testified. You compare this to the rotating coverage when John Mitchell testified, noting that he "was a much higher official in the administration" than Mr. Dean.

The decision was unilateral, made by each network at different times. I can, of course, speak only for CBS.

The decision in question was based simply on the importance of the anticipated testimony. It had nothing to do with the relative position of either individual in the Administration.

It was clear from earlier statements and disclosures that Mr. Dean and his testimony was central to the entire Watergate investigation. Further, he had been on the White House staff; he had openly broken with the President; he had been fired by the President. Add to this his assertion that he would not become a scapegoat and you have all the makings of a potentially explosive witness. The same could not be said of Mr. Mitchell. While we recognized that obviously Mr. Mitchell's testimony would be important, we did not believe that it would equal Mr. Dean's.

Now, even in hindsight, it is quite clear that Mr. Dean's testimony was certainly the most dramatic and potentially the most newsworthy. This is stated neither as a judgment of guilt in the Watergate affair nor as an assessment of the credibility of Mr. Dean's testimony. The decision that you question was one involving a host of difficult, delicate and interrelated judgments including what was likely to occur at the hearings, public interest and getting across the story.

As succeeding witnesses are scheduled, CBS will approach the question of rotating coverage or carrying the hearings in full, as we have done to date. For example, with John Ehrlichman testifying this week, CBS scheduled special coverage on Tuesday from 10 PM to 11 PM, on Thursday from 10 PM to 11 PM and on Friday from 8 PM to 9 PM. On Wednesday, we covered the hearings live as part of the regular rotation practice.

Cordially,

JOHN A. SCHNEIDER.

ABC NEWS,
New York, N.Y., July 19, 1973.

Representative EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ESHLEMAN: Elton H. Rule has asked me to reply to your letter of July 11th in which you inquire as to the basis for ABC's determination to cover John Dean's appearance before the Senate Watergate Committee live for his entire testimony while limiting live coverage of the testimony of John Mitchell and other witnesses to those days when ABC had the rotation responsibility.

Under the rotation plan, each network makes its own determination as to the extent of its live coverage of the hearings on days it does not have the rotation responsibility.

In the case of Mr. Dean, we made the determination, based on our advance information, that the probable newsworthiness of his testimony warranted full live coverage. As it turned out, the latter days of Mr. Dean's appearance, were largely repetitious of his earlier testimony.

Guided by that experience, we made the determination in the case of Mr. Mitchell, following his first day's testimony, that further live coverage in addition to our rotation responsibility was not warranted.

As the Watergate hearings progress, ABC News will continue to make judgments concerning live coverage based on our best eval-

uation of the probable newsworthiness of the testimony.

Only at the conclusion of the hearings can it be properly judged whether we have treated them fairly and honestly. I am confident you will find that we have.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM SHEEHAN.

NBC NEWS,
New York, N.Y., July 20, 1973.

The Honorable EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ESHLEMAN: Julian Goodman has discussed with me your letter raising questions about NBC News coverage of the Watergate hearings, and I volunteered to respond directly to you and to acquaint you with the reasoning that has led to our present scheduling pattern.

When the hearings opened we knew they would be making important news, but we could not know how long they would continue, what schedule would be followed or what, or how many, witnesses would be called. We were also confident there would be unpredictable developments of significant public interest, and all these factors indicated the desirability of full live coverage. So we started on that basis, as did the other networks.

As we came through the early days of the hearings, which featured testimony by a series of technical witnesses, we discerned at least two shortcomings in having all three networks carrying the same pool coverage simultaneously and daily. First, there was the question of how long this course could be followed if the hearings lasted a long time; second, the three-network coverage reduced or eliminated viewer choice of programming across the country. On this latter point, our affiliates began reflecting viewer complaint in their communities and we heard directly from the viewing public.

Consequently, the lawyers for each of the network companies met to determine what could be done that would be legally proper, and as a result the rotation pattern of coverage was agreed on and adopted.

We followed it until John Dean's appearance, which presented a new situation. Dean appeared to be the first witness capable of speaking directly to the key question of the President's knowledge of the Watergate affair and subsequent events. While we were in the process of deciding whether to depart from the rotational pattern, the other two networks announced that they would resume daily live coverage of the hearings. This combination of factors prompted NBC to resume live coverage on a daily basis.

During the week of Dean's testimony, however, we again began receiving criticism, comparable to what we have received before, this time making the point that even for a witness of special importance, the rotation system would provide full, live coverage for those interested and still offer the nationwide audience alternate programming.

We recognized the validity of this contention and during the long recess following Dean's testimony we considered the options and decided to return to rotation coverage in the weeks ahead and announced our plans to do so. As of this writing we have adhered to the rotation system.

I believe it is important to note that the rotation system was begun in the first place as an experiment, and we so described it in our initial announcement. In departing from it we were, in effect, experimenting with an experiment, and throughout our coverage we have been guided by considerations of journalistic competition and our desire to provide optimum television service to the viewing public. Some viewers have assigned partisan motives to our judgments, which, of course, is absurd.

As of now, we plan to stay in rotation, unless some compelling development directs otherwise. We cannot forecast what that might be, but nearly each session of the hearings seems to bring novel considerations to our task, and we are trying to deal with them on a day-to-day basis to the best of our ability so the public may be fully and accurately informed.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD C. WALD.

WOMEN: MYTHS VERSUS FACTS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, poor Mr. Rowen. Since women have learned to read and think, it is no longer safe for a columnist to write a bunch of old myths concerning jobs and employment. The following are three letters to the editor responding to Mr. Rowen's comments, carried in the Washington Post of August 2:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN

WOMEN AND JOBS

Hobart Rowen's comments that the progress of black women is made at the expense of black men is nonsense.

Statistics from the Department of Labor indicate that of all full-time workers, white men earn the most, then come black men, followed by white women, and last are black women who suffer doubly because of sex and race.

In the last decade, children living in a family headed by their father had a 50–50 chance of getting out of poverty. Children living in a family headed by their mothers had a *zero* chance of getting out of poverty, for the number of female-headed families increased, particularly among blacks.

If race discrimination ended tomorrow, many black women and their families would still be in poverty.

BERNICE SANDLER,
Member, Advisory Committee on the Economic Role of Women to the President's Council of Economic Advisers.
WASHINGTON.

In his July 12th column, Hobart Rowen discusses the economic progress of black Americans in the last decade. The data quoted were analyzed by Richard Freeman of the Brookings Institution. Rowen comments that, ". . . Paul Samuelson and others properly called attention to . . . (the fact that) some of the progress of black women cited by Freeman must be at the expense of black males . . ."

As a group of black and white women, we feel that this statement avoids the real issues such as:

1) Black women with college degrees who work full time earn less than black men with an eighth grade education. If we accept Freeman's findings that the average income of black women is virtually on a par with the white women's (except in the South), this tells us that black and white women alike would earn only 64% of the median annual income of black and white men, or only 59% of the median income for white men.

2) The majority of men and women in our society do not compete for the same jobs. Economic research has revealed that occupational segregation by sex is more prevalent than by race. Therefore, it is nonsensical to state that progress of black women is at the expense of black males.

Statements such as Paul Samuelson's do a great deal of harm by giving the false impression that one must choose between equal employment opportunity for black women or black men. This is simply not the case. Moreover, the fact that men like Samuelson and Rowen make comments of this sort shows their disregard for or ignorance of the double jeopardy of economic discrimination on the basis of race and sex from which black women suffer.

The important point to be made is not the inaccurate assertion that the progress of black women is at the expense of black men but that despite some progress black women are still at the bottom of the barrel economically.

The above is endorsed by individuals active in a variety of organizations dedicated to the elimination of discrimination, including the American Association of University Professors, the American Economic Association, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Center for Women Policy Studies, the National Organization for Women, the Women's Caucus for Political Science, Household Technicians of American and the Federation of Organizations for Professional Women.

ARVONNE FRASER,
President, Women's Equality Action League.

JOSEPHINE HULETT,
Field Office, National Committee on Household Employment.
WASHINGTON.

The view that ". . . some of the progress of black women must be at the expense of black males" is the exact opposite of the view that I hold and that I testified to on July 10 before the Joint Economic Committee Griffiths' Subcommittee Hearings on Sex Discrimination. And conversation with my friend Hobart Rowen authorizes me to point out that Rowen did not mean to attribute to me the above quoted fragments from his July 12 column. At the Brookings discussion of the Freeman paper, I made quite different points. Ironically, more than a dozen years ago, when I was a monthly columnist of The Washington Post, I made the opposite point—that the gains of people previously discriminated against do not generally come *at the expense of others in the community.* Being a private in the army fighting against racial, sexual, and other discriminations, I am properly sensitive to misinterpretation of my position.

I wish to go on record as concurring with the views of the above letter: Women, both white and black, are at an undeserved economic disadvantage relative to men; black women are particularly at the bottom of the barrel economically, and any progress they make will *not* imply that black men are thereby made worse off.

PAUL A. SAMUELSON,
Professor of Economics, MIT.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

(NOTE.—The column in question attempted only to reflect the summary printed in the Brookings papers which said: "Some suspected that the gains of black females reflected in part the dependence of black families on women's income, which stemmed in part from the inferior position of males.")

RIEGLE ISSUES CALL FOR POLITICAL RENAISSANCE

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, at a press conference in the Capitol Building this morning I made the following statement, and would like to share it with my colleagues:

CALL FOR POLITICAL RENAISSANCE

During the Watergate hearings we have heard Gordon Strachan urge young people to "stay away" from politics—later John Ehrlichman urged them to "come in" with the warning that they would find here in Washington a culture "which scoffs at patriotism and morality."

Both these men are discredited spokesmen—disclosures thus far indicate that both may be indicted by the grand jury—and neither, to my knowledge, has even sought—or won—public office. Neither has offered useful advice. The subject they have opened up, however, is clearly the most vital issue before the American people at this time.

While it has special meaning for young people—it is just as essential for people of all ages. There is no issue about which I have a more urgent concern, or deeper personal conviction—and so I must join this dialogue.

I believe our self-government process is in grave danger in America today.

As a citizenry we have failed to step up to personal tasks required to produce effective self-government—and we now find government often directed by people that seem accountable to no one.

I believe our self-government process in America has fallen into extreme jeopardy. We talk of democracy—but we do not have real democracy in our country today.

The often prohibitive campaign costs of seeking public office block most people from any real chance to be elected representatives. We are today largely a government of the rich—or of the friends of the rich. Public financing of campaigns could change that.

Many of our laws and government programs reflect the pervasive special interest character. There is, for example, little equity in our tax laws—or most of the governmental spending priorities. The American people are today a doormat for special interest government—with the ITT scandal, wheat deal scandal, milk-lobby scandal, and the Watergate scandal being some of the most immediate examples. This must be corrected.

We also find a double standard of justice. The powerful people, in and out of government, who break the law are often excused, or given another chance—whereas the average citizen—without expensive legal counsel—is inevitably punished with the full force of the law. We destroy faith in our system of law—when our most prominent citizens break the law and are not brought to justice. There must be only one standard of justice, and it must apply equally to all of us.

American politics needs a thorough housecleaning—and I want to urge the American people—of all ages, parties, regions and philosophies to come forward and begin the clean-up.

What is at stake is our liberty—our honor—and our future. Our nation has been forced to "wallow in Watergate" because the best among us have not—in elections past—stepped forward and become our leaders.

The fact that only 55% of America's eligible voters bothered to vote in the 1972 Presidential campaign is a national disgrace—and says, I think, that our people were inspired by the choices available. Where are those candidates who can rally the American people—who can give our elections new purpose and meaning?

The answers are to be found among 210 million Americans—new men and women who have the vision and integrity to restore our political process if they will only step forward and offer their leadership.

This, then, is what we must do:

First, we need thousands of new candidates across our land—people willing to seek public office now and in 1974. The new standard must be independence, integrity, hard work, and absolute loyalty to the broad public interest.

Second—Campaign workers and volunteers of all ages and from all walks of life must step forward to support and elect the best candidates we can find. We need hundreds of thousands of campaign workers—and we need them now. Experience isn't necessary—we learn by doing.

Third—We must insist that the political debate focus on the real human agenda facing our people—jobs, education, health care, a decent living standard, security in old age, equity and justice. We must not allow ourselves to be duped and divided by political dirt, vicious campaign tactics, or phony issues used as diversionary strawmen.

Fourth—We must enter and renew our major political parties, and our various third force political movements. They can and must be made stronger, more open and more relevant to the true needs of our people.

If one central fact should burn through to us at this moment in American history it is that politics—and self-government—are what we make them.

We suffer today—for what we failed to do yesterday.

Self-government means self—it means each and every one of us. It is time for a renaissance in American politics—and that means that each one of us must step up to the challenge of self-government—and begin building a new government—of the people, by the people, and for the people.

MARINE CORPS LEAGUE CONVENTION SET FOR MIAMI

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is the golden anniversary year of the Marine Corps League. During the week of August 19 the Marine Corps League will be holding their 50th anniversary national convention in Miami Beach, Fla. It is my privilege to insert at this point in the RECORD a press release and historical article on the Marine Corps League:

MARINE CORPS LEAGUE CONVENTION SET FOR MIAMI

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 1, 1973.—The Marine Corps League will hold their 50th Anniversary National Convention in Miami Beach August 19–24, 1973. Convention Headquarters will be the Marco Polo Hotel. This announcement was made by Gilbert E. Gray of Kingston, New York, National Commandant of the Marine Corps League.

On hand for some sun and fun, reunions with former comrades, and serious business meetings will be Marine Corps veterans and their families, ranging in service from World War I combat to the Vietnam Conflict, and numerous U.S. military campaigns and expeditions in between.

Taking note of the celebration of their half-century mark, President Nixon issued a special message saluting the efforts and contributions of the Marine Corps League for "preserving and supporting the ideals of the Marine Corps while offering guidance and assistance to young Americans."

One of the few veterans organizations chartered by the U.S. Congress, the Marine Corps League was established by a small group of predominantly World War I Marine veterans who met in New York City on June 6, 1923 to formulate plans for a national organization to perpetuate the Marine Corps spirit. Major General John A. Lejeune, then Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, was elected the first National Commandant of the Marine Corps League.

His present-day successor as Commandant of the Marine Corps, four-star General Robert E. Cushman, Jr., will attend the Miami national reunion and will be the principal Convention speaker at the Grand Banquet on August 24.

The League's two highest awards, the "Iron Mike" Awards, and the "Dickey Chapelle" Award will be presented this year to The Honorable John W. Warner, Secretary of the Navy, and Mrs. Donald Spicer, President General of the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution.

Warner, a former Navy enlisted man and Marine Corps officer, will receive the "Iron Mike" Award for his sterling contributions to the Navy-Marine Corps team. Mrs. Spicer, the daughter, sister, widow, and mother of Marine Corps officers, and national leader of the 195,000 member esteemed women's organization, will be honored with the "Dickey Chapelle" Award for a lifetime of exemplary patriotic service and community leadership.

Previous recipients of the "Iron Mike" Award have been Bob Hope, David Duncan, Howard K. Smith, Berry Zorthian, Ross Perot, John Wayne, and U.S. Administrator of Veterans Affairs Donald E. Johnson. Past winners of the "Dickey Chapelle" Award, presented annually in memory of the famed newswoman killed by an enemy land mine while on patrol with a Marine company in Vietnam in 1965, are Miss Martha Raye, Lucy Caldwell (USO), Marjorie Merriweather Post, Verona Devney (Project HOPE), Esther Clark and Betty Donovan Rentrop (newspaper columnists).

Preliminary convention activities start Monday, August 20 with a National Staff Meeting and a pool-side fiesta for early registrants. Business sessions begin Tuesday morning, August 21 with a Joint Opening Session of the Marine Corps League and the Marine Corps League Auxiliary. The busy pace for the balance of the week will include acion on Resolutions and a substantial revision of the By-Laws, Committee Reports, Workshops, VA Hospital visits, a Memorial Service for deceased Marines, and election of new officers for the coming year.

The 1973 National Convention Chairman is Mr. Larry Bassin, 101 W. 20th Street, Apt. 5A, Hialeah, Florida 33010. Telephone: (305) 888–8703.

THE MARINE CORPS LEAGUE: A HISTORY OF 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 as 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 incorpo-

rated 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 genius of the Marine Corps League for 50 years has been the spirit of *Semper Fidelis*. It was at work from the first, moving the founders of our organization in setting down the great objects of our corporate being. Their motives were patriotic and fraternal, and they were very proud of their honorable service in the Marines, "the oldest branch of the nation's military service." With but minor modification in language the original Objects of the League are identical to those still in force half a century later. It may be said in truth that have stood, Marine-like, against the assaults of Time.

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. The only year no convention was held was in 1932, and that owing to the severe financial condition of the Country due to the depression. This period was devoted to "shaking down" the League, to adopting and refining the Constitution, Bylaws, rituals, and approving such items as the League colors (crimson and gold), grave marker, and its lapel button.

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 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 Lations of Massachusetts, the seniormost Vice Commandant, to run the League in his stead. This Lations 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. Lations' 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 affected 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 member thereof.

The League used its legislative weight to back legislation favorable to Marines and other veterans, and to oppose that which was not. Its greatest weight of the decade, however, was felt when an attempt was made in the early 1930's to abolish the Marine Corps under the guise of "economy." That this effort failed was due in part to vigorous protestations by the members of the League, led by National Commandant Carlton A. Fisher of New York.

New York Detachment No. 1, with Angelo John Cincotta, Milton Soloman, and Frank X. Lambert leading the way, secured donations from members of the League throughout the Country. They bought full page advertisements in daily newspapers protesting against any decrease or possible abolition of the United States Marine Corps. They initiated a drive to send letters of protest to the Congress and the President. Congressman Frances P. Bolton of Ohio speaking in 1953, attributed the "untiring efforts of the Marine Corps League in the 1930's" to the abandonment of efforts to disband the Corps as an economy move.

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. Ilich, gained greatly in national stature. (Before he was to pass away in 1972, Ilich 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 1938, Sylvester Corrigan, a wealthy oilman from Oklahoma, passed away, leaving a large sum of money to the Marine Corps League. The will was contested by relatives, and the League finally settled for $15,000. Of this sum, $5,000 was placed in the Corrigan Memorial Fund, an irrevocable trust, with the income going to the mother of Niles Huff, a Marine who died while serving in the Marines. Mrs. Huff died a few years later so that the interest on this trust now accrues to the League. $10,000 was put in the Niles Huff Memorial Fund with the income going to the League. For a time this money was given to the mother of a deserving Marine.

The Devil Dogs, the Honor Society of the League, was authorized as a subsidiary organization in Boston in 1939. Gerald L. Bakelaar of New Jersey was elected as first Chief Devil Dog.

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.

When World War II broke out, three of the League's first five civilian commandants returned to active duty with the Marine Corps. They were Past National Commandants Ilich, Fisher, and Lations. Hundreds of rank and file Leaguers followed their examples. Their actions gave visible proof to our slogan, "Once a Marine—Always a Marine."

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.

During this period the League sponsored several exhibit tours of enemy war materials with money accruing to the League's Welfare Foundation. Many thousands of dollars for this worthy cause were obtained in this manner.

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 contributions made to the League and 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. Shamgochian 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 Marine Corps League. An estimated 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.

While in National Convention at Washington in 1950 the League received a surprise visit from Harry S. Truman, President of the United States. The president came to apologize for earlier intemperate comments made about the U.S. Marine Corps being the "Navy's police force," and having "a propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's." The National Bugler, Herbert Baldwin of Florida, was so swept up by the unexpected visit he could scarcely sound the notes of "attention." The President's brief visit was well received by National Commandant Clay Nixon of Washington, and the delegates in attendance.

Under the leadership and inspiration of John R. O'Brien of New Jersey the Marine Corps League embarked on a "Free Beer for GI's in Korea" campaign. League detachments collected contributions from especially marked beer cans placed in taverns. General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur in answer to a letter of inquiry, wrote he would be glad to accept the free beer, and that the cans should be marked, "Gift—Not for Sale—For our Armed Forces in Korea from the Marine Corps League." The beer was purchased and shipped by Major General E. O. Ames of California. The Staten Island detachment of New York raised $2,350 for this cause, more than any other League detachment.

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 the vicinity of Washington on national 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.

In 1963, a proposal from the Lou Diamond Detachment of Ohio led to the reorganization of the National Headquarters of the League. A 15-member Board of Trustees was created consisting of eight Division Vice Commandants, four National Trustees, the National Commandant, Senior Vice Commandant, and Junior Past National Commandant. While the latter three each had one-year terms, the Division Vice Commandants and Trustees were elected to rotating three year terms with four up for election each year. The Board of Trustese system provided for stability and continuity in the handling of League affairs, and continues into our 50th year as the governing body of the League.

THE FIFTH DECADE, 1964–73

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 of 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.

In early 1966 the League corrected the perennial problem of bonding paymasters and commandants through the purchase of a blanket position bond covering each of these officers automatically. Mid-West Vice Commandant James H. Shultz of Kansas was instrumental in arranging the bonding at a cost far below what the cost would have been if each individual detachment had procured its own.

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 the 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.

On February 8th, 1967, after attending the Secretary of the Navy's briefing in Washington, League officials led by National Commandant Claude H. Downing, acting in response to a challenge from Marine Corps Commandant General Greene, to "do something besides talk," founded, in coordination with seven other national Navy-Marine Corps oriented organizations, the Navy-Marine

Corps Council. The purpose of the Council was to further the collective efforts of the several organizations in areas wherein they had common interests and objectives in support of the Navy-Marine Corps team. The Council meets regularly, and may recommend actions and resolutions on behalf of the Navy Department to its members, but does not publish or implement such actions or resolutions in its own name.

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 Marine 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.

Out of concern for the wounded, Marines including James Merna of Maryland, Don Yeaman of Washington, Larry Bassin of Florida, and Joseph O. Pueschel of Hawaii, with their fellow Leaguers conducted special projects to entertain the hospitalized. Operations with names like Cheer, Hurricane, Appreciation, and Care and Recuperation did much to help our veterans forget their difficulties and see, at least for a time, that people really cared, and that there was a happier side to life.

Near the end of the decade the League, under National Commandant H. Lynn Cavin, adopted optional health and life insurance programs for the benefit of the membership, and voted to support the Marine Military Academy in Harlingen, Texas, by seeking out potential Cadets for admission.

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 birthdate 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.

CONCLUSION

Many of the events described above were highlights. Less spectacular were the day to day activities of the individual civilian and in-service Marine Leaguers. Always faithful to the purposes of the League they maintained true allegiance to our Nation, practiced Americanism in all its forms, engaged in programs which benefitted their communities, assisted the Marine Corps with quiet recruiting efforts and other activities, celebrated the birthday of the Corps each November 10th as well as other historical occasions of peculiar interest to Marines, basked in their Marine comradeship, visited the sick, aided the distressed, and, when the time came, buried their own.

Marines great and small have marched with John A. LeJeune in the ranks of the League, men like Ray Davis, Chesty Puller, Lew Walt. Smedley D. Butler, Harry Lee, Lou Diamond, J. C. Breckingridge, Clifton B. Cates, Mickey Finn, Len Chapman, John Glenn, Lou Wilson and many thousands of others who, in war and peace, have proudly worn the Globe and Anchor.

The Spirit of *Semper Fidelis* has moved many in the League to outstanding achievement, Marines like Jack Brennan, Merton C. Lowe, Jackie Steinquest, John Baker, Raymond Wilkowski, Orville Hubbard, Mason D. Wade, John P. Lester, Patrick J. Cody, Robert Blanard, Jack Davis, Harold Welsh, Hugh Maus, Charley Stone, Lucian J. Caldara, Lue Madsen, John S. Zak, S. Johanna Glasrud, Edward J. Bange, C. A. Boedigheimer, C. A. McKinney, to name but some of the dedicated Leaguers not previously mentioned. Their ranks are legion.

In its 49th year, the Secretary of the Navy in Washington, John H. Chaffee, paid a singular tribute to the Marine Corps League. In an open letter to all members, Chaffee pointed out that the League ". . . is providing outstanding leadership for our communities, in the same tradition that the Marine Corps has provided distinguished leadership on the field of battle."

He continued:

"The Marine Corps League will be 49 this June. During those nearly five decades, possible the most valuable of the League's contributions—from my standpoint—has been its support of the Marine Corps. You have, indeed, helped to preserve the traditions, promote the interests and perpetuate the history of the U.S. Marine Corps. I appreciate that support.

"I urge your membership to continue, even to redouble, its efforts. The Marine Corps is strengthened by your support. The nation and its people benefit from the work of the Marine Corps League."

The "Society of Leathernecks", as the League was called in 1923, has come a long way in fifty years, from John A. Lejeune to his successor in office as Commandant, Gilbert E. Gray. Its headquarters in that time went from Washington to Albany, to Baton Rouge, to Philadelphia, and back to the Washington area, this time to stay. Today its potential membership is over 1,000,000, with its actual membership scattered all over the world.

The Marine Corps League is recognized as one of the leading national veterans organizations. Its members speak of its history and traditions with pride, and they have worked long and hard to make the League, "second only to the U.S. Marine Corps."

And, like the Corps itself, its record is one of achievement.

FHA INSURANCE AUTHORITY NOW, MARAZITI SAYS

HON. JOSEPH J. MARAZITI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. MARAZITI. Mr. Speaker, my district office in Boonton, N.J., has been deluged with calls from concerned citizens whose FHA housing loans have been held up because insurance authority for FHA loans and mortgages expired June 30, and has yet to be reauthorized by the Congress.

One gentleman in particular is left in the uncomfortable position of having sold his house, moved out, and is unable to move into the new one he is supposed to purchase because of the holdup in FHA loan authority. He has a wife and family to house.

To forestall any further hesitancy on the part of the other body to move on the Housing Finance Bill Conference Report, House Joint Resolution 512 until after the recess, I have introduced a bill which provides a simple extension of FHA authority for the Administrator of the Department of Housing and Urban Development through September 30, 1973. This would carry the Federal Housing Administration through the August recess when the Congress would not be in session.

This legislation also gives the Secretary authority to set flexible interest rate ceilings on FHA loans, which he announced on July 5 that he would set at 7¾ percent. I feel this flexible interest rate ceiling authority is important for both FHA and VA loans to be viable sources of mortgage and loan insurance during changing money market conditions.

It pleases me that the House has acted swiftly today to pass a bill similar to mine providing a short term extension of FHA loan authority through October 1. The American taxpayers deserve this consideration of their housing needs.

To encourage swift action by the President, I am sending him a telegram today to urge him to sign this legislation into law as quickly as possible. I sent a similar telegram to him on July 24, 1973, urging his prompt approval of the VA interest rate bill.

Hopefully, when the House reconvenes in September the Congress will enact more permanent legislation which will revitalize FHA as a prime source of mortgage assistance for the American taxpayer.

A TRIBUTE

HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADDEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would call attention to a hero. It has been said that every hero with the passing of time becomes a bore, but this hero for the nonce is a hero. A macho, if you please.

Bernard Goldstein is a man personally unknown to me, but his stance in these critical times of artificially created shortages of beef should receive as wide dissemination as possible. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Goldstein for 16 years has supplied the White House with beef.

On Monday, he refused a request by the White House for 15 pounds of filet mignon and New York strip steak. I could continue, but after this brief remark, to paraphrase Marie Antoinette's probably legendary statement when she was told the hordes of Paris were hungry, Bernard has told the White House, "Let them

eat ground," but the author said it better.

The article by Bruce Howard, which appeared in the Tuesday, July 31, 1973, Washington Star-News, is as follows:

WELCOME TO THE CLUB, WHITE HOUSE IS TOLD

(By Bruce Howard)

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 crunch, 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."

NEW GOAL FOR FOREIGN AID

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan majority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has recently embarked on an effort—embodied in the Mutual Development Corporation Act, introduced by our distinguished colleague, Mr. ZABLOCKI—that has been called the most significant House initiative in our Foreign Affairs program since the decisions leading up to the adoption of the Marshall plan.

This major reform deserves the attention and support of the House, and with unanimous consent I include in the RECORD following the conclusion of my remarks, an editorial of June 7, 1972, from the Minneapolis Tribune, and reports from the New York News, the Washington Post, and the Journal of Commerce and Commercial. These materials provide a clear analysis of the nature and merits of the act.

Simply stated, the act will have three principal benefits to the United States and to the free world: First, it will sharply focus U.S. economic aid to meet the food, health and educational needs of the poorest people of developing nations—rather than to the erection of monuments to our largess in the form of dams, airports and superhighways; second, it will provide Federal assistance to American industry in financing exports to developing nations—which are rich in resources but short on cash; and third, it will enable U.S. industry to maintain and increase its share of trade with the developing nations, which will provide the U.S. economy with a high payoff in the form of a better linkage to these much needed raw materials.

I would also like to call my colleagues' attention to the creation of a new Emerging Nations Committee of Member of Congress for Peace Through Law. This new committee, on which I am most pleased to serve as vice chairman, under the able and sincere chairmanship of Congressman CHARLES WHALEN, will examine U.S. relations with the emerging nations, and consider in depth the views, problems, and aspirations of these countries. It is our hope thus to provide an effective channel through which the Congress may be currently informed of such matters, and to provide a legislative focus for their consideration.

The articles follow:

[From the New York (N.Y.) News, June 10, 1973]

THE HOUSE SETS A NEW GOAL FOR FOREIGN AID: SUCCESS

(By Jerome Cahill)

For the first time in more than a quarter of a century, the House of Representatives appears ready to take the lead in a major reform of America's program of economic assistance to the poor nations of the world.

If the initiative is successful—and prospects are at least 50–50 that it will be—these are the benefits that sponsors say will redound upon the United States and the free world:

American industry will receive important new government help in financing exports to developing nations, which are rich in resources but short of cash.

The growing share of trade with the developing countries now held by our industrial competitors will be reduced with a payoff to the U.S. economy in the form of a stronger claim to vitally needed raw materials in the so-called Third World.

Direct U.S. economic aid will be more sharply focussed toward meeting the food, health and educational needs of the poorest people of developing nations, instead of building superhighways and dams.

The concepts are embodied in the proposed Mutual Development and Cooperation Act of 1973 introduced by 26 members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It will be the subject of a hearing Tuesday and will reach the House floor later in the month.

Led by Rep. Donald Fraser (D-Minn.), the congressmen over three years ago began casting about for a more effective alternative to the U.S. foreign aid program of the 1960's with its emphasis on building up the industrial base of the developing world.

Their discussions were given impetus by evidence that despite the massive outlays of U.S. dollars during the period, the world's poorest people were just as bad off as they ever were. They were immune from the benefits of industrial development.

The end result of the discussions is the proposed bill which seeks to correct this by taking the same amount of U.S. economic aid as proposed by the administration—$1 billion this year—and channeling the money into programs aimed at meeting the most pervasive problems affecting the poorest groups in such countries—food, rural development, population growth, health and education.

A reversal of America's declining volume of exports to the lowest-income nations of the world, which support a population of more than a billion, is the objective of the second and most novel feature of the bill. It would create a development fund authorized to issue credit of up to a billion dollars a year available on terms that would enable U.S. companies to compete with other industrial nations. If U.S. exports increased by that amount, 80,000 new jobs would be created for American workers, while the developing countries would be receiving resources needed for their own development.

James P. Grant, president of the Overseas Development Council, a private, nonprofit research group, calls the bill the most significant initiative in the House since the Herter select committee was created in 1947. That committee laid the groundwork for the Marshall Plan which rebuilt Europe after World War II.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, June 7, 1973]

AID FOR THE POOREST AND PROFIT

One has to be impressed as much by the ingenuity as the substance of a foreign-aid proposal offered last week by a bipartisan majority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Consider this unlikely combination of elements: The bill should appeal to development idealists. It offers new markets to profit-minded American exporters. It has the potential of increasing U.S. employment. It would not increase taxes, and it is politically shrewd in other ways as well.

The first of the bill's two major provisions has a high humanitarian content. In his latest State of the World Message, President Nixon said that U.S. aid "is focused on a few key areas, such as population planning, agriculture, health and education." The committee bill takes him at his word allocating funds by such categories. Leaders in the development field, notably Robert McNamara of the World Bank, have been calling for greater aid emphasis on the poorest people in the poorest countries. That, too, is what the bill would require of the $1 billion already included in the administration aid request.

Another provision addresses the complaint that American exporters suffer a disadvantage competing in developing-country markets with European and Japanese companies that are aided by their governments. But there are conflicting trends. For instance, U.S. sales to developing countries have been large and growing; that market accounted for a third of all U.S. exports last year. But the resulting trade surplus—the excess of American exports to developing countries over imports from them—shrank from an annual rate of over $2 billion in the 1960s to a tenth of that amount in 1972. Moreover, the volume of American exports to the poorest countries, those with per-capita incomes under $200, has been shrinking.

To reverse that trend and, in the process, boost American business and employment, the bill would establish an export development credit fund. Beginning at $1 billion a year, the fund would extend credit to the lowest-income countries at low rates and extended terms for their purchase of needed American products. It would raise capital in public markets as do other federally chartered agencies. The cost differential resulting from the fund's borrowing at market rates and lending on soft terms would come from the continuing repayments of loans from past foreign-aid programs. Since no new appropriations would be needed, the fund authorization would bypass the Appropriations Committee, whose chairman is a long-time foe of foreign aid.

We can visualize any number of technical and philosophical objections to the proposal, one of whose chief advocates is Minnesota's Rep. Donald Fraser. So far, the objections appear outweighed by the bill's merits. For example, one high administration official has already expressed privately his reservations about the rearrangement of aid priorities. But priority-changing is never a painless process. The executive branch and Congress as a whole will, we hope, welcome this imaginative new approach to an old subject.

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1973]

HOUSE PANEL STRESSES AID TO POOREST NATIONS

An effort to refocus U.S. foreign aid on acute problem areas of poor nations was announced yesterday by a majority of the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

They said they will cosponsor admendments including one to concentrate U.S. aid on food, rural development, nutrition, population growth, health, education, and human resources development programs.

"Projects would be selected which most directly benefit the poorest majority of the people in these countries and which enable them to participate more effectively in the development process," the congressmen said in a joint statement.

Another amendment would create an Export Development Credit Fund authorized to make $1 billion in loans annually for credit for U.S. exports to the lowest income countries.

A third would rename the foregn aid program as the Mutual Development and Cooperation program.

Rep. Clement J. Zablocki (D-Wis.) said cosponsorship of the foreign aid revision by 22 of the committee's 40 members should assure its approval by not only the committee but also the House.

Zablocki said the changes are consistent with comments in President Nixon's May 3 State of the World message, even though they would revise the President's request for a two-year extension of the foreign aid program as is.

[From the Journal of Commerce, May 30, 1973]

PANEL WILL PROPOSE AID POLICY SHIFTS

(By Richard Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 29.—A majority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee will unveil tomorrow proposals for a sharply revised U.S. foreign aid program, including creation of a new U.S. export financing fund.

The fund, to promote U.S. sales to the world's poorest nations, would supplement the Export-Import Bank. Its initial target would be to finance about $1 billion a year in exports, at very low interest rates and long terms.

A new AID agency, tentatively called the Mutual Development and Cooperation Agency, would administer the export fund. The fund would draw on both borrowings in the commercial money market and repayments of past U.S. foreign aid loans. Broadly, the proposed AID unit would take over the foreign aid programs of the existing Agency for International Development (AID). The program would be made to focus more sharply on directly helping the "poor majority" in the developing countries.

The programs would largely concern health, education, nutrition, population control, public administration and human resources development. Education projects, for example, would be more likely to involve primary or secondary schools, rather than higher-level facilities.

"FOUNDATION"

The agency would operate more like "a foundation," one observer said. Little, if any, distinction would be made between outright donations and long-term loans. There would be strong emphasis on providing technical services.

The House committee indicates it would authorize an initial $1.3 billion in fiscal 1974 for these programs, the amount President Nixon recently proposed for bilateral economic aid during the coming fiscal year.

The export credit development fund would not be part of the $1.3 billion authorization, as it would rely on the private money market and then relend on much softer terms, say, three per cent a year over 30 years.

Repayments on foreign aid loans would be used to offset the cost defferentials.

The fund would finance U.S. exports to only the poorest countries, with per capita incomes of less than $200, such as India, Indonesia and Haiti.

The Export-Import Bank finances U.S. exports to nearly all nations, including the wealthiest. It rarely extends credits of more than 10 years, and its standard annual rate is 6 per cent.

The new fund is needed to help stem the steady decline in the U.S. share of poor country markets, the House committee will argue.

The head of the NEL agency would become a kind of "development czar," coordinating all U.S. foreign aid and reporting directly to the President. He would sit on both the National Security Council and the Council for International Economic Policy.

The proposals have the backing of about 20 House Foreign Affairs Committee members, representing a slight majority of the panel. Both ranking Democrats and Republicans are co-sponsoring the bill.

It marks the first major original foreign aid proposal from Congress since the Marshall Plan, observers here say. It may gather enough support to become enacted, but the Nixon Administration's position will be important.

The first reaction from administration circles appears to be cool, possibly because of larger political considerations. The committee initiative might be interpreted as a new attempt by Congress to assert itself over the administration.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO THE COAST GUARD ON ITS 183D ANNIVERSARY

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, during the years I have had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives and as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and particularly during this session of the Congress as the chairman of that committee, I have become familiar with the remarkable work of the U.S. Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard is celebrating its 183d anniversary this Saturday, August 4, and I would like to just say a few words of praise and thanks and wish them well on their birthday.

Most of my colleagues from the coastal States know full well of the many duties which they perform—particularly with respect to rescues at sea—fighting pollution—and keeping the peace among American and foreign fishing interests. During this past spring, I have learned first-hand of the work of this truly good service in connection with the disastrous floods all along our great Mississippi River, including a part of my own congressional district. Working with local officials, they really pitched in to aid in the saving of many lives all along the river. The work of the Coast Guard Reserve, which was called up during the floods, was especially noteworthy. Here was a Reserve force making a great contribution during peacetime.

I am pleased to note the Coast Guard's birthday and to publicly thank them for their fine work over the years.

AMERICAN RED CROSS HONORS DAVID W. SHAW

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, as a consequence of an accident that occurred in Hope Valley, R.I., on January 4, 1973, the American National Red Cross will present the Red Cross Certificate of Merit to one of my constituents, Cpl. David W. Shaw, of the Rhode Island State Police, and I believe that his heroism is worthy of mention in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Red Cross Certificate of Merit is the highest award given by the American Red Cross to any person saving the life of another by the use of skills learned in a Red Cross first aid, small craft, or water safety course. Corporal Shaw had had this training, and the cool application of his knowledge, not only by acting as an individual but as part of a valiant team effort, is credited with saving the lives of three people.

An official memorandum of commendation issued by order of Col. Walter E. Stone, superintendent of the Rhode Island State Police, explains that on the morning of January 4, 1973, the Hope Valley Barracks received a report of a motor vehicle accident in which a car had crashed through a guard rail, had landed upside down, and was almost completely submerged in the White Rock Stream, trapping its occupants inside.

Corporal Shaw, with Cpl. Robert E. Carr, and Trooper Gerard E. Brissette, immediately responded to the accident scene and the need of the victims trapped in the vehicle which they found resting on its roof and submerged in about 5 feet of water. The troopers waded into the icy, muddy water to determine the existence and number of passengers inside the car, and Corporal Shaw was successful in forcing open one of the car doors. An unconscious woman and a partially conscious man were removed from the car and were administered first aid. When the male victim indicated that a small child was still in the car, Corporal Shaw waded back to the automobile and found the unconscious body of a 5-year-old girl wedged behind the back seat. Recovering her, he instantly began mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, and continued until her breathing was restored. The other troopers had successfully revived the man and woman by this same method, and the three victims were then taken to the hospital at Westerly, R.I., where they were treater for shock and immersion.

The official commendation states:

The Troopers involved in this rescue are to be highly commended for their prompt, effective and diligent action taken during this emergency which saved the lives of three persons. Their actions reflect the highest

standards long associated with the Rhode Island State Police.

The American Red Cross will present the certificate of merit to Cpl. David Shaw because his heroic action "exemplifies the highest ideal of the concern of one human being for others who are in distress."

To both of these tributes, I want to add my own words of praise and appreciation, and I am certain that others, reading about this episode of courage, will join me in congratulating not only Cpl. David Shaw of Riverside, R.I., but his fellow troopers, Carr and Brissette, and citizens, everywhere, who daily respond to emergencies with acts of bravery.

WATERGATE DOUBLE STANDARD

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times on August 2, William Safire wrote an essay entitled "The Great Howcum." The article dramatically points out the double-standards that seem to be the order of the day, not only by the Watergate Committee and its staff, but more importantly certain segments of the press and networks. The column follows:

THE GREAT HOWCUM

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—President Eisenhower used to have a benign "enemies list" of his own. Whenever somebody irritated him, he would write that person's name on a scrap of paper, crumple it up and throw it in a bottom drawer, thereby ridding himself of what later came to be called hangups.

When Senator Sam Ervin observed on "Face the Nation" last weekend: "Down in North Carolina, we say—'howcum?' ", his remark sent me to my bottom drawer where I keep my crumpled-up howcums. Flattened out and presented here today, these collected howcums represent a cathartic checklist for diehards, some specifics to fling about in justifying that lingering feeling of helpless resentment.

Howcum the lack of investigation of massive vote frauds in the 1960 Kennedy-Nixon campaign has never been called a "cover-up"?

Howcum John Dean's flat assertion under oath that "I planted no stories" received no refutation from the dozens of people with whom Dean and his lawyers planted stories?

Howcum there has been no clamor to investigate the investigations inflicted on the 1968 Nixon-Agnew campaign?

Howcum people usually sensitive to ethnic or religious slurs feel free to disparage "the Germans" in the White House, and like to identify Haldeman and Ehrlichman as Christian Scientists when they identify no other witness's religious affiliation?

Howcum it is laudable to raise funds to ransom Cubans recruited to land at the Bay of Pigs, but terrible to raise funds for "support and lawyers fees" to Cuban-Americans who broke into the Watergate? (This howcum collapses under examination of motive, but it has a certain symmetry.

Howcum those rightly indignant at unfair prying into the private lives of public figures have shown no interest in the anti-Republican snooping activities of Carmine Bellino, as brought out into the open by George Bush?

Howcum it was right for the Internal Revenue Service to hand over tax returns to a Kennedy investigator, without so much as a written request, when it is wrong for Nixon investigators to even breathe the initials "I.R.S."?

Howcum the wrath of civil libertarians so properly aimed at the misuse of Government power to "get" individuals never managed to get cranked up (with the lonely exception of Wayne Morse) at the misuse of Government power by Robert Kennedy to "get" Jimmy Hoffa?

Howcum nobody is asking now what "foreign intelligence reasons" were given for the King's telephone, or about the propriety of F.B.I. agents seeking to leak contents of those tapes to newspaper editors?

Howcum nobody ever objected before to the "dirty tricks" and "negative advance" perfected by Lyndon Johnson's campaign staff and described on page 349 of Theodore White's "The Making of the President 1964"?

Howcum Daniel Schorr of C.B.S., who as the subject of F.B.I. harassment has more reason than any other reporter to be angry at this Administration, has been reporting the Ervin hearings with restraint and insight, while Carl Stern of N.B.C. has felt free to indulge his biases?

Howcum Bob Haldeman, who was supposed to be so efficient, never arranged for the taping of Presidential conversations aboard the yacht Sequoia? (Maybe this howcum came out of the wrong drawer.)

Howcum the incredible similarity of the devotion of Gordon Liddy and Daniel Ellsberg to a "higher law" has led to one's lionization and the other's incarceration?

Howcum the people who are so irate about our secret bombing of North Vietnamese sanctuaries near the Cambodian border never so much as waggle a finger at North Vietnamese troops for assembling on Cambodian soil in the first place?

Howcum the scoffers who were so certain that the Vietnam cease-fire would not last longer than a few weeks are not admitting they may have been wrong after six months?

Howcum the report that President Johnson surreptitiously taped conversations with George Wallace has raised not a single eyebrow?

That cleans out my howcum drawer. An even longer list could be tellingly directed at the Nixon Administration, but these accumulated resentments are presented to suggest that much of what appalls us today has its roots in the callousness or apathy of too many of us in the past.

The great howcum, as they call it down in North Carolina, is this: Howcum we cannot agree to apply a single standard to political morality, and as we try to raise that standard together, to admit that nobody has the perfect right to cast the first stone?

BILL NATCHER A GOOD EXAMPLE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, legislators, and public officials generally are not held in too high esteem in the public mind these days. Unfortunately, some of this is our own fault. Many of those entrusted with public confidence have not discharged their duties in such a way as to add to the distinction of public servants. Yet, there are many notable examples of good public service that go unnoticed. Everyone talks about those who misuse their office or make mistakes but how many times do we congratulate those who serve in a way that was envisioned by the Founders of our Republic.

Certainly one of the finest gentlemen in this body is our colleague BILL NATCHER of Kentucky. In addition to his fine personal qualities which make him a very popular Member, he is one of the most dependable legislators in this body. Yesterday, August 1, 1973 marked the 20th anniversary of his service in the House. In that period of time he has compiled, in addition to a host of friends and wide respect, a most admirable attendance record. He has a 100-percent attendance record in votes on issues before this body.

Mr. Speaker, we should be proud of the fine service of this distinguished colleague and I join his many friends in wishing him many more years of constructive and loyal service to his district and his country.

NORMAN W. NEUKOM—DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor a selfless man after 35 years of service to the people of the United States, and especially to the people of the Los Angeles area. Norman W. Neukom announced his retirement earlier this year after spending over half his life dedicated to the achievement of fair and equal treatment under the law for all. Over the years, he has been experienced in several perspectives of the practice of law, first as a private attorney, then as an attorney for the office of the U.S. attorney, and finally, as a highly respected referee in bankruptcy.

Mr. Neukom was honored earlier this year by a dinner given for him and attended by over 200 friends and admirers. This high respect for Mr. Neukom is shared by all those who have had the opportunity to work with this faithful servant and most competent jurist. Those who have encountered Norman Neukom have benefited by their association, and many felt compelled to demonstrate their appreciation personally to Mr. Neukom. His rare combination of experience and legal expertise, compounded by Mr. Neukom's extraordinary personality makes his background a truly notable one.

Although born in Indiana, Mr. Neukom was raised in Los Angeles, and graduated from Los Angeles High School. After briefly attending the Southern Branch of the University of California—later to be UCLA—Mr. Neukom worked in a variety of pobs, from oil filed worker to drug clerk, before returning to school at the University of Southern California. He received his law degree in 1927, and practiced law for 7 years before becoming an attorney for the Bureau of War Risk Litigation, where war-related disability recoveries were determined.

After 2 years, Mr. Neukom transferred to the U.S. Attorney's Office in Los Angeles, where he spent the next 23 years, with the exception of 2 years serving in the U.S. Navy during World War II. In the U.S. Attorney's Office, Mr. Neukom tried and supervised many cases that helped determine important points of law.

Over the years, Mr. Neukom participated in the handling of over 50 cases involving food and drug law violations, without a defeat. He was honored for his contributions in this field by the Food and Drug Administration, in appreciation of his efforts to provide a solid foundation for subsequent developments in the law.

In 1960, Mr. Neukom was appointed to be a referee in bankruptcy. In this capacity, he was described by a prominent bankruptcy attorney as "an excellent lawyer, liked by everyone, and possessing an ideal judicial temperament." On that statement, I should only like to once again add my personal congratulations and sincere appreciation to a fine gentleman, a great lawyer and jurist, and a cherished friend.

AN ACT TO PROTECT U.S. DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY INTERESTS IN THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that would encourage American persons and/or corporations with major business investments in South Africa to pursue fair employment practices among all employees.

Specifically, this legislation would allow the President to delegate to the Secretary of Labor and a Presidentially appointed Advisory Board the obligation to insure that the concepts of equal pay for equal or comparable work, equal fringe benefits, equal hiring and training opportunities, and equal opportunity for advancement are followed by all American persons and/or corporations maintaining major investments in South Africa and thereby representing the American public abroad.

The Advisory Board—composed of representatives from the fields of labor, education, business, and civil rights; a representative from the Departments of Commerce and State; a representative from the Equal Employment Commission; and finally two public interest representatives—would assist the Secretary of Labor in the review of the employment practices of each eligible person and/or corporation. Once a satisfactory review had transpired, the person and/or corporation would be placed on a roster signifying adherence to fair employment practices in South Africa and eligibility for Federal Government contracts.

Important safeguards included in this legislation are:

First, the opportunity for notice and a hearing prior to the initial review of employment practices;

Second, a Presidential exemption—up to a maximum of 90 days—from the provisions of the act if reasons of national security are paramount; and

Third, the opportunity for notice and a hearing in the event that a sworn charge of unfair employment practice is lodged against a person and/or corporation subject to the act or if a written charge of reasonable cause to believe a violation has occurred is filed by an Advisory Board member.

Once the charge is aired, appropriate findings would be issued. Any action thereafter would be based upon these findings.

Mr. Speaker, this measure which would do much to lessen the effectiveness of an institutionally cheap labor market detrimental to the economic well-being of the American worker. Just recently, Foote Minerals closed three of its ferrochrome processing plants in the United States because "imported prices, from South Africa, are reportedly even below U.S. production costs in certain cases, making it increasingly difficult for the domestic industry to compete."[1]

Finally, it is strikingly clear that we cannot and should not ignore the fact that the racist doctrine of apartheid, by which millions of blacks are subjugated by a small white minority, is abhorrent to the American people and the world community. It should not be supported. In this august legislative body which enjoys a fine history and commitment to the enactment of legislation which recognizes the equal rights of all persons regardless of race, color, national origin or sex, approval of this measure requiring a similar commitment by American persons and/or corporations with major business interests in South Africa should be immediately forthcoming.

THE MISSING IN ACTION

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, direct American troop involvement in the Vietnam War has come to an end. Our troops have been withdrawn from that country. The Americans officially listed as prisoners of war by Hanoi have been returned. And the American people are turning their interest to other, more peaceful pursuits.

But there are a great number of Americans who cannot forget Vietnam for other pursuits. These are the people who have suffered the death of a loved one, the people who served in the war and came home maimed for life, and the people who continue to suffer uncertainty over the fate of loved ones on the missing in action list, neither confirmed dead nor prisoner.

For the last group of Americans, there can be no end to the Vietnam chapter in the history of America until each and every man declared missing in action can be accounted for. The President realized this and made it an essential part of the Paris Accords last January and again this summer. Article 8, paragraph (b) of the January 27 agreement reads as follows:

> The parties shall help each other to get information about those military personnel and foreign civilians of the parties missing in action, to determine the location and take care of the graves of the dead so as to facilitate the exhumation and repatriation of the remains, and to take any such other measure as may be required to get information about those still considered as missing in action.

Because of the intransigence of the Communist forces in Southeast Asia in refusing to comply with the provisions of article 8, American negotiators sought and received additional language in the supplemental accords reached on June 13th. In those accords the following statement appears:

> In conformity with Article 8(b) of the Agreement the parties shall help each other to get information about those military personnel and foreign civilians of the parties missing in action, to determine the location and take care of the graves of the dead so as to facilitate the exhumation and repatriation of the remains, and to take any such other measures as may be required to get information about those still considered missing in action. For this purpose, frequent and regular liaison flights shall be made between Saigon and Hanoi.

To date, the Department of Defense teams set up for the purpose of investigating crash sites, exhuming remains, and identifying MIA's have not been allowed to visit the necessary sites in Communist hands, or even to exhume the remains of graves so far shown to them. Only two trips from Saigon to Hanoi have been allowed the investigators, and such trips are not scheduled to continue. Yet, there are more than 1,200 cases left unresolved.

We in the Congress must not allow such blatant disregard for humanity to go unchallenged. We have a duty to those listed in the missing in action category and to their families to do all in our power to compel North Vietnam and the Vietcong to allow us to carry out this humanitarian task. There can be no accommodation, no reconciliation and no real peace until the Communist forces act to remedy this situation.

Accordingly, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution which establishes it as the sense of Congress that it shall be the policy of the United States that our Government shall cease forthwith all consideration of aid, trade, diplomatic recognition or any other form of accommodation with the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam or the Provisional Revolutionary Government—Vietcong—until such time as the agreements I have cited above are complied with to the fullest possible extent.

My resolution would let the families of the MIA's know that we have not forgotten them. We are deeply aware of the inexcusable failure on the part of the Communists to comply with the agreements and our humanitarian request.

[1] *"Metals Week,"* Dec. 12, 1972.

This resolution would demonstrate that Congress is resolute in its determination to see justice done for the MIA's and their families.

I would urge the Committee on Foreign Affairs to give this matter its utmost consideration and report my resolution favorably to the floor of the House at an early date.

UNEARTHING THE HOWCUMS—UNEARTHING THE DOUBLE STANDARD?

HON. ANDREW J. HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, there are many persons throughout the country who believe that those who profess to be concerned about the common good and those responsible for, and who participate in, congressional inquiries should conduct these hearings and utter their public statements in an unbiased and politically nonpartisan manner. I believe we generally agree that this should be our goal.

However, in discussions with my constituents, and others, it comes across loud and clear that many times there is little political morality by those who proclaim themselves to be the protectors of our public and private morals.

William Safire, writing in the Washington Star-News on Thursday, August 2, 1973, has stated this problem extremely well and takes to task those who, by their conduct, adopt a double standard.

For the benefit of those of my colleagues who did not read his incisive article I am including it in the RECORD, and it reads as follows:

UNEARTHING THE HOWCUMS

(By William Safire)

President Eisenhower used to have a benign "enemies list" of his own. Whenever somebody irritated him, he would write that person's name on a scrap of paper, crumple it up and throw it in a bottom drawer, thereby ridding himself of what later came to be called hangups.

When Sen. Sam Ervin observed on "Face the Nation" last weekend: "Down in North Carolina we say—'howcum?'" His remark sent me to my bottom drawer where I keep my crumpled-up howcums. Flattened out and presented here today, these collected howcums represent a cathartic checklist for diehards, some specifics to fling about in justifying that lingering feeling of helpless resentment.

Howcum the lack of investigation of massive vote frauds in the 1960 Kennedy-Nixon campaign has never been called a "cover-up"?

Howcum John Dean's flat assertion under oath that "I planted no stories" received no refutation from the dozens of people with whom Dean and his lawyers planted stories?

Howcum there has been no clamor to investigate the investigations inflicted on the 1968 Nixon-Agnew campaign?

Howcum people usually sensitive to ethnic or religious slurs feel free to disparage "the Germans" in the White House, and like to identify Haldeman and Ehrlichman as Christian Scientists when they identify no other witness' religious affiliations?

Howcum it is laudable to raise funds to ransom Cubans recruited to land at the Bay of Pigs, but terrible to raise funds for "support and lawyers fees" to Cuban-Americans who broke into the Watergate? (This howcum collapses under examination of motive, but it has a certain symmetry.)

Howcum those rightly indignant at unfair prying into the private lives of public figures have shown no interest in the anti-Republican snooping activities of Carmine Bellino, as brought out into the open by George Bush?

Howcum it was right for the Internal Revenue Service to hand over tax returns to a Kennedy investigator, without so much as a written request, when it is wrong for Nixon investigators to even breathe the initials "IRS"?

Howcum the wrath of civil libertarians so properly aimed at the recent misuse of government power to "get" individuals never managed to get cranked up (with the lonely exception of Wayne Morse) at the misuse of government power by Robert Kennedy to "get" Jimmy Hoffa?

Howcum nobody is asking now what "foreign intelligence reasons" were given for the unconscionable tapping of Martin Luther King's telephone, or about the propriety of FBI agents seeking to leak contents of those tapes to newspaper editors?

Howcum nobody ever objected before to the "dirty tricks" and "negative advance" perfected by Lyndon Johnson's campaign staff and described on page 349 of Theodore White's "The Making of the President 1964"?

Howcum Daniel Schorr of CBS, who as the subject of FBI harassment has more reason than any other reporter to be angry at this administration, has been reporting the Ervin hearings with restraint and insight, while Carl Stern of NBC has felt free to indulge his biases?

Howcum Bob Haldeman, who was supposed to be so efficient, never arranged for the taping of presidential conversations aboard the yacht Sequoia? (Maybe this howcum came out of the wrong drawer.)

Howcum the people who are so irate about our secret bombing of North Vietnamese sanctuaries near the Cambodian border never so much as waggle a finger at North Vietnamese troops for assembling on Cambodian soil in the first place?

Howcum the scoffers who were so certain that the Vietnam cease-fire would not last longer than a few weeks, are not admitting they may have been wrong after six months?

Howcum the report that President Johnson surreptitiously taped conversations with George Wallace has raised not a single eyebrow?

That cleans out my howcum drawer. An even longer list could be tellingly directed at the Nixon administration, but these accumulated resentments are presented to suggest that much of what appals us today has its roots in the callousness or apathy of too many of us in the past.

The great howcum, as they call it down in North Carolina, is this: Howcum we cannot agree to apply a single standard to political morality, and as we try to raise that standard together, to admit that nobody has the perfect right to cast the first stone?

RAYMOND NICHOLS

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a man well known throughout the State of Kansas for his endeavors in the field of higher education. On this past July 1, Raymond Nichols retired as chancellor of the University of Kansas, after serving the university in many capacities for 44 years.

At this time, I would like to quote the remarks made by the chairman of the Kansas Board of Regents at a recent all-alumni luncheon:

The University of Kansas has had a long distinguished history. Within this history are names of many people who have helped lead KU to the prominent position it enjoys in higher education today. Foremost among these is the name of Raymond Nichols, the 12th Chancellor of the University."

Ray Nichols has prepared the University of Kansas for the beginning of a new era—an era of the extension of mutual understanding and trust between academia and the people of Kansas, and with this understanding and trust, a broadening of support heretofore never experienced by KU in its long and illustrious history.

Mr. Speaker, this man began his years of service to his alma mater in 1929 when he assumed the job of executive secretary of the university. Forty years later, Raymond Nichols was the recipient of a KU citation for distinguished service.

No other person in KU's history has been so loved and respected by students, faculty, and Kansas alumni as has Ray Nichols. He made himself available at all times, and he was always very helpful and cooperative. As an indication of the high regard in which he was held, KU's new space technology building will be named Raymond Nichols Hall, and in addition, the Kansas Board of Regents has bestowed upon him the honorary title of chancellor emeritus.

I know my colleagues will want to join me in paying tribute to this fine man.

TROOP CUTS OVERSEAS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I had intended to vote for the Esch-Carter amendment to the military procurement authorization, but as the legislative situation developed, I, and many other colleagues sympathetic to the amendment, did not have the opportunity to vote for an amendment directly comparable to the language proposed by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Had I been given the opportunity to vote for this amendment, I would have done so for a number of reasons.

In the face of a most impressive lobbying effort by opponents of this and related amendments, I should first add to the explanations already presented by my colleagues and provide yet more clarification of the substance and intent of the Esch-Carter language. That proposal would have directly reduced the total U.S. force level by 200,000 troops. It would have done so by requiring that U.S. overseas force levels be reduced by 100,000 men, and that force levels within the United States be reduced by 100,000. In the aftermath of such cuts, the total military manpower of this country would

remain at 2,019,865 men, a formidable military component capable of meeting any conceivable military threat, notwithstanding the quickening pace of international negotiations which seek to further reduce the possibility of military conflict between the major powers.

When suggesting this amendment, my colleagues (Mr. ESCH and Mr. CARTER) were very sensitive to the international responsibilities this Nation recognized as essential to a generation of peace, and attentive to the prospects for further diplomatic talks which may result in a mutual reduction of military forces in Europe. It is for these very compelling reasons that the amendment was drawn to allow maximum flexibility in planning and implementing the troop cuts mandated.

The proposal did not specify that troop reductions must take place in the NATO area—or in any other part of the world, for that matter—but it did say, most emphatically, that changing world conditions and a careful assessment of national priorities require that we make a sensible reduction in our military forces at this point in time.

In the flurry of speeches and briefings by State and Defense Department officials aimed at congressional troop-reduction proposals, virtually all emphasis and effort has been expended toward justifying the present size of our military commitment to NATO. It may be unfair to draw from that the fact that there are no good arguments against a small troop reduction in non-NATO overseas forces, yet it is nevertheless apparent that the 600,000-strong Korean military force can very readily perform its mission with a slight reduction in the 42,000-man U.S. force presently stationed in that country. And, one wonders if it is not equally valid that the 45,000 Americans in Thailand and the 40,000 in the Ryukyus Islands cannot be similarly reduced in light of the agreement between Congress and the President that all U.S. military activity in Southeast Asia shall terminate on August 15.

Even though there are almost 300,000 non-NATO U.S. troops overseas—and it is conceivable that 100,000-man reduction could very safely be achieved from this complement—we will inevitably get to NATO in discussing the kind of reduction in force proposed by the Esch-Carter amendment. There are at least 2 days of responding to the general tenor of argument which has come from the State Department and the Department of Defense during the past 2 months. One form of rebuttal would take those statements and position papers apart, point-by-point, and thereby include that, even within the strategic and tactical framework articulated by these spokesmen, there remains sufficient flexibility to allow some reduction in force from the present 305,000-troop level.

Given the time and the proper forum, I am prepared to do precisely that, by starting from the premise that there is simply no way to rationalize that a particular number of troops—305,000, 250,000, or a million, for that matter—result in a particular level or strength of commitment to NATO. These remarks do not allow for that kind of exposition, so for the present I would like to suggest a second tack, which is to discuss what I find to be the two primary justifications for the present size of our NATO force. Before doing so, let me mention that I am thoroughly convinced that our NATO alliance, and our direct participation in it, have been fundamental to the emerging détente between the United States and the U.S.S.R. And, I believe it irrefutable that we will build upon that détente by maintaining a strong and battle-ready European alliance.

By the same lights, I do not see the magic in the number 305,000—that being the size of U.S. ground and naval forces in Europe in suppport of NATO. These 305,000 Americans are there, we are told, for two reasons. They are there because the rough nuclear parity which has evolved between the two superpowers creates the necessity for a conventional force deterrent in Europe. And, secondly, those men are in Europe as a living symbol of the United States' commitment to the future vitality of the NATO alliance.

To address either of these assertions, we must first draw some perspective on the size of the total NATO force and the size of the U.S. complement within that force. There are, today, approximately 3 million men serving in the Armed Forces of the NATO allies, so that the present U.S. complement is about 10 percent of the total NATO force. Given these proportions, it is evident that the present U.S. NATO complement carries a relatively small share of the conventional combat mission of the NATO alliance. Is it not possible, then, that 275,000 U.S. troops participating in the NATO force—or even 250,000—can effectively join with their 3 million European compatriots to perform their military mission?

By the same lights, why cannot 275,000 or even 250,000 Americans signal a very firm U.S. commitment to NATO—since, in fact, 280,000 were sufficient to do so in 1968? Who can possibly doubt this Nation's commitment to the security of Western Europe when hundreds of thousands of Americans have died in Europe on two previous occasions when our allies were threatened militarily?

There are those, of course, who do raise doubts about the strength of our commitment to the NATO nations, and who respond that, by weakening our presence in NATO to any degree, we hasten the possibility that Europe may become "Finlandized." I cannot accept this line of response. Not when, at this very moment, nine of 13 U.S. Army divisions have as their mission the reinforcement of NATO allies in the event of a conventional strike by the Warsaw Pact nations.

It defies reason, history, and our own assuredness of our commitment to the defense of Western Europe to presume that a small reduction in our NATO force—as the Esch-Carter amendment might have occasioned—could cause our allies to buckle, to doubt the intentions of this country, to rush to "Finlandize" themselves as the only practicable alternative. Those eventualities just do not follow, and are immensely out of proportion to the slight troop withdrawal which might have resulted from the Esch-Carter amendment.

Let me conclude on this note, Mr. Speaker, I am among the most ardent supporters of the NATO alliance, and I share company in that conviction with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH), and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER). We each listened to the statements and briefings of administration spokesmen; we each sifted and weighed every phrase of those positions, and we found ourselves most confident in suggesting to this body that we can reduce U.S. overseas force levels by 100,000 troops, and our domestic forces by 100,000, at absolutely no risk to our national security, and with absolutely no diminution of our commitments to our foreign allies.

Perhaps, during the course of our debate on the military procurement authorization, the House made this point in a different way. Although the Esch-Carter amendment did not come to a vote, we had the opportunity to vote for another bipartisan amendment which reduced the military procurement authorization across the board by $950 million. I voted "Yes" for that amendment, and I would hope to see the spirit of that provision carried through in the Defense appropriation bill still to come.

THE CHILDREN OF COLUMBUS

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have witnessed an upsurge in interest in the cultural heritage of various American ethnic groups. This new ethnic consciousness is reflected in a large body of literature which chronicles the history, background, and current status of American subgroups.

A constituent of mine, Prof. Francesco Cordasco, of Montclair State College, has provided a valuable summary of significant historical writings on Italian-Americans and I am pleased to share Professor Cordasco's work with my colleagues:

THE CHILDREN OF COLUMBUS: THE NEW ITALIAN-AMERICAN ETHNIC HISTORIOGRAPHY

(By Francesco Cordasco, Montclair State College)

In the floodtide of the new ethnic awareness, the Italian experience in America has been given a prominent attention. It is hardly fortuitous that Italian-American academicians (until the 1960s in little evidence in the universities and colleges) have discovered a cultural *ethos* which relates them to both an enviable minority status and the new egalitarianism, and that they have begun exploring the vast, unchartered expanses of their American experiences. In recent years, the academic community has witnessed a proliferating number of works which attest to these explorations, and which suggest an impatience in clearing away the neglect of past decades. In a little over a year, four new books have turned their attention to the Italian-American experience; if these new volumes are to be correctly appraised, they must be related to that frame of reference

largely defined by the earlier works in the same field. The more important of these earlier volumes will be briefly noted.

Andrew F. Rolle's *The Immigrant Upraised: Italian Adventurers and Colonist in an Expanding America* (1968) traces the history of Italian immigrants in the American West, in some 22 states west of the Mississippi, and is an invaluable study not only of immigrant Italian experience but equally of the multi-faceted identities out of which the American frontier and Western tradition emerged; and as a corollary urban tableau, Humbert S. Nelli's *The Italians in Chicago, 1880–1930: A Study in Ethnic Nobility* (1970) advances the thesis that the Italian urban ethnic colony served primarily as a staging ground where a rural people fashioned new life styles in adjusting to American habits and ideas; a contrary view is Rudolph J. Vecoli, *Chicago's Italians Prior to World War I: A Study of Their Social and Economic Adjustment* (1963) which claims that the life of the Italian subcommunity essentially reflected both the *ethos* and structure of the Italian *Mezzogiorno*. Joseph Lopreato's *Italian-Americans* (1970) "represents a sociologist's efforts to summarize and, where possible bring up to date our knowledge of major aspects of the Italian-Americans' social experiences as they bear on their continuing assimilation." Luciano J. Iorizzo and Salvatore Mondello's *The Italian-Americans* (1971) seeks "to integrate the Italian-American experience with major themes in American history;" and Alexander DeConde, in *Half Bitter, Half Sweet: An Excursion Into Italian-American History* (1972) provides a panorama of Italo-American relationships orchestrated against the background of the massive emigrations of Italians to the United States. Leonard Covello's unpublished doctoral dissertation (1944), *The Social Background of the Italo-American School Child* was the major source for the Italian materials in Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan's *Beyond the Melting Pot* (1963; 1970). The publication of Covello's dissertation in 1967 (reprinted in 1972) was heralded as "A major work of great importance in the sociology of education and in the history of migration." (*Genus*, 24:277, 1968).

It is against this background that the new books by Messrs. Rolle, Tomasi, LaGumina, and Amfitheatrof are to be understood. They are part of a continuing momentum to create a monographic literature, and hopefully a scholarly archives, for the study of the Italian-American experience; itself, not unlike the proliferation in Black Studies publications, and ethnic sociological tracts. Of the present four works, that of Rolle is the more conventional.

Rolle takes "an historical approach to the immigrant experience . . . describing why immigrants left Italy, how they were changed by American culture, how they fared, and where they settled." At best it is an historical primer (in the *Minorities in American Life* series, edited by Alexander DeConde) intended to open up "minority studies to young people" and to meet a "social and educational need." It is a competent review, and Rolle is best in those areas which reflect his own researches ("The Exploring Italians;" "Missionaries;" and "Onto the Land."), essentially, vignettes carved out of his significant full-scale study, *The Immigrant Upraised*. Less satisfactory is his treatment of Italians in the cities ("The New Immigration and Urbanism") which avoids the hard questions framed in the researches of Nelli and Vecoli: and in a broader sense, Rolle does not deal with the harsh themes of conflict and acculturation which fashioned the responses of Italian *contadini* encapsulated in an hostile urban environment. In a last chapter/epilogue ("Beyond Adjustment"), Rolle tries to take hold of some of the themes which have eluded him, but without success. If one is disposed to accept some of his statements, his inadequately detailed text fails to give them credence, *e.g.*, "Today's truculent grandchildren of immigrants, no longer prime targets of hostility, wear red, white, and green buttons calling for 'Italian power.' They insist upon voicing their heritage at public rallies and more often on certain feast days. The descendants of Italian immigrants may seem more willing to acknowledge both good and bad in their forefathers; but the Italian-American Civil Rights League and The Americans of Italian Descent proclaim, in essence, that he who is non-Italian has no right to make such judgments." (p. 122)

Much of the detail which could have given Rolle the substantive contexts which his primer lacks is in the invaluable archive assembled by Tomasi. An important mirror of the "round of life" in the Italian community was the progressive journal *Charities* sponsored by The Charity Organization Society of New York. The COS was actively involved in all of the major urban issues: tenement conditions, crime, health needs, immigration, child labor; and *Charities* served "as a significant clearing house for the thinking and programs of social and settlement workers throughout the United States during the early 20th century." Tomasi has brought together out of *Charities* a significant corpus of materials (1894–1912/13) which deal with the Italian immigrant: the progressives of the period are energetically here, *i.e.*, Eliot Norton, Jane Addams, Robert A. Woods, Lilian Brandt, Florence Kelley; and the themes are immigration, assimilation, labor abuses, housing and social conditions, criminality, health and the scourge of tuberculosis. This is a contemporary register which sees the Italian *ethos* through American eyes, and recommends "enlightened" needs (the few Italian observors, *e.g.*, Antonio Mangano and Gino C. Speranza are, in some ways, more anglicized than their American benefactors); yet, Tomasi has made easily accessible a major resource depository which recreates the Italian subcommunity at the height of its existence as it was viewed by sympathetic American observers. There is, of course, another literature to which the materials in *Charities* were a foil: the nativisitic and abrasively racist clamor which culminated in the restrictive legislation which ended the mass immigration of Italians. And, still neglected, is that vast literature in Italian which responded to the Italian experience in America, written by literate Italian immigrants of every persuasion (political pamphleteers and ideologues, religious reformers, journalists, chroniclers, etc.) of which the following (to cite just two titles) are representative: Gaetano Conte, *Dieci Anni in America: Impressioni e Ricordi* (1903); Alfredo Bosi, *Cinquanti' Anni di Vita Italiana in America* (1921). Much of the bibliographical history and periodicity of the newspapers/journals and printed ephemera of the Italian community are yet to be worked out. The recent microfilming of *La Voce Del Popolo* (San Francisco, 1868–1905) is an auspicious beginning.

LaGumina's *Album* is a disappointment. Its text (intended for young readers?) is crudely filiopietistic, *e.g.*, "Italian-Americans [are] an industrious, God-fearing, family-loving people; and this, today, is a rich cultural heritage." The photographs are injudiciously chosen (and incorrectly captioned, *e.g.*, immigrant Russians identified as Italians, p. 7), without any indication of provenance given. How bad it is as a photographic archive can be measured against the superlative collection of Allan Schoener, *Portal to America: The Lower East Side, 1870–1925* (1967); and, if it is intended as a text for young readers (an important part of the instructional literature of the ethnic revival) it is totally inadequate alongside the works of Barbara Marinacci, *They Came From Italy* (1967), and Jerre Mangione, *America is also Italian* (1969).

It was inevitable that the Italian experience in America would invite the attention of a talented journalist who eschewed the sensationalism of Nicholas Pileggi and avoided the vertiginous portraits of Mario Puzo's "godfather business." Amfitheatrof (born in Milan of a Russian father and Italian mother, and resident in the United States since age seven) has given us an extraordinary chronicle in *The Children of Columbus* which he properly calls "an informal history of the Italians in the new world." A former *Time-Life* correspondent in the Far East (and currently a writer for *Time-Life* Books), Amfitheatrof uses all of the impressionistic techniques associated with the craft of the literary correspondent; and his book is a series of brilliantly sketched pieces (in the tradition of a forgotten Richard Harding Davis) held together loosely in an historical framework. For whatever reason, and not unlike DeConde's *Half Bitter/Half Sweet*, Amfitheatrof anchors his narrative in Italian history; but, fortunately, after brief excursions into the history of 15th/16th century Italian navigators, the Renaissance, and the Risorgimento, he leaves these tangential tributaries and breaks into the main channel of the American experience. What follows are the impressionistic tableaux, each assigned a chapter, each capable of standing by itself, and each brilliantly written for the evocation of effect out of substance.

Enrico Tonti and Filippo Mazzei are juxtaposed (with all of their contrasts) as Italianate identities in a 17th/18th century America; Giuseppe Garibaldi and Antonio Meucci are the nexus for the discussion of mid-19th century America; and Luigi Palma di Cesnola is a demoniac Italian adventurer in America's Civil War and a restive force in an expanding national destiny. Amfitheatrof approaches the great peasant migrations of the late 19th century *via* an essay on the Italian South (largely deriving from Foerster's *Italian Emigration* of our time [1919/1968] and Covello's *Social Background*), and with this essay, as a sociological *caput mortuum*, sketches Italian life in America on a broad canvass (it is these latter pieces which ethnic historiographers will find of special value). Here is a sample (the tragic Lawrence, Mass., 1912 textile strike):

"It was the [Italian] immigrant women of Lawrence who finally broke open the strike. They sent their children away, to safety and sustenance . . . The IWW [International Workers of the World] strike fund was meager, and each family received only 33 cents a day with which to buy food and coal. It was decided, as conditions deteriorated, to evacuate the children rather than go back to work on the millowners' terms. On February 10, some 120 children were put aboard a train for New York, where they were met by three thousand members of the Italian Socialist Federation. When the train arrived at Grand Central Station, onlookers 'wept as they saw the obvious signs of poverty and suffering these half-starved children had endured. Newspapers that had attacked the IWW suddenly turned the full blast of their criticism on the wool trust.' Many of these children had rickets, a bone disease caused by undernourishment. 'These children had been starving from birth.' [William D.] Haywood told a crowd at Cooper Union. 'They had been starving in their mothers' wombs. And their mothers had been starving before the children were conceived.'" (p. 180)

Amfitheatrof is equally facile in other thematic encounters, *e.g.*, on the indigenous literature of the Italian ghetto:

"There were also hundreds of poems written in Italo-American. One of the most ambitious had Dante arriving as an immigrant. After being processed through Ellis Island, Dante was disembarked at the Battery where he was met by Virgil who escorted him through the Lower East Side to Mulberry

Bend—a tour of Purgatory. But the majority of these Italian-American poems were short, bitter commentaries on the indignities and injustices of immigrant poverty. This is a free-verse translation in English of a sonnet written in Italian but employing such Italian-American terms as *briccheliere* (bricklayers) and *ruffo* (roof)."

The Bricklayers came over by the thousands,
A whole Italian gang with calloused hands,
To raise a building forty stories high
Not counting in the basement or the roof.
The skyscraper's now done; it towers up,
A symbol of American achievement.
But who recalls the greenhorns, the paesani,
The ones who died without the sacraments?
What did they gain when error or misfortune
Came crashing down upon them on these floors?
Poor Guinea, helpless, God-forsaken Dago . . .
Seated before his thick half-pound of steak
The boss just laughs and shows his golden tooth.
"Who's dead is dead. I'm breathing. I don't care."

(pp. 244–45)

And he is remarkably perceptive, in distilling out of a huge literature, vignettes of crime; ethnic politics (which includes a superb portrait of LaGuardia); anomic responses in the twin dynamics of conflict and acculturation; and the new "more complex self-awareness" of the Italian Americans of the 1970s. It may not be true that "The children of Italian immigrants no longer feel Italian;" but it is true that the children of Columbus "in shedding a sense of apartness from American life . . . have also relinquished their once-powerful emotional associations with a remote Italian world that they knew second-hand, from family recollections and legends."

Amfitheatrof's successful book (and there is little doubt that it will rival Puzo's *Godfather* on middle-class reading tables) underscores the rich, essentially untapped, ethnic veins which traverse the American corpus. It is a herald of many more to come; hopefully, a new American history and sociology in which academic communities will play an important role.

CAPT. EMIL H. PRAEGER

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of a great American who, although he is neither from my district nor from my State, is the grandfather of my legal researcher, Rick, and belongs to all of the people of this great country of ours. Capt. Emil H. Praeger, U.S. Navy, retired, is celebrating his 81st birthday in his home State of New York where he is still chairman of the board of Madigan-Praeger, Inc. Captain Praeger and/or his civil engineering firm will be remembered for the renovation of the White House during the Truman administration and, more recently, for the report that he submitted concerning the renovation of the west central front of the Capitol.

Captain Praeger served in both world wars, helped to develop most of the New York City and surrounding area road and highway system, and was in charge of the design and construction of the United Nations General Assembly building. Captain Praeger is also noted for his design of the Phoenix project during World War II where he designed the docks for LeHavre harbor, had them floated across the English Channel and sunk in place. This engineering technique was later used in his design of Pier 57 in New York City and the Tappen Zee Bridge in Tarrytown, N.Y. His engineering experience has also been applied to the reclamation of Jones Beach, Dorado Beach, the foundation design of the Verrazano Bridge as well as the design of the Long Island Sound Bridge, considered to be one of the most creative, innovative and beautiful to be designed in years.

Most recently, Captain Praeger designed the Los Angeles Dodger's stadium—Chavez Ravine—and, as chairman of the board, oversaw the design and construction of Shea Stadium, New York City; Houston Astrodome, Houston, Tex., and the RFK Stadium here in Washington, D.C.

I wish Captain Praeger many more birthdays, as I am sure the rest of America does.

THE COMMUNITY ANTICRIME ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1973

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation entitled the Community Anticrime Assistance Act of 1973, which previously has been introduced by my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. CONYERS and Mr. FISH. This bill, if enacted, would provide Federal anticrime assistance grants to cities, combinations of cities, public agencies and nonprofit private agencies. The legislation would utilize private resources to aid in the reduction of crime, by instituting joint programs between the police, citizens, and all segments of the community to report criminal activity and improve citizen cooperation and involvement with the entire criminal justice system.

Fear of senseless, unpredictable, and often vicious crime has driven many of our citizens to organize to protect themselves. Citizen patrols and "crime watches" are operating in some parts of New York City; Washington, D.C.; Alexandria, Va.; Fall River, Mass.; Hammond, Ind.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Omaha, Nebr.; and other cities and towns. Wealthier citizens are able to hire guards or professional protection agencies to provide extra security for their homes and neighborhoods. Middle- and lower-income citizens cannot afford this extra protection, and must either do without and suffer increased risks of becoming victims of crime, or provide their own security at the expense of their limited leisure time and resources.

Our legislation should provide the basis for linking the resources of private industry, business, and labor, with the anticrime efforts of citizens, to forge a strong partnership in the fight against crime. Such legislation is long overdue, since there is no present coordinated Federal program to provide the impetus for, and assistance to, cooperative efforts by citizens to reduce crime.

Our legislation directs the Department of Justice, through its Community Relations Service—CRS—to administer the program of community anticrime assistance. The Community Relations Service, subsequent to its creation by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to resolve community racial disputes, has undertaken new responsibilities to improve relations between citizens and criminal justice agencies. The Attorney General's First Annual Report on Federal Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Activities indicates that CRS helped to develop administration of justice and community relations programs, and sought to establish local criminal justice coordinating councils, composed of private business, labor, education, and religious groups, and other interested citizens, to handle specific crime control and law reform projects.

Various citizens programs including home-alert, merchant-alert, and supervised nonpolice tenant patrols have assisted law enforcement agencies in the detection and apprehension of criminals. A recent report of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice—U.S. Department of Justice, 1972—found that in Washington, D.C., and New York City:

Nonpolice tenant patrols measurably reduce the incidence of stranger to stranger crimes. The decline in actual offenses and in opportunities to commit crime was significant . . . In some housing projects the presence of nonpolice tenant patrols had a greater impact on crime than saturation patrols instituted by the police department.

Similar safety patrols are also in operation in other major cities.

The Boston and Detroit projects, funded by LEAA discretionary grants, have reported a high degree of success to date. In Boston, robberies dropped 77 percent, assaults 22 percent, and purse snatching 78 percent, after institution of the program. Clearly, citizen participation can have a positive effect on crime prevention, and this concept has received extensive support from Presidential Crime Commissions, Federal, State, and local agencies, and private organizations.

President Johnson's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, 1967 Task Force Report on the Police stressed the need for citizens to take an active role in law enforcement:

Crime is not the business of the police alone. . . . Police need help from citizens, from private organizations, from other municipal agencies, and from crime prevention legislation. . . .

To reduce crime in their communities citizens must be prepared to back up their police forces with more than slogans. They need to keep in mind, but in perspective, the possibilities of crime in their daily lives and take reasonable steps to limit criminal opportunities. In emergency situations, they must assume the responsibilities of summoning aid for victims or police in distress; they cannot stay free of involvement and

yet expect others to protect them. In groups and even as individuals they can supply desperately needed auxiliary resources to the police, the courts, and correctional officers.

The Attorney General of the United States, in a 1969 address to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, recommended a detailed plan for citizen involvement in crime prevention, including private anticrime funds for assistance to the private sector, "town hall" meetings on crime problems, a cabinet level council on law enforcement, and a national clearinghouse for community organizations.

The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence in 1969 called for the establishment of private citizens organizations and a National Citizen Justice Center.

In 1971, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations report on State-local criminal justice systems, devoted an entire chapter to citizen involvement in crime prevention, citing numerous ways in which citizens can safely and efficiently participate in the criminal justice system.

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals working papers on January 1973, recommended citizen involvement to reduce crime and governmental corruption.

Finally, the Council on Municipal Performance recently surveyed law enforcement methods in 30 major cities, and found that four of the five cities with the lowest crime rate cited police-community cooperation as one of three primary crime control approaches. Significantly, three of the five cities with the highest crime rates—Newark, San Francisco, and St. Louis—reported that lack of community cooperation was the major obstacle to crime control.

Clearly, crime control cannot be considered to be within the exclusive province of our governments, Federal, State, and local. In the past 5 years we have poured more than $2 billion into Law Enforcement Assistance Administration programs to reduce crime, and nevertheless this Nation's crime index continues at an unacceptably high rate, threatening the safety and peace of mind of our citizens in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural areas throughout this country.

While we are working on long-range programs to eliminate some of the basic causes of crime—education, housing, equal opportunity, health and the like—our short-range goals of crime control depend on the will of our people to initiate crime prevention programs on their own and to cooperate with Federal, State, and local governments in a unified fight to reduce crime in our cities. Our legislation will provide a beginning in financial assistance and support from the Federal Government for such positive citizen involvement, and we are confident that implementation of this program would result in a substantial reduction in our Nation's crime rates.

PROPOSED CAMPAIGN FINANCING LEGISLATION

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to put the financing of campaigns for Federal elective office in a glass house for all the world to see and where I think such activity rightfully belongs.

My bill entitled, "The Federal Campaign Contributions and Expenditures Act of 1973," would establish a kind of Federal bank whose sole function would be to receive contributions to, and make expenditures on behalf of, all candidates for Federal elective office. There would be no public financing of election campaigns as has been proposed by some, but rather Federal dominion would be exercised over the receipt and disbursement of all funds to insure that the accounting is accurate and recipients of expenditures as well as contributors are clearly known and identified. I am confident that my approach to the problem avoids some of the obvious problems of outright public financing of campaigns for Federal elections, yet recognizes the proper governmental concern in the traditional method of campaign financing through contributions from the citizenry at large.

Established by my legislation would be a Federal Elections Commission, to be composed of five members, one each to be appointed by the majority and minority leaders of both Houses and by the President. The Commission would have supervisory control over the agency given the operating authority under the bill, which agency would be called the "Office of Federal Campaign Contributions and Expenditures."

It would be the function of this Office to receive all contributions made to candidates for Federal elective office and to hold such funds on deposit for the candidate, much as a bank does for a depositor. Then, upon authorization by the candidate, the Office would draw checks against the account in payment of obligations incurred during the campaign. Additional clout would be given to the control provided over expenditures by provisions in the bill making it unlawful: For anyone other than the Office to make any payment for campaign needs on behalf of a candidate; and for any person, firm, or corporation to accept payment for any such campaign activity from any source other than the Office of Campaign Contributions and Expenditures.

The making of both the payment and the receipt of payment of campaign expenditures unlawful except when such payments are made by the Office of Campaign Contributions and Expenditures, is probably the most significant part of the bill. Under the table, disguised, or the resort to no-record cash transactions would be eliminated under my proposal since such shenanigans would be more than just questionable tactics, they would be criminal.

In this way, all contributions to candidates would be funneled to the Office where comprehensive records would be maintained for public view, and all payments of campaign expenses would be made by the Office. The hoped-for result of this traffic pattern would be complete, accurate, and accessible accounting of the source and amount of all contributions to candidates and of the purpose, amount, and payee of all expenditures made during a campaign.

I might note that my intention regarding the Office is to keep it as neutral as possible with respect to candidates and their relations with their contributors, creditors, and competing candidates. Thus, I have, in drafting the bill, attempted to circumscribe the authority as closely as possible and I have purposely left intact the powers of the Comptroller General in the areas of enforcement of media expenditure limitations, investigations of complaints of violations of federal campaign law, and the issuance of orders regarding such violations.

In addition, because of the constitutional, administrative and definitional problems I foresaw, this legislation would not assert jurisdiction over groups and committees whose interest is in a particular issue or whose interests lie in both Federal, and State, and local candidates; that is, those whose financial attention has not yet focused on a particular candidate for Federal office. However, if such a committee or group were to decide to make an expenditure on behalf of a candidate for a particular purpose, such as a TV spot, it would be precluded from doing so itself by the prohibition mentioned earlier. Instead, it would have to divert the money, in the form of a contribution appropriately earmarked, to the Office and the Office would then, upon authorization from the candidate, make the payment.

Likewise, my legislation does not attempt to set new spending limitations or the like since many proposals are already focusing on this subject and whatever may be the ultimate determination of such matters, the Office of Campaign Contributions and Expenditures is a necessary mechanism to assure compliance and faithful execution of these other mandates.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I think the bill I have introduced today is capable of striking the delicate balance between the tradition of citizen contributions to favorite candidates and the need for the rest of society to know how much, from whom, and for what purposes a candidate is receiving and using his contributions. I think the creation of the Office of Federal Campaign Contributions and Expenditures will accomplish that purpose with a minimum of Federal involvement and expense, and I would urge my colleagues to favorably consider this bill.

VALUABLE SERVICE FROM YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I take special pride in calling to the attention of my colleagues the valuable work performed during the past year by the 37 young men and women who served on my nonpartisan Youth Advisory Council. I formed the council in 1971 to advise me on matters before the Congress of concern to the young citizens of my district and to initiate positive projects to advance the interests of young people in the community. Each high school in Missouri's Second Congressional District sent a student representative to the council in 1972–73, and all of the representatives are to be commended for the quality of service they gave.

For my part, I offered the students an open and direct line of communication to me, as well as the resources of my office. But the imagination and initiative came from them, in plentiful supply. They dealt with problems that were close to them—problems they faced in everyday life—and in doing so achieved an uncommon degree of effectiveness.

In the fall of 1972, a St. Louis area high school student was rendered paraplegic in a football accident, and it was found that no school insurance policy existed to protect him or other school athletes. The Youth Advisory Council formed a Committee on Health Insurance, chaired by Lis Weber, which immediately conducted a thorough and complete survey of all high school athletic departments in the Second District to determine the quality of high school insurance programs as well as general safety conditions in athletic departments. The results of the study were reported to me and will in turn be referred to the 1973–74 Youth Advisory Council this fall for updated study and dissemination. The council's prompt action last fall should enhance the safety of students throughout the community.

Juvenile justice is another daily concern of the young. Alarming numbers of children and youth are entering the juvenile justice system; moreover, many of the victims of juvenile crime are children and youth. The 1971–72 Youth Advisory Council conducted an extensive study of the Missouri juvenile justice system and concluded that a new State agency responsible for guaranteeing the delivery of needed youth services would improve the quality of justice for juveniles. During the past year further studies were conducted, and the council worked to transform its recommendations into legislative realities.

I joined the Committee on Juvenile Justice in meeting with a Missouri State Senator to discuss possible State and Federal legislation that would reflect the council's recommendations. Under the leadership of Doug Phillips, Pat Hicks, and Jeff Dale, the Committee on Juvenile Justice advanced its proposals persuasively. Doug was invited to testify before a Missouri Joint Interim Legislative Committee which was drafting legislation in the juvenile justice field. I found the testimony sufficiently significant to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 25, 1973, and the legislative committee incorporated a number of the council's recommendations, including the creation of a State division of youth services, in the bill it finally proposed. Doug later appeared before the Missouri Senate Criminal Justice Committee to testify in favor of the bill, which ultimately passed the State Senate. At the Federal level, the council registered input by suggesting an amendment to legislation establishing an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. The amendment, which was included in the bill, provides for the input of young citizens into the Institute on an ongoing basis. In addition to its direct legislative activities, the Committee on Juvenile Justice participated in a number of relevant meetings and conferences.

The problem of chemical substance abuse, which the council found to be symptomatic of larger problems as well, was explored by the Committee on Drug Problems, chaired by John Fox. The committee visited and studied prevention and treatment services throughout the St. Louis area. So much has been said about substance abuse that it may seem as though public interest in the issue is beginning to decline. Nevertheless, the council recognized its gravity and kept well informed and abreast of conditions in the community.

Young people are, after all, the primary consumers of education, and I believe it would be especially encouraging to parents to learn that the members of my Youth Advisory Council gave their attention to methods of paying for it. A position paper on the funding of education was presented to me by Joe Duggan and Lou Fablan of the Committee on Education. I will submit the paper to the incoming council members this fall for further study and recommendations.

Young people are indeed a major consumer group of many products, and consumer affairs do concern them. A Committee on Consumer Protection, cochaired by Mary Jo Milligan and Dave Morlock, studied several pieces of consumer legislation that were pending in Congress and shared their findings with me.

There are a great many municipal courts in the 2nd District, and although they deal with large numbers of citizens regularly, they are seldom scrutinized. A Committee on Municipal Courts, under the leadership of Doug Phillips, Bob Niemeler, and Alan Bornstein, laid the groundwork for a thorough study of municipal courts in the St. Louis area, to make known to the council and the public basic practices and procedures of these courts, and to allow a study of this information to determine whether these courts are in fact just to citizens of all age-groups, income-levels, and races. I will pass onto the 1973–1974 council the plans and background information already developed for such a study.

A Youth Advisory Council Committee on Emergency Medical Services examined legislation at both the State and Federal levels to improve the quality of emergency care and studied the local situation by conferring with local physicians and hospital administrators. In order to get a first-hand observation of emergency medical service needs, council members volunteered to serve as "victims" in a mock disaster at a local hospital. Hospital officials commended them for their cooperation and convincing performance in the drill. The committee's many and varied activities were carried out under the leadership of Mike Blind, Chip Murray, and Liz Weber.

The Committee on Emergency Medical Services discussed the many aspects of the existing system and of proposed improvements with legislative leaders and experts at the 1973 Missouri Youth Legislative Forum in the State capital. The entire council traveled to the meeting, and council members participated in work sessions on juvenile justice, prison reform, education, and adult rights and responsibilities at age 18. Doug Phillips served as chairman of the Youth Legislative Forum.

When the State legislature was presented with a proposal to grant full majority rights to 18-year-olds, the council gave considerable thought to the matter and endorsed the proposal. Doug Phillips was asked to present testimony to the Missouri House Judiciary Committee on behalf of the council's position, and he did so in February 1973.

The many and varied activities of the Youth Advisory Council in 1972 and 1973 demonstrate not only seriousness of purpose and commitment but also a substantial ability to get things done. Of great value in this regard was the work of Doug Portell, Youth Council Coordinator, who performed many of the staff functions of the council while serving as a student member. And the entire council joined in identifying problems and trying to deal with them in the most effective manner. Their studies led them to many places—they came to me but they also went to State and local government agencies and officials, to various meetings and forums, and to many individuals; they went wherever they were led in the pursuit of answers.

The council members recognized they could not solve everything in one meeting or in 1 year. Consequently, they continued projects that had been initiated by their predecessors and began projects to be further developed in the future. Their ability to see themselves as part of an ongoing endeavor contributed greatly to their successes and to the groundwork they laid for future accomplishments.

Finally, in all their work, these students went beyond the initial commitment and enthusiasm we have come to take for granted in young people—they carried out their projects with a continuation of commitment we are not used to seeing—if only because we don't always look for it or give it a chance to flourish. In short, the 37 young men and women who worked with me this past year combined some of the best natural qualities of youth—the hope and strength of spirit—with a large dose of maturity. The fruits of this combination are of clear and substantial value. I would like

to express my sincere appreciation to the following individuals:

Sandy Beck, Mike Blind, Alan Bornstein, Tim Brady, Mary Causino, Jeff Dale, Sue Dannenmaler, Joe Duggan, Lou Fabian, Bill Flaika, John Fox, Susie Green, John Hamilton, Laura Hawes, Pat Hicks, Mat Librach, Joanie Lyles, Denise Mandie, Nan McCurdy, Mary Jo Milligan, Dave Morlock, Chip Murray, Bob Niemeier, Richard Parks, Doug Phillips, Doug Portell, Jane Ruzicka, Laurie Sabol, Debby Sansone, Henry Scott, Doug Schwartz, Chris Schulte, Becky Smith, Richard Stoff, Bill Thorne, Liz Weber, Rick Yelton.

MY BUTZ IS HURTING

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my irritation at a statement made by Secretary of Agriculture Butz yesterday in regard to the present freeze on beef prices. The freeze was economically idiotic and many of us said it would not work when it was put on. Now that it has proven to be such a failure, the Secretary says that politicians pushed him into it.

When the President announced in July that beef prices would remain frozen until September 12, Secretary Butz publicly endorsed the idea even though he knew a similar freeze had been a dismal failure in pork and poultry. I predicted then the freeze would have to be lifted by mid-August because by then we would be facing serious beef shortages. The Secretary maintained the freeze would continue until September 12. Now, in the face of beef shortages, the Secretary says if he had his druthers he would consider lifting the freeze before September 12.

I think it is about time Secretary Butz gave this country some agriculture leadership. First we subsidize farm exports and then we embargo them. In April consumers boycott beef and in July they are crying for it. One day the Secretary infers that anyone who favors food price freezes is a fool; the next day he embraces the freezes and when they do not work, he says we were pushed into them by politicians.

I feel it is about time the OMB admits it does not know a bale of hay from a bushel of beans and turns agriculture decisions back to the Department of Agriculture before the consumer's pocketbook and the farmer's livelihood are both severely damaged.

It is my firm belief that agricultural decisions have been coming from the OMB instead of the Secretary of Agriculture who I feel knew in advance that food prices were going up because of food shortages and that you do not solve problems of food shortages with food price freezes. Secretary Butz is an agricultural economist and is too smart a man in this area to have been responsible for the decisions that have our country in such a food mess.

I contacted the OMB and asked them to tell me who in their department was making agricultural decisions. Their reply listed 10 men in OMB and, aside from 2 who had an economic background in forestry, only 1 of the 10 had any academic background in agriculture. We have hundreds of men in the Department of Agriculture a few blocks from OMB and I think it is about time we started using them before both consumers and producers, as well as our economy, are hurt further.

GEN. A. J. GOODPASTER ON NATO AND AN ERA OF DÉTENTE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to submit for the RECORD excerpts from an address given by Gen. A. J. Goodpaster to the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies. General Goodpaster's keynote remarks led a discussion on "Alliances in an Era of Détente," and there is certainly no one more qualified to speak on this subject than General Goodpaster, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, and Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command.

Since 1969, the General has held the important position as head of NATO and the American forces in Europe. His military career began when commissioned a second lieutenant upon graduating from West Point in 1939, and with that start he went on to become a respected military leader and a distinguished American citizen.

General Goodpaster's words on the role of NATO in international affairs today deserve to be reviewed. He is a great man with important and welcome words on our world today.

Excerpts of General Goodpaster's address follow:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY GEN. A. J. GOODPASTER, SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE

EXCERPTS

I first want to emphasize that I have long considered detente one of the four objectives of NATO, along with deterrence, defense, and solidarity. These objectives are interrelated in a number of ways. We need to achieve all four together, not any one merely by itself.

Deterrence must, of course, head the list. Deterrence is today, as it was when the treaty of the North Atlantic Alliance was signed back in 1949, the chosen route by which to provide for the security of our people while safeguarding our freedoms. For deterrence means simply insuring and reinforcing peace by dissuading military attacks and military pressures.

* * * * *

The objective of deterrence includes dissuading the Soviets not only from direct military attack but also from policies and tactics based on the exercise of military pressures.

For this deterrence to be effective, we must convince the Soviet leaders that the risks and the costs of war would far outweigh any gains they could realistically expect to make. Thus deterrence rests squarely on the second traditional objective of NATO, defense. In addition, of course, if deterrence should fail, strong and ready defense forces would come into play as the essential means of safeguarding our nations.

The third objective of the Alliance is solidarity—collective action and unity among the nations of the Alliance. Our integrated military command— Allied Command Europe, which stretches from the North Cape of Norway across Central Europe and the Mediterranean to Eastern Turkey—joins with other institutions of NATO to serve this objective. . . .

* * * * *

As I indicated earlier, I consider detente the fourth objective of NATO. Detente is a word which is much used these days—and, I might add, often abused. In a recent speech in Bonn, Sir Alec Douglas-Home distinguished between "real" detente and "illusory" detente, and the distinction seems to me both valid and important. Genuine detente, a meaningful and durable detente, must be based on reducing and removing the causes of tension among nations, rather than merely the symptoms of tension. And in today's world, one preeminent cause of tension is the massive and still-expanding military power maintained by the Soviet Union.

A reduction in the surface manifestations of tension not accompanied by a reduction in the basic causes—what Sir Alec called illusory detente—carries considerable risks. It could give our people a false sense of security, and lead them to drop their guard. Thus it would actually increase the danger and reduce the stability in our position, and thereby in fact contribute to future tension, rather than resolve it.

My first main point about NATO and detente, then, is that detente is, quite properly, one of the principal objectives of NATO. My second point is closely related. We are in an era of detente, I would argue, largely because of the success of NATO in achieving these objectives. Indeed, it seems to me that we do not emphasize often enough—or perhaps not loudly enough—just how tremendously successful NATO has been. For more than two decades now it has been the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, above all else, that has preserved the peace and safeguarded the freedom and prosperity of Western Europe and North America.

Since the end of World War II, twenty-eight years have passed without war in Europe. For comparison, twenty-eight years after the end of the First World War, Europe had undergone the six years of death and destruction of World War II. This is the first time in many centuries that Europe has had so long a period of peace.

* * * * *

For, while the era of detente has been marked in the West by tendencies toward a weakening of dedication and support for NATO, and by a concentration on the divisive problems facing the Alliance, there is no evidence of similar developments in the Warsaw Pact. Indeed the hard facts are just the opposite. Despite all the talk of detente and accommodation, the last few years have been marked by a continuing—and disturbing—growth in Russian military strength.

The Soviets may be talking more quietly just now, but they are carrying a big stick, which is in fact getting bigger. An independent study conducted not long ago by Professor Erickson of Edinburgh University confirmed that there have been substantial and sustained increases in Soviet military forces during the last few years. This conclusion occasioned widespread comment and a good deal of surprise. And this is a fact which is itself surprising, since there had been no lack of public statements, including some of my own, about the increase that had been taking place in the Warsaw Pact forces. In each one of the last six years—since the time in fact of the removal of Khruschev—the Soviet military budget has increased in real terms over the military budget of the previous year. Recent published estimates indicate that the Soviet military budget exceeds that of the

United States—from a total national economy only half as large. In this area of detente, then, NATO faces a kind of paradox—on the one hand continuing negotiations with some degree of euphoria and weakening of support, and on the other hand growing Soviet forces—the strongest military power the world has ever seen. What should we do in this situation?

The primary thing we should do, I believe, is to keep a keen edge on our thinking processes. We should take conscious care not to slip further into the complacency, the unthinking euphoria, that is already all too widespread in connection with military needs and problems. We must realize, and somehow make sure the public realizes, that the military strength of NATO is not in contradiction to the search for detente and peace. It is rather an essential element, an indispensable underpinning, for that search.

* * * * *

The question is often asked, "Why are US troops still in Europe twenty-eight years after the end of World War II?" Posed in these words, the question is an invitation to confusion. I consider that the right question is not how long it has been since World War II, it is how long it is before World War III. The US troops in Europe are there to keep World War III from taking place, and they have been succeeding in this task for nearly three decades. It is a worthy task.

A second version of the question is almost as faulty, and as pernicious: "Why are US troops in Europe to defend the Europeans—why don't the Europeans defend themselves?" The answer to this charge, of course, is first of all that the bulk of the defense forces in Europe are in fact provided by the Europeans—ninety percent of the ground forces, seventy-five percent of the air forces, and eighty percent of the ships. This is an important fact that is all too little realized in the United States.

* * * * *

But it is, above all, US security interests that are involved in Europe. As John McCloy put it in his testimony to the Randall Subcommittee, "the extent of our interdependence is such that if we attempt to visualize a Europe no longer on our side but opposing us in all critical issues, neutral or oversensitive to all Communist pressures, the prospect would be bleak indeed."

There are, I believe, three propositions that are basic to United States security interests in this regard. The first proposition is that NATO, or something like it, is essential to the security interests of the United States, just as I believe it is to the security interests of every other member of NATO. Without NATO, the West would lie exposed to Soviet pressure, to Soviet efforts to pick off countries one by one, and to dangerous instability and threats to peace.

The second proposition is that a substantial collective force, in-being, in-place in Western Europe, is essential to a viable NATO and therefore to United States security. Without such a real, living force in being, NATO could become no more than a "scrap of paper," like other treaties before it. Moreover, if this collective force were lost, I for one do not believe it would be possible to build it again.

The third proposition is that a balanced American military force contribution in the European area, not substantially less than we have there today, is at present essential to the continued existence of a strong collective force, therefore, to the continued effectiveness and viability of NATO, and therefore to the security interests of the United States. This will remain true until mutual reductions can be made with the other side.

And a clinching point to me in all this is that the forces we have in Europe are much more effective militarily in achieving our aims of deterrence, peace, and stability by being *there* than by being in the United States. President Nixon trenchantly underlined this same conclusion when he said, "The United States can no more disengage from Europe than from Alaska."

Certainly the burden of maintaining these forces and of defense in general is not light. The measures that I urge—maintaining forces at their present levels until the Soviet Union agrees to balanced reductions, continuing our programs of modernization and improvement—these policies will not be cheap nor can they be expected to prove universally popular in this era of detente. In this regard, I like to compare NATO's military force to a small town police department which, in more than twenty years, has not had to cope with a single major crime.

We therefore find it increasingly difficult to obtain from the community budget the money for a new patrol car and to justify to the town council the employment of so many policemen. But I would point out that the NATO policemen on the corner—hard at work at deterrence—have had a major hand in preventing any major crimes from taking place.

This comparison seems to me to illustrate two important dimensions of national contributions to NATO. The first and most obvious one is the contribution of military forces. Here the maintenance of force levels and the conduct of modernization programs are of great importance to the future of the collective military security of the NATO nations. But a second set of contributions are of equal importance: The efforts by national leaders to create and strengthen an atmosphere of understanding and support for the sacrifices required for the collective defense, at a time when such support must come from reason and constructive thought, and not from the visceral impulse of fear.

Today a vital part of a nation's contribution to NATO is a willingness to take the political heat that is involved in shaping and meeting our military obligations.

In 1951, when he addressed the Congress of the United States, General Eisenhower predicted: "The cost of peace is going to be a sacrifice, a very great sacrifice individually and nationally. But total war is a tragedy; it is probably the suicide of civilization." Today, in this era of detente, total war seems to be much more remote than it seemed in 1951. I know of nothing, however, that has reduced the costs of peace. On the contrary, those costs and the sacrifices they demand continue to be heavy.

Today, despite inflation and an atmosphere of detente, it is vitally important that the nations of NATO obtain the money for the new patrol car and other more modern equipment. It is equally important for them to justify the policemen to the town council.

Now, as perhaps never before, there is a need for national leadership that can and will maintain the collective strength of the nations, and make clear to all the interdependence of deterrence and detente. Only thus will NATO continue to be in the coming years what it has been in the past—the most successful alliance for peace and security that the world has ever known.

CORPORATE TAX STUDY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, August 1, I delivered a speech in the House on corporate Federal tax payments and Federal subsidies to corporations for 1972. This was a major speech of some 18 pages with numerous tables and complex footnotes.

As usual, the Government Printing Office did a fantastic job of printing this speech with the tables in the period of just a few hours. However, there are a few typographical errors. My staff and I are in the process of meticulously proofreading this data, and I will enter a few corrections in tomorrow's RECORD.

I want to take this opportunity today to mention this, since many of the figures in my speech are being widely quoted. I hope that interested persons will delay in reprinting from this data until the few typographical errors are corrected in tomorrow's RECORD.

"CAROWINDS"

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, may I recommend to my colleagues in the Congress, their families, constituents, and friends a visit to CAROWINDS. This fabulous amusement and recreation center will be open to the public every day during the August recess of the Congress and every weekend through the late fall.

From Washington, CAROWINDS is less than a day's drive down superb Interstate Highway 85 with other splendid highways connecting from the South, East, and the West. Nearby is the International Airport of the Queen City of Charlotte. CAROWINDS is astride the North Carolina-South Carolina line, 10 miles south of Charlotte, N.C., and 13 miles north of Rock Hill, S.C., on Interstate Highway 77. CAROWINDS is thus located in the congressional districts of my distinguished colleagues—the Honorable TOM S. GETTYS of South Carolina and JIM MARTIN of North Carolina. Gov. James A. Holshouser of North Carolina and Gov. John C. West of South Carolina recently dedicated this great historical, cultural, and entertainment attraction in appropriate ceremonies. CAROWINDS is recommended by the Recreation and Tourism Departments of the Carolinas and by historical societies and agencies throughout the southeast. The birthplace of Andrew Jackson, the Kings Mountain National Battlefield and Park, and Cowpens National Battlefield and Park are nearby and countless other historic attractions are located near CAROWINDS.

In the beautiful Piedmont Belt of the Carolinas at the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains, CAROWINDS is ideally situated. CAROWINDS is the largest amusement park in the United States. Its main entrance features a magnificent colonial mansion with the North Carolina-South Carolina State line in exact center of the mansion. In front of the mansion is the carriage from the famous 1939 movie "Gone With the Wind." In your imagination you can see both Scarlett O'Hara and Rhett Butler. There are well over 100 attractions crammed in 73 acres of CAROWINDS. Over 1,200 young men and women of high school and college age are employed for the summer season.

These young people are selected for their charm, personality, and talent.

Clean, wholesome, dynamic entertainment will thrill every moment of your stay at CAROWINDS. Three centuries of Carolina history, heritage, and tradition are depicted through a fantastic multimedia show projected on a huge 140-degree screen. CAROWINDS emphasizes ecology, environment, and natural beauty. It features a magnificent avenue of magnolias, shrubs, flowers, and even vegetable gardens and Indian lore.

In a recent news story, CAROWINDS is thusly described:

A 100-yard strip of golden concrete now marks the place where the border of the two Carolinas passes through the entrance to CAROWINDS.

In a colorful ceremony dedicating the mansion entrance to the new theme park, CAROWINDS President E. Pat Hall described the occasion as the beginning of a new era of harmony between the two Carolinas.

The State's 1973 Pageant Queens, Connie Dorn of Kinston, N.C., and Bonnie Corder of Columbia, S.C., assisted Hall in pouring the golden concrete strip on the Carolina border which divides the magnolia lined gateway to CAROWINDS.

Lights are set in the strip so that passengers on the 340-foot CAROWIND Skytower as well as passengers in planes can see how the State line divides the park at night.

CAROWINDS officials also uncovered names of 146 counties in the two States which are engraved in bronze in the court of the Carolinas. The name plaques are set in concrete squares which form the courtyard immediately behind the eight columned mansion entrance building. Coins tossed in the unique bistate pool in the center of the courtyard are donated by CAROWINDS to the Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children in Greenville, S.C.

Earl Patterson Hall, president of CAROWINDS, is one of America's most dynamic and imaginative businessmen. His is a Horatio Alger, Knute Rockne, Jack Dempsey story of obscurity to fame. Born March 28, 1921, on a farm near Matthews, N.C., Pat learned early to scrape for himself. He was one of a family of 10 children—six brothers and three sisters. After graduating from high school, Pat took a job as an office boy in Charlotte. Three years later, he joined the U.S. Army where he served faithfully and loyally. In 1946, he returned to his hometown and married Hope Pitts, a news girl with the Charlotte Observer. Pat Hall's business success was spectacular. In a few years, he was one of the Nation's outstanding businessmen. While Pat Hall was building his immense business reputation, he was also constantly experiencing a recurring dream. Yes, Pat Hall "had a dream." His first visions came during a trip through California's Disneyland in 1955. Overwhelmed by its magical qualities, he began to think what a similar park could do for his native Carolina.

During the next 14 years, he would visit amusement parks at every opportunity wherever his business arrangements would take him. By the late 1960's he had seen virtually every family recreation complex in the entire world and the dream of a theme park showcasing the great heritage of Carolina was now taking on new dimensions. Pat Hall's next booming business announcement came on October 10, 1969, when he declared he would build a $250-million recreational-residential-industrial complex called CAROWINDS. Far more than a sound business investment, Hall saw CAROWINDS as a new platform from which to express his great love for children. Having been one of ten, he had fathered four more himself. Pat Hall's dream is now a reality. He and his lovely and charming wife, Hope, preside daily over the world's greatest recreation and amusement center—CAROWINDS.

DEATH CLAIMS DR. BELL

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I report to the Senate the passing of a fine Christian leader and a great American, Dr. L. Nelson Bell.

Dr. Bell was well-known to many Members of this body. His life and his great work have been an inspiration to many thousands of men and women whose faith was strengthened by this man's unyielding dedication.

Dr. Bell was the father of Mrs. Billy Graham. He died in his sleep early yesterday morning. I feel, Mr. President, that it was a measurement of the man that Mrs. Bell, when she discovered that her husband had passed away, calmly called a friend and said, "Dr. Bell is in Heaven now."

Dr. Bell will be missed, and most especially by Mrs. Helms and me. We extend our deepest sympathy, of course, to Dr. Bell's family. But at the same time, we rejoice in his splendid life, and are grateful that this remarkable man passed our way.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from this morning's Washington Post be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

PROTESTANT LEADER L. NELSON BELL DIES

(By Marjorie Hyer)

The Rev. Dr. L. Nelson Bell, a major figure in American Protestantism and the father-in-law of Evangelist Billy Graham, died early Thursday at his home in Montreat, N.C. He was 79.

Dr. Bell was reported by Dr. Graham, who lived nearby, to have died "very peacefully" and apparently in his sleep, only a few hours after having addressed a world mission conference of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

The church leader had been under treatment for both circulatory and vision problems, but was able to maintain an active writing and speaking schedule.

Last June, he completed his term as moderator of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, known as the Southern Presbyterian Church.

His one-year term in his denomination's highest honorary post was made more strenuous by severe polarization within the church along conservative-liberal lines.

Although Dr. Bell, a former medical missionary to China, was widely identified with the conservative position, he worked hard—and to some extent in vain—to keep dissident congregations within the fold. Nearly 200 churches have withdrawn from the parent denomination, which they maintain has departed from the Biblical faith.

When the first handful of dissident congregations met last November to form a new church, Dr. Bell predicted sadly, "Judging by the past history of splinter movements, it is very likely that this group will split up."

As a young man, he turned down a career in professional baseball to pursue studies that would eventually lead him into three other careers.

When the threat of war brought an end to his 25 years as a medical missionary in China in the summer of 1941, he practiced surgery in Asheville, N.C.

Plagued by a recurring heart condition, he retired from medical practice in 1956.

The same year, he and Dr. Graham were instrumental in founding Christianity Today, a fortnightly journal published in Washington that has come to be recognized as the voice of evangelical Protestantism in this country.

His name has continued on the magazine's masthead as executive editor.

Two books, "While Men Slept" and "Convictions to Live By," have been compiled from the biweekly column, "A Layman and His Faith," which Dr. Bell has written for the journal.

Dr. Bell continued to live in Montreat, which is also the site of a major conference center of his church, but made frequent trips to Washington to take part in editorial conferences at the magazine. His last visit here was on June 21.

According to a spokesman for Christianity Today, his last column, written shortly before his death, will appear in the Aug. 31 edition. It deals with the resurrection.

Dr. Graham described his father-in-law as a "Christian world leader and kind counselor to many."

In 1957, Dr. Bell received an editorial award from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge and the following year was cited for the best editorial of the year by the Freedoms Foundation.

Dr. Bell's China experiences are told in a book, "A Foreign Devil in China," by John C. Pollock.

He is survived by his wife, the former Virginia Myers Leftwich, and four children: Mrs. Graham of Montreat, Mrs. C. Donald Montgomery of Las Alamos, N.M.; Mrs. John N. Sommerville, a missionary to Korea who was home at the time of Dr. Bell's death, and the Rev. B. Clayton Bell, who was just named pastor of Highland Park Church in Dallas, Tex., the largest church in the denomination.

GEORGIA STATE STUDENT CHOSEN NSPA DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the National Society of Public Accountants, representing some 14,000 independent practitioners in the accounting profession, has announced the award of 22 scholarships for the 1973–74 academic year through the Society's Scholarship Foundation.

I am pleased to note that the NSPA Scholarship Foundation has chosen David R. Grande of Augusta, Ga., a senior at Augusta College, where he is president of the Student Government Association, as the recipient of the Distinguished Scholar Award. This is certainly

well-deserved recognition of his outstanding scholarship and leadership, and I commend him on this award.

This recognition is granted the applicant judged to be the most outstanding in competition with accounting students from across the Nation.

Mr. Grande, in addition to receiving the scholarship grant, will be awarded a plaque in commemoration of this honor.

The final selection of the scholarship winners was made from among 480 students who submitted applications to the NSPA Foundation. All applicants were judged for scholastic achievement, financial need, demonstrated leadership ability and extracurricular activities.

The students selected and their home towns and the schools that they are attending are as follows:

NAME, HOMETOWN, STATE AND SCHOOL

David R. Grande, Augusta, Georgia; Augusta College.

Douglas J. Reid, Uxbridge, Massachusetts; Johnson and Wales College.

Larry Johnson, Lewiston, Maine; Auburn Main School of Commerce.

Samuel P. Starr, Chambersburg, Tennessee; Pennsylvania State University.

Linda L. Hart, Plattsburgh, New York; Plattsburgh State University.

Donald M. Liechty, Pittsville, Maryland; Strayer College.

David M. Ross, Arlington, Virginia; University of South Carolina.

Steven G. Messing, Coral Gables, Florida; University of Florida.

James E. Esselman, Oshkosh, Wisconsin; University of Wisconsin.

Edward J. Wainscott, Muncie, Indiana; Ball State University.

Michael A. Smith, Chattanooga, Tennessee; University of Tennessee.

Delores Y. Nybo, Gulfport, Mississippi; Phillips College.

Wesley Peterson, Audubon, Minnesota; Moorhead State College.

Lonna M. Pueringer, Red Lake Falls, Minnesota; Moorhead State College.

James P. Hall, Tulsa, Oklahoma; University of Tulsa.

Terry K. Fisher, Bartlesville, Oklahoma; Oklahoma University.

Lynn L. Kenshalo, Greeley, Colorado; University of North Colorado.

Don W. Ramet, Pocatello, Idaho; Idaho State University.

Jim G. Sabbatini, Fresno, California; California State University.

Sherman Anderson, Bountiful, Utah; University of Utah.

Winnie Hung, Hong Kong, B.C.C.; Church College of Hawaii.

David Yu, Laie, Hawaii; Church College of Hawaii.

My sincere congratulations to all these individuals and best wishes for success in the careers that they choose. It is, of course, especially pleasing that a Georgia student and school were selected to head this list.

Begun in 1969, the donations of individual accountants and outside contributors have made this worthwhile program available to 75 students now. The financial aid has been increased to $300.

This type of project reflects an awareness that the strength of the future of our country is to be found in our young people.

The National Society of Public Accountants should be commended for its part in this important endeavor.

SENATOR MAGNUSON—A LEADER IN HEALTH

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, in the June 1973 issue of Journal of Podiatric Education, the official monthly publication of the American Association of Colleges of Podiatric Medicine, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor-HEW, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, was the subject of a column called "Congressional Leaders in Health."

The column is aptly titled. Chairman MAGNUSON is truly a leader in health, and has staunchly supported adequate funding for important health programs even in the face of stiff opposition. The article points out that in the 5 years Senator MAGNUSON has chaired the Labor-HEW Subcommittee, annual health spending has increased by over $10 billion.

As a member of Chairman MAGNUSON's subcommittee, I can attest to the competence and fairness with which he runs the subcommittee, and also the vigor with which he defends the principles in which he believes. I congratulate him for being honored by the American Association of Colleges of Podiatric Medicine.

Mr. President, out of respect for and as a tribute to my good friend and colleague from the great State of Washington, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have the column from the Journal of Podiatric Education printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS IN HEALTH—WARREN G. MAGNUSON

Warren G. Magnuson, as the 3rd ranking Member of the United States Senate, is easily one of the most powerful men in Congress. The Washington Democrat has spent more than half of his 68 years in Congress—7 in the House of Representatives and 29 in the Senate—while establishing himself as a leader of health and education causes and a champion of the "ordinary citizen.' Widely respected by his colleagues as well as those in business and the professions, Sen. Magnuson has carved out an impressive and enviable record of legislative achievements.

As early as the 1930's, the Minnesota native exhibited his interest and knowledge in the health field by introducing legislation establishing the National Cancer Institute and, in later years, the National Institutes of Health. The Senator's interest in the health field expanded broadly in the 91st Congress when he assumed the Chairmanship of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor-HEW, where he has been instrumental in assuring adequate funding in vital health fields.

In this endeavor, Sen. Magnuson has found himself repeatedly at odds with the Administration. Following a presidential veto of a Labor-HEW appropriations bill, he acknowledged that the Nixon Administration's budget was badly out of balance, but asked, "*. . . why is it out of balance. Is it because we in the Congress added money to his* [Pres. Nixon] *woefully inadequate requests for training doctors and aid to emotionally disturbed children?*" His answer was "no," as he indicated that investment in health and education pays dividends which far outweigh initial costs.

Senator Magnuson has been outspoken in proclaiming the need for adequate funding of health programs. When he became Chairman of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee in 1969, the federal outlays for health programs totalled $11.6 billion, representing 6.3% of total budget outlays. The Fiscal 1974 estimate for federal outlays for health programs is $21.7 billion, or 8.1% of the federal budget. Thus, in the five years in which he has chaired the Senate appropriating subcommittee, annual health spending has increased by over $10 billion.

Some of the legislation sponsored by Sen. Magnuson which has become law includes the National Health Service Corps, the Toy Safety Act, the Cigarette Warning Act, the Poisonous Prevention Packaging Act, and the Auto Safety Research Act.

Senator Magnuson has consistently led his committee to appropriate funds for health and education far beyond those funds passed by the House of Representatives. There is every indication that his pattern will continue into the future.

THE AUTOMOBILE DRIVER EDUCATION ACT

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the danger of an epidemic that would kill 60,000 Americans and injure 5 million others were forecast for 1973, all possible means would be employed to stop or reduce the intensity of such a tragedy. Such an epidemic is predicted for 1974 and the present prognosis is that it will continue indefinitely. One hundred and fifty Americans can be expected to die today alone. Five thousand more will be permanently injured. Yet, this is not a disease which can be eased by our doctors but, rather, by us, the lawmakers of this country; for this disease is not cancer or heart attacks—although it kills more than either—but traffic accidents. Unlike a disease, however, these accidents are viewed as inevitable by too many people. Ironically, they are inevitable only insofar as the public believes them to be so.

While I support any efforts to improve the safety standards of cars and roadways, I feel that this is not attacking the crux of the problem. Cars will be made safe through the supervision of their manufacturers; but they will be made far safer through the education of their drivers. It is the latter who are estimated to be the cause of 90 percent of all accidents. It is they who must receive our concerted efforts at prevention.

Presently approximately 50 percent of all drivers are receiving driver education prior to obtaining their licenses. This, however, accounts for only a small percentage of the 115 million drivers in this country and takes no account of the 95 million nondrivers who, as pedestrians, are part of the shocking national death rate. Even those drivers with some education will quickly lose its beneficial results if the education is not constantly refreshed in their minds.

My proposal, consequently, calls for a campaign of education and reeducation

through the media. This program would center on thoroughly researched, psychologically tested, expertly prepared 1-minute capsules. The purpose would not be to scare but, rather, to inform. These "ads" would clarify for citizens a law that many of them may well be hazy on, as well as giving training on what to do in specific danger situations—driving on ice, for instance.

I realize that the networks have an obligation to donate time to public safety announcements. My program, however, calls for more coverage than the media could provide under their public service, and I propose the following plan for the funding of this large program. I am calling for the addition of one-tenth of 1 cent Federal tax on each gallon of gas and other motor fuels. The expense to each driver will be about 85 cents a year but the tax will raise $85 million. There is virtually no expense entailed in the collection of the tax and need be little incurred in its administration. Therefore, almost the entirety of the fund can be used to obtain the goal of informed and safer driving.

Compared to the 85 cents which each American purchaser of gas would be taxed, approximately $15 billion is presently being payed annually by taxpayers for either the direct or indirect cost of traffic accidents. Even if the program which I propose is only 1 percent effective, it will cut this figure by $150 million, to make no mention of the savings of lives and good health, the value of which is beyond these statistics. Dr. Douglas Toms, former head of the National Highway Safety Bureau, has, however, estimated a far higher success rate than this 1 percent figure. He believes that the program I have proposed, funded by $85 million, would cut traffic accidents by 15 percent. The cost to each citizen of such a reduction is small by anyone's standards—as small as the benefits are large.

I insert the text of the "Automobile Driver Education Act" in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. —

A bill to provide for a national educational campaign to combat the lack of consciousness of the public as to the danger of improper uses of motor vehicles on the highways, and to impose an additional tax of one-tenth of a cent per gallon on gasoline and other motor fuels to pay for the costs of such campaign

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 "Automobile Driver Education Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Transportation, acting through such officers and agencies of the Department of Transportation as he deems appropriate, shall carry on a national educational campaign designed to educate drivers, pedestrians, and others with respect to (1) the dangers incurred when driving on, crossing, or otherwise using the highways, and (2) improving safety on the highways.

(b) In carrying out his functions under subsection (a), the Secretary may engage in research, provide training, and engage in any other activity which will effectuate the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Effective July 1, 1973, the taxes imposed by sections 4041(a) (relating to tax on liquids used or sold for use in diesel-powered highway vehicles) and 4081 (relating to tax on gasoline) are hereby increased by one-tenth of a cent a gallon.

(b) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, any additional tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be treated as a tax imposed by section 4041(a) or 4081, as the case may be, of such Code.

SEC. 4. (a) The additional taxes imposed by section 3 are hereby appropriated to the Highway Trust Fund.

(b) Amounts deposited in the Highway Trust Fund pursuant to subsection (a) shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, to pay for the costs (including costs of administration) incurred by the Department of Transportation in carrying out the provisions and purposes of this Act and for no other purpose.

GRADUALISM ON SOVEREIGNTY

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the July 25 edition of the Hopewell, Va., News included an excellent article by Mr. Anthony Harrigan, executive vice president of the U.S. Industrial Council, concerning issues involved in U.S. sovereignty.

Mr. Harrigan takes note of a recent address by Ambassador John Scali, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, in which it was stated that a resolution of the United Nations Security Council was binding upon the United States. The resolution in question called for an embargo on trade with Rhodesia, and such an embargo was put into effect by former President Johnson.

In 1917 Congress repealed this embargo as it affected the importation of chrome ore, a vital strategic material, from Rhodesia into the United States. Ambassador Scali took the position that the action of Congress violated international law.

In his article, Mr. Harrigan attacks the statement of Ambassador Scali as "off base" and points out that if the Ambassador's statement were correct, the sovereignty of the United States would be undermined.

I heartily agree with Mr. Harrigan's view, and have taken the same position in speeches on the floor of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Gradualism on Sovereignty," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

GRADUALISM ON SOVEREIGNTY

(By Anthony Harrigan)

In a very perceptive article in State of the Nation Newsletter, Prof. Henry Paolucci of St. John's University in New York writes that "gradualism in surrendering American lives, honor, and sovereignty is the great American scandal of our time, for which the Watergate coverup itself is but a cover-up."

Dr. Paolucci is a rare figure in the academic world—a nationalist intellectual. He believes strongly in the concept of national sovereignty and its basis in a people with a common set of recollections from the past and expectations for the future. Sovereignty, in other words, is the essence of nationhood. It is what character and purpose are in an individual. Yet, in our time and country, there is a studied effort to phase-out sovereignty and to substitute supranational authority. The effort to weaken the concept of national sovereignty is paralleled by a foreign policy leading to a submissive detente with the Soviet Union.

For confirmation of Dr. Paolucci's position, one has only to consider the recent statement of Ambassador John Scali, U.S. Representative to the United Nations. On June 7, Ambassador Scali gave an address on the subject of the U.N. and used the occasion to attack Congress for passing a law permitting importation of vitally needed chrome ore from Rhodesia.

Ambassador Scali's speech has come under fire in the U.S. Senate. U.S. Sen. Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia termed "nonsense" Mr. Scali's assertion that the position of the U.N. Security Council on the embargo of trade with Rhodesia is binding on the United States. Sen. Byrd strongly denied that the U.N. can take action binding on the Congress or the people of the United States.

Sen. Russell B. Long, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, supported Sen. Byrd's stand. "If Mr. Scali thinks that other nations of the world respect a resolution of the Security Council or of the General Assembly as being international law binding on them," he said, "I would invite him to go around the world and find out how many nations do regard it as being international law and binding upon them."

This senatorial concern with Mr. Scali's speech is right and necessary. Ambassador Scali was way off base when he called on Congress to change the law to be in conformity with the action by the U.N. Security Council. Regardless of how members of Congress feel about trade with Rhodesia, they should be concerned with the mistaken and improper statement by U.S. Representative to the U.N. that the actions of the international forum are binding on the United States. If Mr. Scali were correct, the sovereignty of the United States would be undermined; the decisions of Congress could be vetoed by the votes of a combination of communist powers, neutralist states and mini-nations in the U.N.

Other nations have refused to accept U.N. resolutions as authoritative. Israel, for example, has repeatedly rejected United Nations statements that are the handiwork of the Arab nations backed by the communist and Afro-Asian countries. Very recently, France declined to accept the authority of the World Court in the controversy over atomic tests in the Pacific. No valid reason exits why the United States should obey the dictates of an organization whose membership is so overwhelming opposed to American goals and objectives.

It is unlikely that the Congress, at this point, will subordinate its authority to the U.N. Nevertheless, it is disturbing that Mr. Scali, the U.S. Representative to the U.N., has such a defective understandng of the sovereign powers of the United States. Given such an incident as Mr. Scali's speech, it is no wonder that many Americans are concerned about a gradualist, step by step abandonment of national sovereignty. It is not an illusory fear, as Dr. Paolucci and Sens. Byrd and Long make clear.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania Mr. Speaker, the high cost of health care

has provided journalists with ample material for thousands of articles.

Yet skyrocketing costs of medical care are a legitimate concern to millions of Americans. Congress soon must develop a mechanism, from the many legislative proposals now before us, to ease this burdensome cost.

James Moorhead, writing for the Dardanell newspaper chain of Allegheny County, which publishes the Wilkinsburg Gazette, the Penn Hills Progress, and the South Hills Record among others, has offered his thoughts on the subject.

With a certain amount of fatherly pride, I would like to commend this article to my colleagues and include it in the RECORD at this time:

HEALTH CARE COSTS PILED ON MIDDLE AMERICAN

(NOTE.—Members of Dardanell Publications editorial staff present their views in this space on a rotating basis. Views expressed are not necessarily those of Dardanell Publications.)

(by Jim Moorhead)

The middle American should be yelling louder than anyone about the need for a national health insurance program.

Middle-aged with middle income, he is too young for medicare and too wealthy for Medicaid. He pays for health care at all costs, for all people.

But the income tax system gives him little credit for doing so. Current tax deductions favor the rich. They can afford large expenditures for health care and therefore receive large tax deductions for them. The more they spend, the more they get back.

The middle American, though, finds that while his medical expenses devour a proportionately large share of his income, a tax deduction remains an unaffordable luxury.

The answer? A proper national health insurance program can bring to the middle American medical benefits being developed for the poor and aged, and which the rich already have because they can afford to pay for them.

But which one? A plethora of bills await Congressional action. A common factor among many should be understood.

Proposals by President Nixon, the insurance companies, and the American Medical Association all work from the premise that the present system conducted by the private health industry is working. They argue that all it needs is more money.

Untrue. Private insurance companies have botched the job badly.

Each American last year was spending 145 percent more for health care than he was 10 years ago—$394 per person, compared with $161 in 1962. During the same period, the Consumer Price Index was increasing by 36 percent. If there are no changes, experts predict health care costs will continue to rise 10 percent for at least two years.

The story told by health indicators is equally dismal. The U.S. trails behind 14 other countries in infant mortality, behind 27 other nations in life expectancy for males at age 45, and 11 others in life expectancy for females.

Despite the fuss made by private health insurers over how extensive their coverages are, the important point is that the insured three-fourths of the population has only about one-third of its medical bills paid through insurance. Expenses for drugs, dental care, and office visits are excluded from most policies.

The system actually feeds inflation in several ways. For example, an estimated one out of four patients hospitalized on any given day would not be there if insurance paid for out-of-hospital care. Unnecessary hospitalization drives up the total cost of health care, including the premiums paid for insurance.

The cost of an average day in the hospital in 1972 was $105.30, up 126 percent since 1964.

All blame does not rest with private health insurance. But it has shown itself incapable or nondesirous of controlling costs and assuring quality.

Almost nothing more than billpayers, they cannot be considered as a vehicle for financing medical care for the American people.

What then? The Health Security Plan, sponsored by Senator Kennedy and others? This promises comprehensive coverage to nearly all Americans under a program of shared costs among the federal government, employers, and individuals.

But its faults are many. The flatly stated intention of dismantling nearly all existing financial programs overnight, without the assurance of anything better than a well-intentioned dream seems hardly wise. The final price tag would undoubtedly be a stunner.

Be smart, middle American. You now work one month a year to pay your health care and health insurance bills. Urge Congress to move thoughtfully, yet urgently. Urge Congress to avoid another half-baked plan like Medicaid. Do not just lie back and say "aah" and leave matters to your "friend," the insurance company.

COPERNICUS, FOREFATHER OF MODERN ASTRONOMY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today in connection with the Fifth Annual New Jersey Polish-American Day we honor Copernicus, the forefather of modern astronomy. Not only was Copernicus an accomplished astronomer, he was also well educated in the fields of mathematics, law and medicine. Besides these achievements he secured an active and powerful position in the church which he held until his death.

It was Copernicus who made a bold break with tradition. Until his theory of astronomy came to be accepted it was widely believed that the heavens revolved around a stationary Earth. Somehow Copernicus comprehended the true nature of the Earth. His understanding led him way beyond the scientific technology of his time. He was sincerely devoted in his constant pursuit of knowledge.

Copernicus' wide culture, experience of affairs and practical ability were as important as his intellect in his achievement. He had the strength, wisdom and patience not to expose himself to, and be frustrated by, ignorant and vicious opposition. His intellectual courage should certainly be admired or perhaps even emulated to some extent. He surely set a fine example.

Polish heritage even beyond Copernicus is rich in tradition and contributions. Both Polish and Polish-Americans have surely proven themselves to be among the most prominent and distinguished in many fields. I join my many Polish friends in celebrating this special occasion and honoring Copernicus and all other Polish-Americans who have contributed so much in science, technology, government and other fields. These achievements are greatly appreciated and valued by all Americans.

WHY VETERANS' RECORDS BURNED

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the fire at the Military Personnel Records Center in St. Louis last month was devastating, and emerges as an even greater tragedy with the disclosures about its avoidability. Military records from World War I through the Vietnam war containing data about pensions, disability compensation and discharge information were totally destroyed.

The frustrating facts behind the blaze reemphasize the need for the enforcement of fire safety standards. Although sprinkler systems were in prominent use in 1955 when the building was constructed, none were installed. At that time a closed filing system was in use, but when the filing system was changed to an open one, where records were placed in boxes and open shelves, there should have been no question about the installation of a sprinkler system.

The following article from Business Week magazine, July 21, 1973, points out several interesting facts regarding the neglect of the Army Corps of Engineers and General Services Administration with regard to the safeguarding of their important records:

WHY THE VETERANS' RECORDS BURNED

In the aftermath of the fire that raged for two days on the top floor of the vast Military Personnel Records Center in St. Louis, these startling background facts emerged:

When the building was put up in 1955–56, architect George E. Kassabaum was unable to sell the Army on a sprinkler system. "They said water damage was a much more severe threat than any fire could be," reported Kassabaum.

Also rejected, to insure "maximum flexibility" of record files, were fire doors to divide floors that are more than twice the size of a football field.

The roof of the six-story building was a solid concrete shell with no openings. The Army insisted on this design to forestall illegal entry from above.

All these measures contributed to the frustration of legions of firefighters who battled for two days to bring the fire under control. Once it gained headway, the blaze swept unchecked from end to end of the 728-ft.-long floor. Firemen were able only to dab ineffectively at the edges of the conflagration by training their hoses through windows at either end.

Fueling the flames were the service records of 6-million post-World War II veterans, 9-million veterans of World War II, and 5-million World war I vets. Included, too, were records of some 300,000 veterans who have been discharged from military service in recent months, among them a group given dishonorable discharges whose cases are still under appeal.

Sharp criticism was directed at the Army Corps of Engineers, which built the struc-

ture; the Army, which operated it originally, and the General Services Administration, which is currently in charge. St. Louis County Fire Marshal James E. Holdinghaus said it was a prime example of how not to build a high-rise structure. "Firemen don't have a chance if the proper safeguards are not built into such a structure," he said. Officials said they had repeatedly—to no avail—recommended installation of a sprinkler system, ceiling vents, and other safety measures.

A top Veterans Administration official described the destruction of records as "a tragic loss." Defense Dept. lawyers were said to be "in a state of shock." Stored on the sixth floor in boxes on open shelves were all the records of the Adjutant General and service records for Army officers, all AG and service records for noncommissioned officers from 1912 to 1960, and similar records for veterans discharged in recent months. They contained data essential in the adjudication of claims against the government for widow's pension, disability compensation, and other causes.

A VA official said that data are available for "restructuring" the files to "minimize any chance of a person losing a legitimate claim." The VA has a complete index for all servicemen back to the Spanish-American war.

A day after the fire, there developed an exquisite irony. The public relations arm of the Kansas City-based GSA region announced first-place winners in various categories for fire prevention. The winner in the large-federal-building class was—you guessed it—the Military Personnel Records Center.

WILSON'S ETHNIC SLUR MUST BE CONDEMNED

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, America was confronted with just one more of a long line of ethnically oriented insults that have diseased our society, that have pervaded even the sanctity of Congress, an edifice built as a bulwark for democracy where men's rights for equality stand first among other considerations. I speak of the vicious slur by John J. Wilson against one of our finest legislators, the distinguished Senator DANIEL INOUYE.

It is because of such statements and such prejudices that for hundreds of years the black man was ashamed of the color of his skin and the Indian was slaughtered at the hands of his brothers. Such statements as those by that self-termed "little American" John J. Wilson portray the extent of prejudice among the peoples of America. But we must remember—only our own diligence, our own pursuit of freedom, can cause the labels of inferiority to crumble and the eyes of the world to look at us as a land where all are really free.

A man's ancestry does not decide his capabilities. A Jew's blood runs no thinner than a Catholic's and his national heritage does not make him any less a man.

We all know of the tremendous sacrifices of Senator INOUYE both in peace and war. He is a man to be emulated, a man who deserves the thanks and respect of every American.

A man's heritage is a part of his strength. It is that extra bit of identification and oftentimes that extra bit of comfort. It is something each of us should be proud of and respect when we see it in others.

In this great Nation in which every town, village, and city is its own international melting pot, men have kept vitality in their social existence by sharing the uniqueness each has to offer. Senator INOUYE, like everyone else, shares this quality as an American of Japanese descent. He portrays just one aspect of the whole known as the United States of America.

A man's history is precious, like a jewel it shines and deserves respect, and it should never be the center of selfish animosities formulated by another.

LET'S MEDDLE IN SOVIET AFFAIRS—FOR JUSTICE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, Si Frumkin is a distinguished Californian who has served for some years as chairman of the Southern California Council for Soviet Jews. His views on problems involving Soviet Jews deserve attention, and accordingly, I am pleased to draw this article, appearing in the August 1, 1973, edition of the Los Angeles Times, to the attention of my colleagues:

LET'S MEDDLE IN SOVIET AFFAIRS—FOR JUSTICE

(By Si Frumkin)

Senator J. William Fulbright (D–Ark.) seems to have emerged as the spokesman for the opposition to the proposed Jackson amendment, which Jews everywhere adamantly support.

The Jackson measure, of course, would deny most-favored-nation status to a country that restricts the free emigration of its citizens. Its immediate effect would be to deny the Soviet Union the privilege of exporting its products almost duty-free into the American market.

Fulbright, in statements filled with righteous indignation, denounces the Jackson amendment as "meddling in the internal affairs of another country," and urges us to ignore Soviet disregard of the most elementary human rights because to do otherwise might hurt the feelings and wound the pride of the Soviet hierachy in a time of delicate international negotiations.

Surely Fulbright has ancestors who arrived in this land from some European country. We are a nation of immigrants, and as descendants of immigrants have preserved within us a conviction that any human being, anywhere in the world, has the right to leave the place where he no longer feels happy so that he may seek his fortune elsewhere. This is what the Jackson amendment is all about.

It is important to note that the Jackson amendment is not anti-Soviet and/or pro-Jewish. The words "Soviet Union" and "Jew" do not appear in the amendment or its House counterpart—the Mills-Vanik Freedom of Emigration Bill. The measure would apply to any country that restricts the free emigration of its citizens.

Why then is there no protest from other countries that enjoy most-favored-nation status? Why don't we hear objections from France, England or Mexico? Could it be that only the Russians would be affected because they are the only ones who insist on keeping their citizens behind bars like some new 10th-century species of caged animal?

All the Russians have to do is to adhere to the same standards of civilized behavior that is observed by every other country in the world, and any threat they see in the Jackson amendment would immediately dissipate. If they refuse to do this, the onus must be on them, not on our legislators.

Fulbright has decided that he is not pleased with this state of affairs—he deplores "meddling." We must be charitable and assume that his aversion to it does not date back to the time when the federal government "meddled" in the internal affairs of the sovereign state of Arkansas during the Little Rock unpleasantness. At that time Fulbright stood behind Gov. Orval Faubus during the latter's stand against the admission of black pupils at Central High School.

Still "meddling" is a serious charge and Fulbright is an honorable man, so what of meddling?

The scene: The House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress votes 300 to 1 to apply trade sanctions against Russia because of the persecution of Jews in that country. Time: 1911, the administration of Teddy Roosevelt.

Indeed, the United States has quite a history of "meddling"—many examples could be cited that are at least as dramatic as this one. In fact, there was a time when we felt that we had a moral obligation to intercede on behalf of freedom and liberty throughout the world.

It was America that formulated the principle of self-determination after World War I, and it was President Wilson's insistence on the preservation of human rights that prompted Clemenceau's famous aside to Lloyd George wherein Wilson arrived at Versailles: "Look out, here comes Jesus Christ."

Our intervention on behalf of the oppressed resulted in respect—yes, love—for America among all those who could look to us as torchbearers of freedom. Lately, however, our interventions have not been so pure or so commendable, Southeast Asia, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic—these are not glorious chapters in our history. Perhaps it is time for us to change course and "meddle" on the side of liberty once again.

The Russians need American goods to save their economy from collapsing, but they have already told us that they do not have the money to pay for what they buy. The prospect is that we American taxpayers will lend the money to the Russians. The prospect is also that the money will not be repaid—after all, the Russians still owe us money from World War II.

It's a lousy deal and one which any credit manager of any company would turn down without hesitation. So why not ask the Russians to pay not only in dollars but also in some concessions to freedom?

Polite persuasion never works in international politics. Pressure and force usually do, and history has handed us a weapon that we can use to obtain some freedom for oppressed Soviet citizens. If this be "meddling," then let us meddle—in the name of justice.

POLITICAL PRISONERS IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, July 11 was the 10th anniversary of the arrest in South Africa of the leadership of the African National Congress, and others, who were subsequently sentenced to life imprisonment at the Rivonia trial. This was one of the first of the great political trials in South Africa, which decimated the leadership of the African majority in the sixties, and banned the political parties and movements of over 80 percent of the population which is black.

Amnesty International is concerned with political prisoners throughout the world, and has consistently tried to draw attention to the very bad situation in South Africa. On the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Rivonia trial, Amnesty's executive director for the United States, Dr. Amelia Augustus, has made a statement on the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa. I include it in the RECORD.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL OF THE U.S.A.,

New York, N.Y., July 9, 1973.

POLITICAL PRISONERS IN SOUTH AFRICA

Amnesty International is a non-governmental organization with no political affiliations, whose object is to secure throughout the world the implementation of Articles 5, 9, 18, and 19 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These articles prohibit arbitrary arrest and detention, and outlaw the use of torture or cruel and humiliating treatment.

In the South African context, arbitrary arrest and detention *incommunicado* have become over the past few years, the standard method of silencing political opponents of the regime. Such measures as the Terrorism Act and the Suppression of Communism Act are already sufficiently notorious, both in their intention and their operation; I need not enter into a detailed description of them here. The same is true of the torture or maltreatment of detainees.

In a society based explicitly on an ideology of descrimination, one should not be surprised to find that discrimination extends to within the prisons themselves. The discrimination concerns specifically political prisoners, since their prison conditions, whether they are white or black, are worse than those of ordinary criminal prisoners. In addition the conditions of black prisoners (and most political prisoners in South Africa are black) are worse than those of whites. This is in direct contravention of the U. N. Resolution on Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (endorsed by the United Nations Economic and Social Council on July 31, 1957) which states as a basic principle that "there shall be no discrimination on grounds of race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status." (Part 1, 6(1))

It is interesting to note that the 1969 *Report on Prison Administration in South Africa* included the entire text of the U.N. Standard Minimum Rules in an appendix. Comparison is thus invited between the Rules and the actual conditions under which political prisoners in South Africa are held.

(1). All prisoners in South Africa must serve a maximum of two-thirds of their sentences; but all, *except* political prisoners, have the right to earn remission of up to one third. For example, a convicted prisoner sentenced to nine years for robbery can, by good behavior, be released after serving only six years; a prisoner of conscience convicted of contravening one of the state security laws must serve his full sentence. A member of the South African parliament put it succinctly in June 1968 when he said: ". . . one is better treated in South Africa if one has committed the crime of rape or assault or battery or attempted murder, or any of the serious crimes, as far as remission is concerned, than if one has committed a crime which falls in the category of an offence against the State."

(2). In addition to being refused remission, political prisoners are excluded from amnesties. For instance, many thousands of criminal prisoners were amnestied May, 1971, on the tenth anniversary of the declaration of the South African republic; no similar amnesty was extended to political prisoners at that time, in spite of the appeals of Amnesty International and other international organizations.

(3). A third aspect of the discrimination against political prisoners concerns the total ban on news from the outside world which is inflicted on them. Political prisoners include many of the most intellectual, highly-educated, and politically aware elements of African, Indian, and Colored society in South Africa; the few white long-term political prisoners also fall into this category. It is in direct violation of the Rule 39 of the Standard Minimum Rules, which states that "prisoners shall be kept informed regularly of the the more important items of news by the reading of newspapers, periodicals or special institutional publications, by hearing wireless transmissions, by lectures or by any similar means as authorized or controlled by the administration.

(4). Black political prisoners in South Africa are also discriminated against in a number of other ways which contravene the Standard Minimum Rules. For instance, white political prisoners in Pretoria Prison have now been allowed accommodation in workshops where they can use their skills. But African, Colored, and Asians on Robben Island are employed in the quarries, crushing and dressing stone, collecting seaweed and moving sand. In consequence African graduates, lecturers, and lawyers are crushing rock, by virtue of the fact that they are "politicals" and blacks. Furthermore, Rule 37 of the Standard Minimum Rules, which specifies that prisoners should be allowed visits from family and friends at regular intervals, is violated in the cases of most of the African political prisoners on Robben Island; one may cite for instance the 16 Namibians who have been serving life sentences for political offences on the island since 1969—the difficulties encountered by the relatives of these men in attempting to make the journey from Namibia to Cape Town in order to visit them are practically insufferable. In other instances also, the conditions do not conform with the Standard Minimum Rules. Corporal punishment is used to punish breaches of discipline, chaining is employed as a means of restraint, and there exists gross discrimination in the matter of diet which would result in African prisoners receiving unsuitable food. The infliction of the death penalty in South Africa is marked by an extreme racial bias. Almost half the world's known hangings take place in South Africa, and almost without exception the persons executed are Africans. Furthermore, the number of crimes for which the death penalty may be imposed is increasing, and these include crimes against the state as defined by the Sabotage Act of 1962 and the Terrorism Act of 1967, under which the burden of proving his innocence falls on the accused. Capital punishment for political crimes is a fact in South Africa—to quote but one instance, about forty African members of the PAC were hanged following politically-motivated riots in the Western Cape during 1962.

Amnesty International is deeply concerned by the victimization of African and political prisoners. We would urge that political prisoners in South Africa be accorded the same right of amnesty and the right to earn remission of sentence as other prisoners. To ignore this point would be to countenance yet another aspect of the system of repression through which the advocates of *apartheid* silence and intimidate its opponents.

CBS SEEKS TO BROADEN PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENT

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues and other thoughtful Americans, I applauded the recent adoption by the Columbia Broadcasting System—(CBS)—of a new policy which will permit the presentation of contrasting views following major Presidential broadcasts.

CBS, the first of the major networks to adopt such a policy, has taken a significant step on the road to increased public participation in government. By ending the all but exclusive domination of the airwaves enjoyed by Presidents of both political parties, and expanding its post-broadcast coverage to include the views of members of the legislative branch and other knowledgeable members of the public, CBS has assured a more meaningful public debate on the great national issues in the future.

Regrettably, however, the historic significance of the new CBS policy has been largely overlooked due to criticism of a relatively minor aspect—the CBS abandonment of so-called instant analysis of Presidential broadcasts by broadcast journalists. Some critics even go so far as to accuse the network of a "craven surrender" to the Nixon administration. That, of course, is an unfair accusation, for I am informed that CBS has not abandoned its privilege of commenting editorially on addresses by the President. In fact, the new policy may result in more comprehensive and more thoughtful analyses of Presidential broadcasts. As CBS news analyst Eric Severied has said—

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the new CBS policy will not only be fair, it will be

more informative and more interesting to the public. It deserves our support.

ANOTHER TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE RESULTS FROM PLEA BARGAINING

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I recently spoke at length about the rash of incidents of judicial abuse resulting from the misuse of plea bargaining. Plea bargaining occurs when the prosecutor and the defense attorneys combine forces and permit an accused violator of the law to plead guilty to a lesser charge, thus eliminating the need for a trial.

Another incredible example of the misuse of plea bargaining occurred last Saturday in New York City. Robert Martin, a 27-year-old Pentagon correspondent for a German newspaper, was attempting to peddle marijuana to a group of 12 teenagers in the West Village section of the city. These responsible youngsters reacted by dragging this pusher into the neighborhood police station.

What was the result? A mere 18 hours later, Martin walked out of the station a free man after the four charges against him were reduced by plea bargaining to disorderly conduct and he received a suspended sentence.

Is this the way we teach our young to respect the law? I hardly think so. This case is so incredible I want to include the newspaper account of it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

KIDS DRAG HIM TO COPS, BUT HE BARGAINS OUT

(By Harry Stathos)

A 27-year-old reporter was literally dragged into the W. 10th St. station house by a dozen West Village neighborhood teenagers late Saturday night after he allegedly tried to sell marijuana to them.

However, 18 hours later he walked out of court when four charges against him were plea-bargained down to disorderly conduct and he received a suspended sentence.

The suspect, Robert A. Martin of Reston, Va., appeared before Manhattan Criminal Court Judge Milton Samorodin, who dropped three charges against him with the consent of an assistant district attorney and he was allowed to plead guilty to disorderly conduct. The judge gave him a conditional discharge.

KID 16 AND UNDER

Martin, who works as the Pentagon correspondent of the Overseas Weekly, a privately owned newspaper published in Frankfurt, Germany, which is published for U.S. servicemen in Europe, protested, saying he is a Quaker and that he wanted to spend 15 days in jail under the maximum sentence. But the judge refused, and Martin walked out of the courtroom.

Martin was arrested by Police Officer George Mourlot, 27, when the neighborhood youngsters took him into the station house about 11 p.m. Saturday.

One 16-year-old boy and four 14-year-olds told police they were playing with a group of teenagers near Pier 49, not far from the Hudson River, when Martin drove up and allegedly offered them marijuana.

The indignant youths grabbed Martin and forced him to go with them to the station house, where a surprised Mourlot placed him under arrest after an investigation.

After informing Martin of his rights, police asked him whether they could search his car, and he gave his permission. Mourlot said he found a duffel bag on the front seat with a wooden box inside that contained two bags of marijuana and a pipe for smoking hashish.

Martin was charged with felony sale of dangerous drugs to persons under 21; felony possession of dangerous drugs; a misdemeanor for loitering, and a misdemeanor for endangering the welfare of a minor.

CHANGING MINDS

Police Officer Eric Morris, who was in the station house when the youths brought in the suspect, said: "We were amazed to see this group of kids bringing in a grown man. But we're happy to see them do something positive for a change because they have been bum-rapped in the past."

Morris said that many of the neighborhood kids in the West Village have been blamed for acts of vandalism in the past and this action "will change a lot of people's minds."

"It's refreshing to see kids rebel now against marijuana," he added. "In the past, they would have just taken it and we never would have heard of it. It's a good sign."

WHY THE REVERSAL ON OEO?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, today I sent the following open-letter to the President of the United States regarding the change in policy toward the poverty program:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Earlier this year you stated to the American people your intention to reverse the direction of the poverty program. To carry out this policy, you nominated Howard Phillips as Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. During his six month tenure at OEO, Phillips worked tirelessly to institute your stated objectives.

The man who you recently nominated to replace Phillips, however, has initiated many changes that seem inconsistent with your policy. Since taking over as Acting Director, Al Arnett has:

(1) in testimony before a Congressional committee requested funds to continue the operations of OEO and community action programs

(2) funded many grants which had been rejected or stalemated under Phillips, included the Colorado Migrant Council, the Community Nutrition Institute and the Rural Housing Alliance

(3) extended funding of all OEO legal service backup centers for an additional six months and voiced strong support for them

(4) transferred funds from conservative-oriented new initiatives into community action programs.

(5) funded the Rand Corporation Dayton health experiment despite strong Congressional opposition to the experiment and the questions of propriety involved

(6) failed to reaffirm the regulations which Phillips issued to restrict the use of Federal funds for left wing lobbying activities

(7) instituted a joint union-management task force for participatory leadership of OEO

(8) removed and failed to reinstate many of the employees and consultants hired by Phillips to carry out your stated objectives

(9) agreed to transfer the OEO migrant division to HEW rather than the Labor Department and to protect the left wing activists now working in the division

Do these changes, Mr. President, reflect a change in your position regarding the poverty program or are these changes an example of a holdover bureaucracy in OEO subverting your policy? If your policy is being subverted, then the Arnett nomination should be withdrawn.

VIRGINIA COUNTY PROVIDES INFORMATION

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, Prince William County, which I have the honor of representing, is attempting to provide its residents with full and complete information concerning the county's activities, an action which I think is most commendable.

At this time, under my leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD a recent article from the Manassas, Va., Journal Messenger outlining the county's information program and profiling its new information officer, Mr. Jack Dabney.

DABNEY SEES JOB FREE OF POLITICS

Prince William County's new public information officer, Jack Dabney, sees his office as very much divorced from politics. "It cannot be a political arm, and this office won't be," he asserted in an interview yesterday.

Dabney started work Monday as the county's first public information officer, coming to the $15,000 a year post from radio stations WEZR and WEEL where he was news director.

He has temporarily set up quarters in what was formerly County Attorney Floyd C. Bagley's office before Bagley moved to offices on Peabody Street next to the Personnel Office.

Dabney doesn't plan to remain there for long, however. He wants to move out into the outer offices of the Board of County Supervisors "to get in the mainstream of things." His temporary quarters are due to be occupied by Cora Lee Cardwell, clerk to the county board and her deputy, Shirley Hawkins.

Dabney envisions his role to be in three major areas. First, he sees his office as a source of supplemental information between the county government and the Supervisors' constituents.

While he does not intend to pattern Prince William's public information office after any other jurisdiction, he noted one service provided by the City of Fairfax that he would like to implement here. That would be an information telephone which would provide a taped automatic answering service. The information would probably be changed daily. The information telephone could preview an upcoming board agenda, list official board actions and provide emergency news such as school and road closings during snow storms, he suggested.

Secondly, he sees his role to assist the county press corps and to encourage cooperation of county departments with the local press.

While noting that he does not have the authority to order closing channels of communications between various county departments and the press (such an order would have to come from County Executive J. J. Salovaara, he said), he does not view his office as the only funnel of information. He did not think yesterday that it would be necessary for all county information to be channeled through him.

"I don't really want this office to serve as an Iron Curtain," he declared. "I don't believe it was envisioned to be."

"The press corps should remember I am a county employe. But I do not envision it as a cover-up office. I will put forth my full efforts to answer any question. I will either relay the information or why I cannot get it," he said.

Thirdly, Dabney sees his job as one of a go-between the general community and general procedures. He got his first opportunity Monday when a county resident called to inquire as to the procedure for obtaining a special use permit to use a mobile home for a residence because of hardship reasons. Dabney said he had called the zoning office to obtain the information and then relayed it to the citizen.

Before coming on the job, Dabney participated in an emergency simulation developed as part of an emergency training program by the University of Virginia. Dabney said he did not receive the training other county employes did but is aware of the role he will have to play should an emergency such as Hurricane Agnes develop.

He will not take over the dispersal of routine police information. He also said he does not intend to be the disseminator of information in "major political crises," leaving the task of investigative reporting to the press corps.

Dabney discussed several ideas he has for improving the flow of information from the county to the press. One complaint members of the press have had is the inability to get information on board days because the "press folders" are often incomplete.

Within the means of his limited budget, Dabney suggested that he could maintain a master folder which would be available to all members of the press. Copies of any information in the master folder would be available on request.

One of the first major jobs facing the new public information officer is the creation of an annual report. If it is desired by the Supervisors that the report be in the same form as in the past, Dabney said its publication will about shoot his budget for the year.

Dabney said the Virginia Freedom of Inmation Act "is what we will live by."

A NEW KENT STATE INVESTIGATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, thank Heaven for small favors. And a small, but significant development is what occurred this morning when the Justice Department announced it would reopen the inquiry into the killing of four Kent State University students 3 years ago by Ohio National Guardsmen.

In making the announcement, Attorney General Richardson said he doubted that the inquiry would turn up any new evidence to substantiate a violation of Federal law but he admitted that there were certain areas of the incident that needed additional review.

This tepid response from the Justice Department is a response nonetheless.

Still I would feel more secure knowing that a committee of the Congress is doing an independent inquiry into the killings, or at least looking into the Justice Department's handling of the original investigation.

Therefore I am heartened that our colleague DON EDWARDS, chairman of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Judiciary Committee, announced he will monitor the Justice Department's latest effort and if necessary initiate his own investigation into the matter.

TEAMSTERS PENSION FUND AND ORGANIZED CRIME

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD another of a series of articles written by Jim Drinkhall. The article is entitled "Extortion and Kickbacks Charged in New Central States Pension Fund Scheme":

EXTORTION AND KICKBACKS CHARGED IN NEW CENTRAL STATES PENSION FUND SCHEME

The already-shaky retirement future of Teamsters members covered under the Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Pension Fund was placed in further jeopardy recently by government action against a company which has received Fund loans. The steps being taken by federal agencies were started following an investigation begun by OVERDRIVE in early 1972.

In Washington, D.C., a federal grand jury has been hearing testimony from at least two men who have been granted partial immunity from prosecution. This case, being handled by the Justice Department, centers on the question of kickbacks being paid to obtain over $23 million in Fund loans by an Indiana-based corporation.

And while activity on this loan has surfaced, the federal probe by two agencies into Fund loans has widened yet further, involving transactions which have occurred outside the United States. Through information obtained from various sources, the number of Fund loans under active investigation for possible criminal violations is fast approaching 20. In addition, three series of transactions are "very near" the indictment stage, according to one source in New York.

On March 28, Allen Dorfman—considered by most to be the prime mover in illegal Fund activities—surrendered to federal authorities in Chicago to begin serving his sentence on six convictions for fraud and conspiracy. Dorfman was convicted in 1972 on charges arising out of his taking a $55,000 kickback for expediting a Fund loan. Although he is supposed to serve one year at the minimum-security prison in Marion, Illinois, those familiar with him and his connections believe that he will manage to be released in about three months. In the meantime, his well-oiled alliance with organized crime and the Fund will continue to operate, and it is expected that he will take up where he left off upon his release.

The federal grand jury in Washington is probing into the tangled affairs of Telesis Corporation, a company incorporated in Delaware, but with its home office in Lafayette, Indiana. Testimony before the grand jury has been kept secret, and investigators for the Justice Department aren't commenting on what they've uncovered after pouring over thousands of pages of documents. A fairly complete picture can be pieced together, though, based upon OVERDRIVE's investigation launched a year ago. Prior to the grand jury action, this magazine had been able to interview a number of people and has had access to numerous pieces of correspondence and records. What finally emerges is a tale spanning eight years, millions of apparently wasted and unaccounted for dollars belonging to Teamsters members, and amply laced with allegations of kickbacks, attempted extortion and fraud.

Telesis was formed in 1965 by Ferris Traylor and Richard Shively, and their plans were to get into the cable television business. The company started out with $100,000 of Traylor's, but the stock was split equally between the two. In the same year, Telesis was ok'd to do business in Illinois. The principals found that they needed an additional source of financing (they already had received some from a company called Economy Finance) to handle the rapid expansion that Traylor said was the best move.

At this time, an individual named Sam Block was doing some unspecified work for Telesis. Block learned that the company wanted money, and passed the word to Traylor that he had sources who could help. Traylor agreed, and three were mentioned to him. Two never materialized, but the third did: Block introduced Traylor to the Central States Pension Fund.

Little is known of Samuel B. Block. He has always remained an elusive, shadowy figure, but his access to power, plenty of it, is known to insiders in the nation's capital. He is known in the vague capacity of "lobbyist"; a man who is able to convince politicians of the correctness of his client's point of view, and a person with access to what a Congressman might need or want. Additionally, he has been known as a money mover; a contact man able to gain entry to the inner sanctums of groups having huge arsenals of cash. One person Block was extremely close to who controlled that kind of money was Jimmy Hoffa.

The point at which Block became so very well-connected with Hoffa and the Teamsters is something of a mystery. What has been revealed is that after Hoffa's close political lieutenant, Sidney Zagri, was killed in the early 1960's, Block came into his own, wielding the same enormous authority and power. Throughout Overdrive's investigation of Telesis, a number of attempts were made to interview Block. None were successful, as Block became quite adept at avoiding phone calls and personal visits. His only visible operation is that he is associated with a company called Techbuilt Homes, an enterprise which doesn't officially exist, according to the Recorder of Deeds in the District of Columbia.

Exact details of the original contact with the Fund by Traylor are blurred, probably on purpose because of the grand jury sessions. What has come to light, though, is that the Fund did approve a series of multi-million

dollar loans to Telesis. The first transaction involved over $7 million, with Telesis to receive pieces of it over a two year period, 1966–1968. Conditional upon this loan, and perhaps some of the others after that, was payment to Block of a 3% "finder's fee," plus a 1% "service fee," payable to the Fund. Some have said that the "service fee" charged by the Fund, supposed to cover closing costs and other items, is merely a device to legitimize the kickbacks spread around to some of the trustees of the Fund. No one has ever been convicted under such a theory, however.

Prior to the payment of the 3% "finder's fee," according to one source, Allen Dorfman entered the picture. Shortly thereafter, Traylor and Shively were being pressured to pay a 6% fee. There apparently was resistance to paying this higher fee, but in the end, according to this account, Shively drew up papers approving that percentage, and they were signed by Telesis officials. Traylor insisted that the Fund trustees would never approve 6%, but then one day Dorfman called him and said that the steering committee of the Fund had approved the 6%. "Dorfman was elated," said Traylor, "and he reminded me that I said he couldn't do it, but that he got it approved."

Traylor then related that those papers came back to Telesis before the 6% was paid. They were sent to John Early, Telesis' lawyer, and they had this handwritten notation on them: "Dear John, please destroy all these. Nate Wolfberg." The person signing that note was Nathan Wolfberg, a lawyer in the Chicago firm of Teitelbaum, Wolfberg & Guild. These are the lawyers of the Pension Fund who compose and assist with loan agreements. Until he died earlier this year, Joseph Teitelbaum was a master mind genius when it came to drawing up these documents, as federal investigators have grudgingly admitted. And Wolfberg is in the same class, they add. When questioned about this 6% figure, Wolfberg said that he doesn't remember what the finder's fee was, but denies that it was 6%.

Although no one will say why the finder's fee didn't go through at 6%, it is believed that Wolfberg felt that such a high fee would raise embarrassing questions, and he convinced Dorfman and the trustees to drop it to 3%. That Block received 3% as a finder's fee has been verified. What happened after that is a question which both the IRS and Justice Department are zeroing in on. One source has said that Block claims he didn't get most of the money. If that is true, then who did get it? Some believe that it was Jimmy Hoffa, but another person close to the Fund in Chicago states flatly: "Allen Dorfman got it. Maybe not all of it, maybe some went to Hoffa. But Block gave it to Dorfman." The accuracy of that statement will be established if federal investigators are able to trace the money to its ultimate destination. If they are, the source will most likely be identified after the grand jury hands down indictments.

The first indication that the Fund's interest in Telesis was more than that of a lender came in 1967. In that year, documents obtained by OVERDRIVE show, Champ Madigan, an employer trustee of the Fund (he died in 1972) became a director of the corporation. Another interesting item was that Telesis placed its insurance with Amalgamated Insurance Agency Service, an Illinois company controlled by Dorfman. By 1968, Madigan was listed as a vice-president as well as a director. And these new directors were added: Allen Dorfman and Sam Block.

Dorfman and Block know nothing about cable television, so it is of more than passing interest that they now would be in a position to take part in decisions directing the financial future of Telesis. It has been suggested that Dorfman obtained a position with Telesis because he would be able to protect the Fund's interest in the company. But in reality, Dorfman had no position with the Fund; he was supposedly just a "special consultant." Block, it would seem, would have even less reason to be connected; he was simply a middleman in a prospective loan transaction. And during this same year, a total of $10 million of Fund money had gone into Telesis, with more promised.

At the same time, Telesis was having serious financial problems, and was unable to repay the Fund as originally promised. This occurred, claims Traylor, because Dorfman wanted to control Telesis and milk it of its assets. According to Traylor, Dorfman wanted him out of the company because he (Traylor) simply wanted to run a CATV business profitably. He would have left, he says, if Dorfman and the Fund would have purchased his stock at a fair price. But he says that Dorfman and Albert Matheson (a Detroit lawyer who is also an employer trustee) demanded that he accept about half the amount he wanted. Traylor refused, and what followed then was a full-scale attempt to get his stock and force him out of Telesis.

Lending credence to this is the fact that the Fund did seriously begin proceedings to foreclose on the Telesis loans. Traylor's lawyer blocked this attempt, and a settlement agreement was signed whereby Traylor would leave. Part of the terms were that Traylor be released from his personal note to the fund, and his real estate which was put up as security for the Fund loans was returned to him. In addition, 365,000 shares of his stock were signed over to Block, the Fund and others. Traylor's only connection with Telesis in late 1968 was the stock he still had, said to be worth over a million dollars.

Wolfberg's explanation of Traylor's leaving was that he wasn't a good money manager, and that Telesis' problems were his doing. He referred to Traylor as an "entrepreneur who gets in trouble." On the other hand, he said, Shively was a professional in the cable TV business. It has been learned, though, that both men entered the CATV field on the same day, and that Shively's previous experience had been as a television personality and had run television stations for Traylor. The implication that Traylor is financially incompetent doesn't seem to stand up in light of the fact that he has been wealthy for quite a while, and continues to be, through various ventures and businesses he operates.

Following Traylor's departure, even more persons connected with the Fund moved into Telesis: Wolfberg became the secretary of the company and two Fund trustees were added as directors—Don Peters, a Teamsters official from Chicago, and Al Matheson. In addition to remaining as a director, Block became vice-president. Dorfman and Madigan remained as directors, as might be expected.

Based upon Wolfberg's claim that Telesis' financial plight was due to Traylor, and since his departure the Fund was able to obtain almost total control of the company's operation, one would expect Telesis to reverse its condition, and begin working toward profitability. After all, those familiar with cable television unanimously agree that it's an extremely profitable business, and even Shively (now president) said that it's "a very good business." And the Fund advanced millions more to Telesis that year.

But all of this was a facade masking something very wrong with Telesis. Certain documents obtained by OVERDRIVE show that by the end of 1969—more than a year after Traylor left—Telesis was on the verge of bankruptcy. At that time, the company had received over $12 million from the Fund in four separate loans. And now most of it had vanished. Telesis owed the Fund a total of just about $14 million; a million-and-a-half dollars in unpaid interest alone was also past due.

For reasons known only to the trustees (and they refuse to discuss the subject), more money was funneled into the tottering company. By the end of 1970, two more loans totaling just about a million dollars were made. These loans were approved and the money dispersed even though Telesis continued to fall behind with its payments. Now, the company owed the Fund over $16 million, with $3 million of that in past due interest. Whether it was the sheer embarrassment of the situation or in furtherance of their plans, the trustees decided to halt the situation; not by foreclosure, as the circumstances seemed to indicate, but rather by "revising" the agreement so that Telesis only had to make interest payments. Following that, the trustees voted to advance more money. Right now, the total Fund commitment to Telesis is $23,600,000.

Since then, and even up to the present, according to sources, Dorfman and apparently others have been attempting to gain control of Traylor's stock and take over the assets of Telesis (they operate CATV outlets in 8 midwest states). At one point, using Shively as a front, goes this report, they attempted, through a complicated transaction, to transfer a profitable Telesis asset (KNOP TV in North Platte, Nebraska) into Shively's name so that he could dispose of it and share the proceeds with Dorfman, Matheson and others. It has been verified that the Board of Directors at Telesis did vote to approve some form of sale as described, but Traylor, who still has an interest in that station, blocked the transaction.

Whether the Fund (or, more correctly, the members covered by the Fund) will suffer a catastrophic loss on this loan remains to be seen. The grand jury is still in session (as of the middle of this May) and more witnesses who have refused to testify are expected to be granted immunity and then called before it. One significant indication of what the future holds came to light recently during a meeting among top Teamsters officials and others. The subject, naturally, was the most serious problems (financial and criminal) facing the Fund. With respect to Telesis, it was stated that if the company wasn't drastically and immediately overhauled, it would most likely be forced into bankruptcy.

WITHHOLD COMMITMENTS ON HOME RULE BILL

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, several members of the Committee of the District of Columbia have forwarded a letter to each Member of the House urging them to keep their options open on the matter of home rule until H.R. 9682 is taken up on the floor of the House. I submit the text of the letter for the collective attention of my colleagues who might not otherwise have an opportunity to read it in the rush toward adjournment for the summer recess:

COMMITTEE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1973.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Recently H.R. 9682, a home rule bill for the District of Columbia, was reported out by the Committee on the District of Columbia. In the coming weeks you may be urged to endorse or otherwise support this bill; however, we urge you to keep your options open on this matter until it reaches the Floor and can be debated on its merits.

The Report of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia (also referred to as the Nelsen

Commission) was filed with the Speaker of the House on August 17, 1972. The Report contains over 450 recommendations designed to promote economy, efficiency, and improved services in the transactions of the departments, agencies, etc., of the government of the District of Columbia.

The Senate District Committee in reporting out the bill establishing the Nelsen Commission recognized the Federal interest in productive economy in the District by stating:

"Your committee has recognized its obligation to all of the Nation's taxpayers, who give a substantial measure of financial support to the operations of the District of Columbia government: the logical complement of the appropriation of an annual Federal payment is oversight and reform in the interest of productive economy at least."

It is disappointing that the Nelsen Commission recommendations are entwined in this home rule bill; we tried to separate them in the Full Committee, but this was denied by vote of the Committee. However, it appears unfair to the Members of the House, who authorized the Nelsen Commission study and the $750,000 to cover its cost, that these major opportunities for improvement in the local government may be lost by being tied to H.R. 9682, this 132 page bill which bristles with controversial provisions. For instance, it is undesirable to eliminate the traditional Congressional review of the total budget for our Nation's Capital, as provided in H.R. 9682, at a time when the District is entering a period of rapidly increasing costs for debt service requirements (for Congressionally approved capital projects) and to meet retirement funding costs; and to deny any reservation of authority to the Congress and our Presidents in such areas as the appointment of judges, which they have had from 1801 to date.

In the event the House finds H.R. 9682 unacceptable, we will be prepared to submit alternatives for you to consider when this matter comes up on the Floor, such as an amendment in the nature of a substitute that would permit the Nelsen Commission recommendations to be considered separately on their merits.

Should you have any questions, please call us or have your staff call the Minority Committee staff at 57158.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN, EARL F. LANDGREBE, GENE TAYLOR, WILLIAM H. HARSHA, STEVEN D. SYMMS, E. G. SHUSTER, JOEL T. BROYHILL, and WILLIAM M. KETCHUM, *Members of Congress.*

HISTORIC LANDMARK IN BUFFALO TO BE PRESERVED

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of our modern glass, steel, and concrete cities, people in our country often speak wistfully of the beauties of the venerable architecture of Europe. Centuries-old structures on the European continent are lovingly renovated and carefully maintained and are a joy for architectural enthusiasts and admirers of beauty. In the United States, on the other hand, when the needs for space and buildings change, we are more apt to send in the wrecking ball and bulldozer regardless of historic or architectural value.

Such a waste was narrowly averted in Buffalo in the case of the Ansley Wilcox Mansion. This historic site, where Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States following the assassination of President McKinley, was slated for destruction. But the Interior Department was persuaded to designate it a National Historical Site, and I am proud to say that legislation which I sponsored and which was supported by my colleagues provided Federal funding to aid in its restoration. Today it is visited by a growing number of tourists as well as by area groups and individuals.

Our old main post office building in Buffalo has been threatened with demolition, but plans are being formulated to save it. It is one of the most beautiful structures in the country—a masterpiece of Victorian architecture, and esthetic pleasure.

I would like at this point to insert a recent WGR–TV–AM–FM editorial on this subject:

OLD POST OFFICE/ETHNIC INSTITUTE

A couple of years ago we suggested that the old post office on Ellicott Street be demolished if no use could be found for it. Most people who wrote us said we were wrong. The post office building should stay. It is still a prominent landmark downtown. The fate of the old building hasn't been determined, but a suggestion has been made to use it as an ethnic center. If that means an active progressive organization that will make a meaningful contribution to the people of this city, we go along with it. Where would the money for such a project come from? Who would manage the operation? What service would it provide? It requires some cold calculations.

Buffalo's multi-national heritage gives this city a richness and charm very few American cities can claim. This city and its people have been instrumental in the progress of this nation. We think an active and progressive organization to commemorate our forebears and honor our present citizens would be fitting for the Post Office Building if community need and support can be generated.

As a welcome change from the "down with the old, on with the new" philosophy, citizens in Buffalo do want to preserve this landmark and progress is underway.

Last week I met with representatives from the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society, Landmark Society of the Niagara Frontier, County Executive Edward Regan, and various ethnic organizations. We are working to answer the questions raised in the editorial, and I believe we are finding these answers. With strong community support, this prominent landmark will be preserved for the Niagara frontier.

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS C. PERTEET

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I take great pleasure in honoring Mr. Louis C. Perteet, a true humanitarian, who risked his life to save the life of a fellow man. This is truly the most honorable deed a human can perform.

On October 6, 1972, Mr. Perteet heard screams coming from a building at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard. He entered the building and found a fellow employee kneeling with his left hand lodged inside a highly energized degaussing unit. At the risk of his own life, Louis Perteet broke the electrical hold by pushing the injured employee from the unit. He moved the man a safe distance from the electrical unit and then left to call for assistance. When he came back, Mr. Perteet found that the injured employee had been forced back to the unit by the energy generated by the machine. Again, he moved and assisted him until the ambulance arrived.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to have such a man as Louis Perteet as one of my constituents. He has certainly performed a heroic action and an extraordinary service, and in recognition of his courageous action, Louis Perteet is today receiving the well-deserved, "Distinguished Civilian Service Award for Heroism" from the Department of the Navy.

I know Louis Perteet's wife, Marcia, and their young daughter, Jansen, are extremely proud of him, and I am sure that all the people of the Long Beach area will want to join me in commending Mr. Perteet for his courageous action.

FEDERAL REGULATION OF FOOD SAFETY

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, in 1969 a recall of products containing cyclamates—an artificial sweetener—was a matter of considerable public concern. Indeed, to those millions of Americans who are diabetic and hence forced to rely upon artificial sweeteners, the recall and its extension in 1970 were a matter of critical concern.

Recent studies in this country and abroad suggest that the cyclamate ban may have been unnecessary. The new results have failed to substantiate conclusions previously reached regarding the harmfulness of cyclamates. In the Wall Street Journal of July 2, 1973, staff writer Richard D. James reports that the cyclamate issue will be reopened by the Food and Drug Administration as a result of the current tests.

Mr. Speaker, governments as well as other institutions learn much from experience. I believe that the Food and Drug Administration is today acting in a very responsive manner in its evaluation of the safety of saccharin. The public has a right to expect a safe food supply. It has an equal right to expect a regulatory agency to whom Congress has assigned that responsibility to avoid precipitous actions and to ensure that the decisionmaking process is sound. It is in an effort to render congressional and administrative decisionmaking more scientific that I have introduced H.R. 7439, a bill to direct the National Academy of Sciences to study certain re-

quirements of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

As a sponsor of the National Diabetes Act of 1973 with Congressman WILLIAM A. STEIGER and 99 other Members of the House, I am especially concerned that we provide proper and safe food ingredients to ease the burden of diabetics.

The Wall Street Journal coverage of the cyclamate situation sheds considerable light on an area of vital concern to millions of Americans. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask that this article be included at this point in the RECORD.

REMEMBER CYCLAMATES? MAYBE THEY WERE NOT SO HARMFUL AFTER ALL—NEW STUDIES SAID TO CONTRADICT CANCER EVIDENCE THAT LED TO FDA'S BAN ON SWEETENERS

(By Richard D. James)

CHICAGO—Cyclamate artificial sweeteners may be innocent after all.

Evidence is beginning to accumulate in research laboratories around the world that the chemicals, which the government banned in 1970, don't pose the health hazard once thought. It's too soon to say whether the sweeteners will return to the market; that's up to the Food and Drug Administration to say after it examines the new findings. The drug industry, however, is following the developments with interest, and at least one large company is readying a major effort to resume marketing.

Before their ban, cyclamates were the largest selling artificial sweeteners. In 1968, the last year prior to marketing restrictions, some 17 million pounds of cyclamates were produced with a value of about $34 million. Diet-conscious Americans consumed the low-calorie substances in all sorts of foods from jams, jellies and canned fruits to soft drinks. Sales of cyclamate-sweetened diet cola were estimated to be around $300 million annually at wholesale prices. Sales of other cyclamate-sweetened canned goods ran to millions more.

So far, no completely acceptable replacement for cyclamates has been found, though numerous companies are working to develop one. The only other widely used sugar substitute is saccharin. Users, however, claim it has a bitter aftertaste, and some say it may soon go the way of cyclamates.

OFF THE "SAFE" LIST

The National Academy of Sciences currently is conducting studies on the safety of saccharin for the Food and Drug Administration. The FDA recently removed saccharin from its list of substances classed as "generally recognized as safe" and issued a temporary order limiting usage to no more than one gram a day for an adult.

Two saccharin studies that have been published show that the substance apparently causes bladder cancer in test animals. Depending on the National Academy of Sciences findings, the FDA may be under pressure to ban saccharin under a 1958 law that prohibits the use in food of any chemical that causes cancer in animals.

This was the law the government invoked in October 1969 when it announced a ban on cyclamates in soft drinks. That ban was extended in August 1970 to include all marketing of the artificial sweeteners, including that in foods labeled as drugs, for diabetics or dieters, which the government at first had said it would permit.

The ban was prompted by a study conducted for Abbott Laboratories, the largest U.S. cyclamate producer, by Food and Drug Research Laboratories, a private independent research organization. Groups of rats were fed various doses of cyclamates and saccharin. Of 80 rats fed the highest dosage, eight developed bladder cancer. Rats in the lower-dosage groups weren't affected.

MORE ANIMALS, LONGER PERIODS

The new work suggesting cyclamates aren't a hazard involves not only more test animals but also higher doses of the sweetener for longer times than the original research. One key study, by Dr. Dieter Schmahl of the German Cancer Research Center at Heidelberg University, which will be published late this summer, involves 832 rats, twice the number in the earlier study done for Abbott.

Moreover, in Dr. Schmahl's study the animals received cyclamates during their entire lives instead of just two years as in the earlier study. Only with lifetime feeding "can low-grade carcinogenic (cancer-producing) effects be detected which become manifest in very old animals," Dr. Schmahl writes.

The rats received cyclamates in doses ranging from one to two and a half grams per 2.2 pounds of body weight. This is equal to what an adult would have gotten before the cyclamate ban from drinking 200 to 400 bottles of diet cola a day. Dr. Schmahl found bladder cancer in only one of the 832 rats, an animal receiving the lower dose. No cancer was found in the higher-dose groups. He concludes that the tumor was produced by an unrelated bladder condition that, in humans, is known to lead to cancer.

The National Cancer Institute is sponsoring studies in which even higher doses of cyclamate are being fed to test animals. The work is just being concluded and won't be completely evaluated at least until August, but preliminary reports indicate it has produced nothing to tie cyclamates to cancer.

"There's no evidence they (cyclamates) cause cancer," says Dr. Freddy Homburger of Bio-Research Consultants Inc. of Cambridge, Mass., one of the researchers under contract to the institute. His study, results of which have just been reported to the institute, involves some 300 rats and mice that were fed up to five grams of cyclamate daily for each 2.2 pounds of body weight during their lifetimes. That's twice the amount fed in Dr. Schmahl's work.

The cyclamate research also has been extended to other animals as well. Dr. Phillipe Shubik, director of the University of Nebraska's Eppley Institute for Research in Cancer, is feeding the sweetener to 360 golden hamsters. The work, also sponsored by the National Cancer Institute, still has another month to run. But Dr. Shubik says: "We have examined quite a few of the animals and have found nothing adverse."

If cyclamates don't, in fact, produce cancer, how do scientists explain the study that triggered the government's ban? They don't yet have a definite answer, but they suggest several possibilities. One is that since the rats' diet in the original work was a mixture of cyclamates and saccharin, the saccharin could have caused the tumors. At the time, the researchers were inclined to blame cyclamates because a separate study revealed that one rat being fed cyclohexylamine (CHA), a chemical relative of cyclamates, had developed bladder cancer.

Researchers also now realize that cyclamates sometimes contain impurities, some of which could cause cancer. Finally, it was found that the rats used in the original test were infested with worms, which some scientists now believe predispose the animals to bladder cancer.

ABBOTT YES, PFIZER MAYBE

The Food and Drug Administration will soon have to consider the significance of the new findings. Abbott Laboratories is presently compiling the results as part of a food-additive petition asking the agency for permission to resume marketing. The company, whose cyclamate sales prior to the ban totaled about $16 million a year, says it will file the petition by mid-August. Abbott still has some stocks of cyclamates remaining, and it has retained some of its production facilities.

The other former major producer, Pfizer Inc., also has retained some of its production facilities, and industry sources say the company would resume marketing if the FDA were to clear the way. Pfizer won't say what its plans are. A spokesman says the company understands the new research is favorable and that it will be watching Abbott's activities "with interest."

Food companies also are watching the situation. "Our people are aware of the new research," says a Pillsbury Co. spokesman. FDA clearance however, "wouldn't automatically mean we'd go back on the market" with cyclamate-sweetened products, he adds. "We'd have to see what kind of consumer acceptance there was." Prior to the ban, Pillsbury sold cyclamates as a tabletop sweetener under the name Sweet 10 and in a low-calorie drink, Funny Face.

Whether consumers would accept cyclamates as safe, of course, isn't known, but Abbott Labs believes there are indications they would. "From the number of letters we have received since the ban, we know there is a backlog of interest," a spokesman says.

TICKLISH PROBLEMS

Reopening the cyclamate issue will pose some ticklish problems for the FDA. Even though the new findings don't substantiate the original research on which the agency based its 1969 and 1970 rulings, the original research has yet to be explained away, and so far scientists don't appear to have enough facts to do that. Too, there is the political embarrassment that might follow if the FDA were to reverse itself, thus admitting that it made a hasty—and apparently wrong decision. (On the other hand, of course, there are those who would commend the FDA for erring—if indeed there was an error—on the side of caution rather than permitting a product to remain on the market when any doubt existed about its safety.)

Finally, the FDA will almost certainly insist on considering other hazards besides cancer that have been blamed on cyclamates. For instance, prior to the ban, FDA scientists found that CHA produced significant breaks in chromosomes of rats. The experiments were based on the fact that the human body sometimes converts the artificial sweeteners into CHA.

Scientists aren't certain what the significance of the broken chromosomes really is, but some worry they may lead to cell mutations and eventually to birth defects or other conditions.

Recent research casts some doubt on the chromosome issue. A study by Dr. Ben Oser of Food and Drug Research Laboratories, which isn't connected to the FDA, found no evidence of chromosome breakage in any of the test animals.

RELAXATION IN GERMANY

Heart and circulatory problems also are sometimes attributed to cyclamates. Dr. Schmahl of Heidelberg University, however, says he examined his rats for evidence of these problems and found none at all. "Feeding of the sweeteners and mixtures of the sweeteners used was tolerated by the rats unexpectedly well," he writes.

At least one country has relaxed earlier restrictions on cyclamates. At the time of the U.S. ban, Germany limited their use to table sweeteners. Late last year, however it approved the sweeteners for foods and beverages. Few countries have followed the U.S. in instituting a total ban.

Officially, the FDA says that it will consider Abbott's petition when it is received. "If somebody comes forward with convincing evidence of cyclamates' safety we're legally obligated to issue an additive order (permitting marketing). So it will depend on how convincing the evidence is," says Dr. Virgil Wodicka, director of the FDA's Bureau of Foods, which must rule on the matter. Dr. Wodicka says he is aware of the new research but hasn't seen any of the results.

Drug-industry sources say they have been encouraged by FDA officials in private conver-

sations regarding cyclamates. "The FDA has indicated that it would like to have a wide variety of artificial sweeteners available so there won't be over-indulgence in just one of them," says one source.

WE MUST NOT NEGLECT THE ELDERLY

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like, once again, to call to the attention of the House the national crisis centering on our neglect of older Americans. This is an important concern not only to the State of Iowa, with its 12 percent elderly population, but to the entire Nation. These people must be assured that their retirement years can be lived with dignity and peace of mind.

One way in which we could facilitate this goal would be to open better channels of communication between ourselves and senior citizens and thus learn firsthand of their problems, including limited means of transportation, fixed incomes, loneliness, and health. Some of these difficulties are illustrated in an article from the Cedar Rapids Gazette which I am inserting into the RECORD today:

YEARS BRING JOY, HEARTBREAK TO ELDERLY

(By Dale Kueter)

Ben Franklin: "All would live long, but none would be old."

Maude Weaver is anxious to "get back in the saddle again."

Staying home (she is recuperating after a five-week hospital stay) all the time bends her life-style.

"I feel better every morning," she chortled.

Every day she plays the piano and organ, and soon will be back at Jane Boyd Community House, Riverside Recreation center and her other engagements, making music for the elderly.

Sometimes she sits with an old person. Maude Weaver, soon to be 81, is a happy person. "My life is as happy as it can be without my husband," she said. "We had a very happy life together." A widow for 11 years, she lives at 4420 Bowling S.W.

Across town, John Q. Elderly sits heartbroken. One side of his living room chair, where he sits most of the day, is a box of tissues to wipe his tears. On the other side of the chair is a wastebasket nearly full.

To use his real name would embarrass him, because he is self-conscious about his deep grief. He is 82. Last January, his wife for 61 years died. He is extremely lonely. He has no children.

Nate Leibsohn is lonely too. But his memories produce smiles instead of tears. His wife, Helena, whom he married in Frankfurt, Germany, 63 years ago, died in 1967.

Leibsohn lives at 4630 Midway drive NW, a single-level home that he maintains neatly with the help of a once-a-week visit of a woman from Homemaker Service. He hasn't seen his son and daughter for seven years, and can't remember when he last saw his grandchildren.

Mr. and Mrs. Jess Stevens, 2251 C street SW, are quite crippled. About the only place they go outside their Hawthorne Hills apartment is the doctor's office. He is 81. She is 71.

Many of their friends have died, but new friends visit often. Their children visit regularly. "We're happy," said Mrs. Stevens. "I love to read. I read to Dad, and my ears are good," she said. "We get the 'Good Old Days' magazine and 'Capper's Weekly'."

Growing old is a tough pill to swallow for most. But life as an elderly person, although considerably more restricted and dependent, can be lived much like life at any stage. Some make the best of it. Some don't.

One thing appears certain. Being old in 1973 is quite different than it was a decade or more ago.

The emphasis on being young is incessant. Why, you can even take away as much of the gray as you want.

Ironically, as everyone tries harder to look younger, recent years have produced a greater recognition of problems the elderly must cope with. Senior power has come into being as evidenced in local and national government.

"We really have a pioneer group of elderly," said Meta Schwiebert, director of the Council on Aging. "In years past, the elderly were part of a close-knit family circle." "Today," she said, "families really aren't structured to take in grandparents."

A two-year-old study by Iowa State University, "Life After 70 in Iowa", reveals that one-third of the children of elderly persons interviewed had left the state. Only a third of the elderly had children living in the same community in which they lived.

So the elderly, particularly those alone, must more and more depend on friends to escape loneliness. "When you get older," said Miss Schwiebert, "you have to develop a fabric of continually making new friends as the old ones die."

Many elderly still cluster about the familiar. "They play golf, or cards, or are active in churches the same way they have always been," she continued. "It's when you have become stranded from things you have always known that you need help."

The help comes in many ways, through hundreds of organizations. Some elderly maintain strong ties to their lifelong occupation by being active in employment retiree groups.

Churches sponsor Keen Agers and Senior Citizens groups. The unknown question is how many elderly persons fail to associate with any peer group, remain alone, just putting in time.

In 1930, there were 184,239 persons in Iowa over age 65, or 7.5 percent of the population. By 1960, the number over 65 had grown to 327,685 or 11.8 percent of the state's population. In 1970, there were 350,293 over 65, 12.4 percent of the population.

In Linn county in 1930, there were 6,196 over 65, also 7.5 percent of the county's population. In 1960, there were 13,496 over 65 in Linn county, 9.9 percent of the population, and in 1970, 14,812, or 9.1 percent.

"Many times," said Frank Sieh, executive director of Family Service agency, "some physical illness is the first time society's attention will be called to the problems of a particular individual.

"Many of our elderly were brought up in an era of helping yourself and don't consider welfare as a right."

Sieh adds other dimensions to elderly life. "There are elderly wealthy, elderly poor; elderly healthy and elderly ill. The person caught old, poor and ill spirals into a dire situation."

Young and middle-aged persons usually have the versatility to meet financial demands. In fact, Sieh points out, most working people improve themselves financially every year.

"The elderly cannot anticipate improving their financial position by their own effort, and with some a constant preoccupation about money makes old age a bitter thing," he said.

Loneliness, abetted by immobility, is the biggest problem many elderly face. Many who provide services to the elderly say the mere visit with an elderly person can be the greatest gift.

"The fact that Meals on Wheels provides a hot lunch every day, is great," said Alice Eicher, administrative assistant at Family Service, "but the person coming every day, being there, is even more important to many."

She believes Americans have less respect for the elderly than in most other countries. The relationship between elderly persons and their children is not as strong in this country, she claims.

"It seems," said Sieh, "that early in life now we orient ourselves to the wife and kids, to a nucleus family." In the past, grandma and grandpa were very much a part of the family, he observed.

"And many young people," he continued, "just don't have the wealth to do a great deal for their parents." Despite distance, said Sieh, families are maintaining more contact, if only by letter and telephone, than had been forecasted by social scientists.

Sieh believes it would be a big mistake to paint the plight of the elderly picture all bleak. "It depends so much on the individual," he said. Mildred A. Scott, director of the Senior Recreation center in Greene square, agrees.

"Many elderly are self-sufficient," she said. "The problems of aging are not necessarily unique, only the elderly have less ability to solve their problems. Many of the problems for the elderly didn't come until after World War II when compulsory retirement came."

WORK PLANS

"Many elderly had planned to work until death," said Miss Scott. "With compulsory retirement, they had to find something else to fill their time."

Miss Scott has worked with the elderly for more than 20 years, and gets perturbed by anyone who would diminish a person's value on the basis of age. "Older people are people!"

The Iowa State study describes aging in American society as "essentially a process of attrition in which individuals increasingly give up claim to important cultural values."

As one grows older, the study says, it becomes increasingly more difficult to retain valued goals of personal independence, energetic living, good health, or social and economic status.

There are pervasive stereotypes in our society that older persons tend to be forgetful, childlike, feeble, and asexual, the study points out. Even so, the Iowa State study reveals a very high number of elderly, 91 percent of those they surveyed, were satisfied with their life.

Seventy percent disagreed that old age "is the dreariest time of life." At the same time, however, only half said they are as happy in old age as when younger. Still, 60 percent said old age was better than they thought it would be.

Jess and Jennie Stevens' biggest problem is not being as active as they once were. "We used to have such a nice garden when we lived in Rompot, and we went dancing a lot," she said.

"We had a big yard and I kept it mowed all the time," said Jess, who worked on a railroad section crew for 48 years.

"I don't think children are deserting their parents," said Mrs. Stevens. "They are so much busier today, involved in the rat race of making a living.

"We're happy being together," she said, then recalled the times when her husband was gone for several days at a time working on the railroad. "He worked awfully hard," she said.

"It doesn't bother me a bit to grow old," said Mrs. Stevens. "I had good parents, a good home. My life has been good. It (being old) is heaven compared to being young. I had to work hard then, barely keeping body and soul together."

WORKED HARD

Nate Leibsohn worked hard too.

"I lost everything in the Depression, and

I made up my mind then to get a business of my own," he said. The rest of his life was in the shoe business, selling new ones and repairing old ones.

"I was in my shop so many years," he recalled fondly, "meeting the public. They took me out of the shoe shop in 1967." His shop, located on urban renewal property and razed, now is the site of the Village Inn motel.

At 83, Mr. Leibson's eyesight is failing. He can't read. He can't drive. His 1966 Plymouth is in perfect condition. It has only 3,600 miles. "I just put in a new battery," he said proudly. "It runs good."

He would like to live life over again. "I had a very good wife. I think of her a lot. She brought me my lunch at the shop, and many times helped me clean shoes." He is proud of his workmanship as a shoe repairman and his ability to build a business.

"My advice to people is to keep on working," he said. "They say you should get a hobby, to go fishing. But how long does that last. In one year, you are disgusted.

"A man who can't produce something is worth nothing. When you are born a loafer, it's different."

Once a week when the Homemaker Service woman comes, he gets out of the house. "Many of my old friends are dead," he said. "Maybe those who aren't will read this and give me a call."

But he is coping with old age. Since his wife died, John Q. Elderly has not. "You are never ready to give them up," he said tearfully of his departed wife. "I don't like living alone. I get awful lonesome, especially in the evening. I cry a lot."

Meals on Wheels bring him lunch every day, otherwise he is alone. After his monthly payment on a small bungalow, he has less than $90 left from his social security check.

"The only time they'll ever get me to leave this house is when they carry me out," he said, again picturing his wife as though she were still with him. His grief is overpowering.

"There were four of us boys," he said. "We used to play pinochle. I expect I wouldn't be any good at that any more. My mind is with her."

RECIPE FOR LIFE

Maude Weaver has a recipe for a happy old life. "I don't let myself be lonely. You have to keep busy, help others, always have a smile." She doesn't regard old age as a burden.

"I have many friends," she smiled. "I got over 100 cards when I was in the hospital."

"As you approach old age," said Miss Schwiebert, 69 years young herself, "you have to do something about it." She has just started a new career, working with the aged.

Attitude is a big factor in growing old, and perhaps the secret lies within a phrase posted on a wall at the Council on Aging office:

"Youth is a gift of nature, but Age is a work of art."

TRIBUTE TO MR. MILES LEADERMAN

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to pay a special tribute to one of my constituents, Mr. Miles Leaderman, who has personally demonstrated his concern for law and order.

Mr. Leaderman, an employee with the U.S. Postal Service, played a major role in the apprehension of two criminals. He followed four men, who had robbed a drug store of $2,500, and was able to get a clear description of the men and their license plate number which he promptly turned over to the police.

Mr. Speaker, the crime rate in America has escalated during the last decade at a staggering rate. I realize what a demanding task our policemen are performing and I commend them accordingly. At the same time, I would like to give special commendation to Mr. Leaderman for his act of bravery and his special service to the community.

IN TRIBUTE TO ELMA LEWIS

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to announce to my colleagues and the American people that the American Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission in Washington and Vision Associates of New York have chosen the National Center of Afro-American Artists—NCAAA—led by its famous Founder-Director Elma Lewis, as the national representation of "the symbol of the arts made meaningful in current history." A half-hour documentary film about the NCAAA, the major film of the Bicentennial Commission, will be shown on a thousand TV stations across the Nation in September. Future plans call for the film to be used extensively as a short subject in theaters throughout this Nation and abroad.

Miss Lewis needs no introduction to the people of Boston. She is the recipient of over 100 national and international awards as well as nine honorary doctorates. The NCAAA was found by Ms. Lewis in a 6-room apartment in Roxbury in 1950. Originally called the Elma Lewis School of Fine Arts—ELSFA—the school has grown into a fine institution of education, culture, and heritage where, according to Ms. Lewis:

We are stating black heritage, and sharing the beauty of our arts with all people.

The center employs 125 professionals from all art disciplines and serves over 350,000 people annually. The original ELSFA is now one of 40 such components making up the NCAAA.

One of the NCAAA's many successful programs is the technical theater training program in Norfolk Prison serving over 100 inmates. The Norfolk program has produced such stage successes as "The Plague," "Cadillac Alley," "Blak Rhythms," and "The Installment Plan"—plays conceived, written, and performed by the men inside the walls. Both the inmates and correctional officials of the prison have asked for more courses to continue and expand this highly successful program, a program which has given many inmates the tools with which to carve a new, productive future.

Another well-known and highly acclaimed program is the Elma Lewis playhouse in the park. In recent years, Boston audiences have been treated to performances by such famed stars as Duke Ellington, Baba Olatunji, and the Alvin Ailey Dance Troop, as well as talented local performers. Located in Franklin Park, it is now going into its eighth season of 62-free performances which have annually drawn over 100,000 people.

Besides these programs there are 15 other professional performing and visual arts companies and programs as well as numerous career-oriented training programs in the arts, management, and teaching.

Writer, producer, Director Lee Bobker of Vision Associates has titled the film, "We Hold These Truths" and intends for it to give focus to the bicentennial theme—"Festival, Heritage, and Horizon." The NCAA will represent the festival section.

According to Bobker:

The film is going to reflect the tremendous potential in this country to do what you want.

Ms. Lewis was chosen as a symbol of this "revolutionary American spirit" because "she epitomizes individuals who have made a major impact in their communities without waiting for Federal funds—one who said:

Here's a problem, I will do something about it.

Fittingly, Ms. Lewis' own motto is—

You can what you will.

I can think of no one more deserving of this recognition. For almost 25 years Elma Lewis has selflessly given of herself to build the NCAA from its very modest begininng into what is considered one of the finest centers for the arts in the world. Elma is to be applauded further for these untiring efforts in light of the fact that the center has been operating with a chronic shortage of funds since its conception. Yet she has always shown the courage to go in the face of this poverty. And it is this courage and drive to accomplish a goal that makes Elma Lewis a living example of the spirit upon which this great Nation was formed.

LEGISLATION TO EXPEDITE OUR SEARCH FOR AMERICAN MIA'S

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I have good news and bad news to report today.

First for the bad news. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, despite their signed pledge to help the United States account for the more than 1,250 Americans listed as missing in action in Southeast Asia, are still blocking our MIA search teams.

The North Vietnamese and Vietcong prohibit the examination of plane and helicopter crash sites in territory they hold, and they are not permitting the examination and exhuming of the bodies of American graves behind their lines—both in direct contradiction of the agreements they signed in Paris.

Now for the good news. My House concurrent resolution, which expresses the sense of Congress that our Government shall cease forthwith all consideration

of aid, trade, diplomatic recognition or the like if the North Vietnamese and Vietcong do not help us expedite our search for American MIA's is receiving strong bipartisan cosponsorship by Members with widely differing political ideologies.

Last night, H. JOHN HEINZ III, of Pittsburgh, Pa., joined the ranks of cosponsors. He was No. 57. With "57" varieties, we cannot help but prevail.

"ONE ALONE"—WELL, NOT REALLY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been looking forward to the performance of "The Student Prince" at the Kennedy Center. However, I understand that the "The Desert Song," and another great Sigmund Romberg production will run into early September and I may not have the opportunity to again be inspired by "The Student Prince". However, lovers of musical theater in the Chicago area will fare much better.

I am especially pleased to note that a most gifted columnist Dean Linton, assistant editor of the Suburban Life in Chicago, expressed in his column a most heart-warming commentary on the revival of the Sigmund Romberg productions.

The column follows:

(By Dean Linton)

"ONE ALONE"—WELL, NOT REALLY

It did my middle-aged heart good last weekend to see so many people really enjoying themselves once again in musical theatre.

The exceptionally good ticket business which both "The Desert Song" and "The Student Prince" have experienced at Chicago's Shubert Theatre during the usually slow downtown summer season should be evidence enough that there still is a craving for such productions.

Producer Lehman Engel might have been inspired for the Sigmund Romberg resurrections by the success of revivals "No, No, Nanette" and the current Debbie Reynolds' Broadway hit "Irene," along with our apparent nostalgia craze.

But it had to take real guts to gamble the amount of money needed to mount these fine productions of well worn Romberg operettas of 50 years ago.

Sure, the story lines are weak and the humor of the early 1920s is even weaker, but the Romberg music is there in its full glory, equaled by a superior orchestra and cast, with a few minor exceptions.

Fresh, new costumes and scenery bring sparkle to the Shubert stage which has seen far too many drab sets in recent years to inspire much enthusiasm from even the constant theatre-goers.

It is a joy to sense the great audience acceptance, to feel the near "sing along" participation when the Romberg heroes slip into The Desert Song's "Blue Heaven and you and I" and the prince's "Serenade."

Yes, it's an experience to watch senior citizens relive those "golden days" when Romberg was king, and for us "middle-agers" and even some "young folk" who are experiencing the charm of Romberg on the stage for the first time.

I think it's great to leave a theatre humming the melodies you've just heard. But that doesn't occur too often in our contemporary musical theatre. Of course there are exceptions, but far too few.

The Shubert is experiencing capacity crowds and ticket demands on this pre-Broadway run has prompted the "held over" sign on the marquee. Apparently the "I wouldn't be caught dead in the Loop after dark" scare isn't bothering these music lovers.

There's room for Romberg, Rodgers and Hammerstein, Lerner and Loewe and a host of others when the productions are well done and priced within the means of the general public.

And there's certainly room for Three Dog Night, Led Zeppelin, Blood, Sweat and Tears, Chicago and other such rock groups, who seem to have little trouble filling the Auditorium, Stadium or International Amphitheatre for their programs.

Although the rock concerts aren't my particular cup of tea either, I can't help but disagree with the inobjective manner which a Lyons reader approached the rock music subject in a letter to the editor last Thursday.

To term rock music as that played "in the lowest dives and cabarets, with creepy sleazy characters in attendance" is neither being objective or truthful.

The youth of every generation has had its own life-style, music, dress, etc.

Ours is no different. Tolerance and understanding always has been needed to bridge this age-less generation gap.

I guess what this all boils down to is that it's great to see some good entertainment aimed primarily at us oldsters, 30 and up.

Who knows? Maybe 50 years from now today's younger generation will bemoan the fact that the Sons of Led Zeppelin aren't being amplified enough in their revivals.

As the old newsreel said, "Time marches on."

GIRL SCOUTS, U.S.A., HONOR BUFFALO, N.Y., STORE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the National Equipment Service, the sales division of Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., has inaugurated an annual recognition of the 25 most outstanding Girl Scout departments in major retail stores across the country.

I am pleased to learn that from over 2,000 stores, my constituent, Mr. Ralph H. Wilcove, president of Sattler's in Buffalo, N.Y., has been given the Most Outstanding Girl Scout Department in the U.S.A., 1973 award.

The award is in honor of management's interest in Girl Scouting and the community, as well as superior performance in handling Girl Scout merchandise.

I am very well acquainted with Mr. Wilcove and his store, and there is no one more deserving of this recognition. Congratulations to the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. for their selection, and to Sattler's for their contribution.

EARTHQUAKE RESEARCH: WHERE DOES THE FAULT LIE?

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to greatly expand the Federal Government's Earthquate Research program. The goal is to develop techniques to predict, to prevent, and to reduce the hazards of earthquakes in the United States.

As a native of California, I experienced the great earthquake of 1971 and witnessed the vast destruction it created. Many lives were lost and many people were left bewildered and terrified by the erroneous predictions of a greater aftershock to follow. The initial earthquake itself was harmful enough to leave people with no place to turn, no home to return to, and a lack of knowledge as to where to begin rebuilding the private life they had worked so hard to create for themselves—a life that was shattered in a matter of seconds. Sixty-four persons were killed and more than $500 million damage was caused by that 1971 California earthquake.

But by no means are earthquakes solely a problem for California. The Office of Emergency Preparedness has designated over 20 States as containing areas of high seismic risk. These States range from Alaska in the northwesternmost tip of our country to Arkansas and Mississippi in the deep South. They include several States along the east coast, as well as many in the Midwest. As is evident, the earthquake problem is of the utmost national concern.

Research is currently being conducted in the United States by both the Federal Government and the States, notably California.

However, this research is limited and does not meet the need we face now of discovering earthquakes before they discover us and cause more damage than we are able to cope with in terms of money and lives. We need a greater national effort in studying these fatal disasters. Moreover, current Federal research efforts are fragmented in different agencies and are stymied by a lack of coordination.

Great progress has already been made in earthquake research. Three major breakthroughs have occurred over the last 20 years. Electronic devices and computers have been developed, the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission have invested some $230 million into research for detecting underground nuclear explosions, and intensive study into the cause of the first really large earthquake in the world—the Alaskan earthquake of 1964—has been conducted by modern instruments.

With the progress of this research, prediction of earthquakes has become a great possibility. A system for prediction would require the deployment of massive automated instrument systems along faults to monitor changes in the earth's crust that accompany the buildup of

forces that generate earthquakes. The automated field measurements in combination with the results of experimental and theoretical studies of mechanical processes that generate earthquakes would provide a working computer model of the earth's crust, which could be used to predict the time and location of earthquakes larger than a magnitude of five on the Richter scale.

The control of earthquakes, apart from prediction, may also be feasible. The first planned effort to control earthquakes is presently in progress at Rangely oil field in northwestern Colorado. Experiments are being conducted testing the effects of fluid injection on the cause of earthquakes, as well as the interaction of fluids and rock structures. Tests have shown that fluid injection tends to loosen the earth, thereby allowing less ground movement during a quake. Strain accumulation and release rates along active faults can be manipulated by fluid injection to provide for gradual release of stress and less impact at one time. Other experiments observe and study quakes and earth movements induced by underground nuclear explosions.

A third area of great potential is hazard reduction. One of the great concerns of earthquakes has been the force with which they hit and destroy structures. Finding methods to give our buildings and other structures stronger support would enable us to control the impact of an earthquake. This field requires much research, but a part of the needed data can be obtained through advancing earthquake engineering.

An ability to find "earthquake-proof" sites is necessary to the location of nuclear reactors. As the use of nuclear energy increases, finding safe sites for these potentially dangerous installations becomes ever more important. The relevance of earthquake research to our energy supply is further evidence of the national scope of the earthquake problem. The techniques and instruments used for locating earthquakes are also used in analyzing sites. The data acquired through this earthquake engineering will also provide needed data for construction techniques. Knowledge of more durable construction methods and better placement of our structures, avoiding fault areas in particular, will be of great benefit to our minimizing loss from earthquake damage.

Mr. Speaker, my bill proposes the further expansion of earthquake research by the Federal Government, as well as the installation of prediction systems throughout the country in regions of high seismic risk.

Although other legislation has been introduced calling for either earthquake research or prediction programs, my bill represents a truly comprehensive approach to the earthquake problem, since it involves wide-ranging research into methods of prevention and hazard reduction as well as prediction.

Perhaps the greatest virtue of this bill lies in its provisions for coordinating the on-going Federal earthquake research effort. The General Accounting Office, in an evaluation of Federal earthquake research programs last fall, concluded that—

Fragmented responsibility and lack of national goals have made a coordinated research attack on the Nation's earthquake problems difficult.

The GAO found that the several federal agencies involved in earthquake research were engaged in overlapping and duplicative programs. The result has been an inefficient and wasteful use of the limited resources we have assigned to the earthquake problem. This legislation will correct this crippling deficiency. It assigns to the National Science Foundation the responsibility to coordinate the Federal Government's overall earthquake research program, without depriving the other Federal agencies their proper role in the effort.

I am delighted that nine of my colleagues on the Science and Astronautics Committee are cosponsoring this measure. They are JOHN DAVIS, the chairman of the Science, Research, and Development Subcommittee, which will consider the legislation, CHARLES MOSHER, the ranking minority member of our full committee, and GEORGE BROWN, PAUL CRONIN, MARV ESCH, BARRY GOLDWATER, JR., KEN HECHLER, ROBERT ROE, RAY THORNTON, and LARRY WINN.

A national program of earthquake research is of the utmost importance now if tragedy is to be averted. I believe that this legislation will provide both the most effective administration of our Federal effort and the most promising results.

NEW PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been gratified to receive quite a number of communications from around the country in response to legislation I have introduced (H.J. Res. 547) to amend the Constitution to permit Congress to call for new Presidential elections. Among those communications is one from Mr. Cyrus Eaton, chairman of the board of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., and a distinguished American. Readers of the RECORD will, I think, be interested to know of Mr. Eaton's support for the concept of new Presidential elections, and will find his other recommendations for Government reform provocative, as I did. Mr. Eaton's letter follows:

THE CHESAPEAKE & OHIO RAILWAY CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio, July 17, 1973.

Hon. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BINGHAM: Heartiest congratulations on the proposed constitutional amendment to permit Congress to call for new presidential elections, as set out in your "Report from Washington" for June. There are two additions that I wish you would consider.

One would provide for four-year terms for members of the House of Representatives, with elections to be held at the same time as presidential elections. This should command the support of the Congress, since the present system of biennial primary and final elections amounts, in effect, to a campaign every year.

The other change would be to divest the President of the powers of Commander-in-Chief of the Army, Navy and Air Force. In no other nation in the world, democracy or dictatorship, does a civilian head of state exercise such absolute authority in this day and age. What may have been fitting and proper for President Washington, after his service as General, is now considered an absurdity by leading military experts everywhere.

Sincerely yours,

CYRUS EATON.

NATIONAL SCOUT JAMBOREE

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, 51 Boy Scouts from the Ninth Congressional District in Florida stopped by in Washington yesterday on their way to the National Scout Jamboree at Moraine State Park near Pittsburgh, Pa.

These boys, from Troop 205, in Maitland, Fla., for the most part financed their own way to the National Jamboree and the stop over in Washington.

I met with the Scouts yesterday and found them enthusiastic about the jamboree, which opened today, and their visit to Washington and tours of national monuments and historic sites.

The 51 boys from Troop 205 will join about 40,000 other Boy Scouts from the eastern United States today for the eighth National Jamboree.

Another 30,000 Scouts are already in their week-long jamboree in Farragut State Park in Idaho.

This is the first year the Scouts of America have held two jamborees, one in the East and one in the West, and this demonstrates the new National Scouting emphasis on getting more people involved in Scouting, whether they live in the East, the West or come from the city or farm.

The Scouts from Troop 205 represent what is right with American youth today, they represent the adventurous spirit and the willingness to learn more about their Nation and at the same time develop sound minds and bodies.

As an indication of Troop 205's interest in Scouting, and thus in America, the Troop already has 10 Eagle Scouts.

Those Eagle Scouts are: Tom Slade, Michael Tipton, James Slade, III, Scott McPherson, Brian Andrew, Bob Amend, Michael Abernathy, Frank Kovacik, Henry Howard, and Kevin Schloot.

Those Scouts, along with Troop leaders, Robert McPherson, Wayne Rohlsing, Mike Callahan, James Tipton, and Don Abernathy, were among those meeting with me in Washington yesterday.

Others who stopped by the Nation's Capitol on their way to the National Jamboree were: Howard Irish, Sidney Lynch, Scott Schimmel, Thomas Douglas, James Tipton, Jr., Michael Amend, Andrew McDonald, Ken Acre, Jeffrey

Clark, Eric Clark, Richard Orth, Charles McGathy, Tony Ragsdell, Ken Hendryx, David Hendryx, Rodney Williams, Michael Callahan, Arthur Bushner, Doug Richter, Bill Murphy, Richard Buchanner, Rick Norden, Glenn Gomer, Scott Hall, Clifford Schilling, Richard Kovacik, William Barnwell, Tom Ramsey, Hudson Marvel, Bruce Pflueger, Steven Rohlsing, Thomas Carver, James Conniff, Mark Feinberg, Richard Weidley, Jr., David Lasley, and Don Sawyer.

I know my colleagues join me in wishing the Scouts well at their National Jamboree and in encouraging more young people to get involved in this fine organization.

ON INTRODUCTION OF THE UTILITY ADVERTISING AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1973

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is now generally recognized that the United States has a serious energy problem. Whether or not it is a "crisis" is a matter of debate, but it is clear that our energy usage is growing too rapidly and we are wasting too much energy. The inevitable results of our energy gluttony are depletion of our resources, degradation of our environment, and increased costs to consumers.

And, yet, the gas and electric utilities of America continue to advertise and promote their products. Even if no energy shortage did exist, it would not make sense for these utilities to advertise at considerable expense to consumers. Consumers do not "buy" electricity; they "use" electricity. Consumers do not "shop" for electricity, or buy competing brands of electricity. An electric or gas utility is a natural and legal monopoly. The consumer has no choice but to use the product supplied by his utility.

But still utilities advertise. The consumption of electricity in this country is doubling every 10 years. Huge nuclear generators are being constructed in close proximity to densely populated urban areas; miles and miles of western land is being stripped to provide coal for mammoth generators in the Southwest—generators which have blackened the skies in what once was the cleanest part of the country. The country is being traversed by thousands of miles of new transmission lines, and thousands or square miles of forests and fields are being flooded for hydroelectric facilities.

Yet, if one turns on his television set, one still hears ads promoting the use of electric heat, the most inefficient heating system currently in use. A home heated by electricity costs over three times more per unit to heat than a similar home heated by natural gas. It also consumes more than twice as much primary energy resources per Btu than a home heated by gas. But still, electric home heat is being promoted by electric companies.

At the same time that utilities are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on promotional advertising, considerably less is being spent on research and development. In fact, the efficiency of electric power systems in this country has actually been declining in the last 10 years. In 1964, efficiency, which is defined as total energy sold divided into the amount of primary fuel needed to create that power, was 29.4 percent. In 1970, it had declined to 27.8 percent.

In 1970, the electric utility industry spent only $46 million for research and development, as opposed to $306 million for sales and advertising. In the past year, the utilities have raised their R. & D. budget to somewhere over $100 million. By comparison, one camera company, Kodak, spent over $200 million by itself for R. & D. Given the enormity of the electric utility industry, and the pressing need for research in the energy field, the amount of research being done is simply not adequate.

Numerous bills have been introduced to create a Federal agency to fund and conduct energy research. I support this approach, but also feel that the private utilities industry should be encouraged to undertake their own research programs.

To this end, I am today introducing the Utility Advertising and Research and Development Act of 1973. The bill itself, and the premise behind it are simple. No public utility should spend more money for advertising than it spends for research and development. The bill directs the Federal Power Commission not to allow utilities to pass on to consumers expenditures for advertising that exceed expenditures for R. & D. projects.

Since the FPC already has clear definitions of both advertising and R. & D., this provision will not create administrative difficulties. And the bill does not prohibit advertising expenditures in excess of R. & D. expenditures—it simply makes the company's stockholders pay for the additional advertising, not the public.

There is a real need for energy research—there is little need for utility advertising. I believe the legislation I have introduced today offers a responsible means of dealing with these two problems in a relatively simple way.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the bill in the RECORD.

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to require that advertising expenses of any public utility regulated by such Act be no more than research and development expenditures for purposes of determining rates and charges of any such public utility

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 205(a) of the Federal Power Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)" in such subsection; and

(2) by adding to the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"(2) The rules and regulations affecting or pertaining to rates and charges as specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection may not allow such rates and charges to be based on any amount of advertising expenses which exceeds the total expenditures on research and development spent by such public utility in any fiscal year of such public utility."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall become effective with respect to advertising expenses and research and development expenditures incurred by public utilities in the first fiscal year of any public utility, regulated under the Federal Power Act beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

KOREAN-AMERICAN ORPHANS

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a private bill calling for admission of 25 teenage Korean orphans to the United States. I realize, of course, that 25 will seem an unusually large number for one bill. The circumstances surrounding these orphans, however, are also unusual, and, in my judgment, justify special treatment for them.

The 25 orphans listed in my bill are all mixed-race offspring of Korean women and American servicemen. They are currently living in Seoul, Korea, in group foster homes under the care of the Holt Adoption Program, Inc., an internationally recognized children's service agency. Over the years, all the normal administrative channels of relief for this group of orphans have been explored and exhausted. Now that they are approaching adulthood, surely humanitarian considerations demand that some expeditious means be found to bring these innocent victims of the Korean War to America and to the new homes they have been waiting for all these years.

In order to help these teenagers obtain the guidance and foster home placement in America which they so desperately need, the Holt Agency is willing to assume all financial responsibility for home placement as well as educational training. There is no question of their becoming public charges. Furthermore, during the years which the 25 orphans have spent in Holt group homes in Korea, they have been taught English and are being given American cultural training to assist them in adjusting as rapidly and easily as possible to the United States.

I have been requested to introduce this legislation by the Holt Adoption Program, Inc., of Eugene, Oreg., of whose board I have been a member for a number of years; but I am also doing so out of my own concern for the future of these orphans. Those familiar with the Holt Agency will certainly share my conviction that this outstanding agency will do everything possible to see that these orphans are well taken care of once they arrive in America. Many may in fact remember Harry and Bertha Holt, the Oregon farm family who adopted eight Korean orphans after the Korean War and then went on to found the program which has brought thousands of homeless children on chartered airplanes to eager American parents in history's first "babylift." Over the past 20 years, thousands more of these innocent victims of the Korean war have found new lives around the world thanks to the conviction of Harry Holt that "Every Child Deserves a Home of His Own."

Now we have a special group of American-Korean teenagers who have been waiting years for word of adoption. The bill I am introducing today is urgently needed to insure that our Nation's moral obligation to these young people is met and that their futures will have hope. My colleague from Oregon Senator HATFIELD, has introduced identical legislation in the Senate, and it is my hope that both bills will see quick and favorable action in their respective bodies.

REDUCED TRAVEL FARES FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, inflation, or for that matter any adverse economic problem, has a brutal effect on our senior citizens. It is most unfair for these people who have worked a lifetime for their pension to have it eroded by the ravages of an inflation they did not cause and are powerless to stop. This coupled with the disintegration of the family in our society today, are among the reasons I am introducing legislation which will permit our senior citizens the opportunity to travel at reduced fares on all common carriers in interstate commerce.

Because travel is so costly and senior citizens are generally forced to live on a fixed income often forces these individuals to become housebound. My bill will provide half-fare travel during nonpeak hours. This allowance would increase a desired mobility of these deserving senior citizens. Hopefully, this legislation would help the air carriers which many times operate at half capacity. However, all modes of transportation would be included. Our senior Americans must be assisted to lead a full and resourceful life.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to prohibit common carriers in interstate commerce from charging elderly people more than half fare for their transportation during nonpeak periods of travel, 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 "Senior Citizens' Transportation Act of 1973".

TRANSPORTATION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no common carrier for hire transporting persons in interstate commerce shall, during nonpeak periods of travel, charge any eligible elderly person more than half the published tariff charged the general public in connection with any transportation which is requested by any such person.

(b) In any case in which a common carrier can show that it incurred an economic loss during any calendar year solely because of the requirement imposed by subsection (a), such carrier may apply to the head of the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the filing and publishing of the tariffs of such carrier for Federal financial assistance with respect to all or part of such economic loss. The head of any such Federal agency is authorized to pay to any such carrier (1) an amount not exceeding one-half the difference between the published tariff and the tariff charged elderly persons for each such person carried during the calendar year covered by the carrier's application, or (2) an amount not exceeding the aggregate of the economic loss of the carrier claimed under such application, whichever is less.

(c) The head of each such Federal agency is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, including but not limited to the defining of nonpeak periods of travel and regulations requiring uniform accounting procedures.

(d) The head of each such Federal agency is authorized to establish a commission of elderly persons to advise him in carrying out the provisions of this section.

(e) As used in this section, the term "eligible elderly person" means any individual sixty-five years of age or older who is not employed full time.

TRANSPORTATION IN INTRASTATE COMMERCE

SEC 3. Section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (49 U.S.C. 1602) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary shall give preference to applications made by States and local public bodies and agencies thereof which will adopt (or require the adoption of) specifically reduced rates during nonrush hours for any elderly person in the operation of the facilities and equipment financed with such assistance, whether the operation of such facilities and equipment is by the applicant or is by another entity under lease or otherwise. As used in this subsection, the term 'elderly person' means any individual sixty-five years of age or older.".

OUR NATION SALUTES THE HONORABLE RONALD S. GALL, OF NEW JERSEY, DISTINGUISHED AVIATION-SPACE JOURNALIST AND GREAT AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, in today's fast-moving world of time and space, the good deeds of man are oftimes secluded in the silent admiration of his family and friends whereas if the story could be told his achievements and accomplishments could inspire the youth of America and serve as a shining example of the vast intricate fiber that has been woven by our people throughout the centuries to make our world a better place to live in and maintain our Nation's preeminence and leadership in global affairs.

I am pleased and privileged to call your attention to the outstanding contributions that have been made to the quality of our life by a leading citizen of our community and State of New Jersey, respected industrialist and businessman, outstanding conservationist and environmentalist and longtime personal friend and neighbor, the Honorable Ronald S. Gall, who has extended a lifetime of outstanding service in aviation research, design, and development and has been nationally recognized as a distinguished aviation-space journalist.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a news article that recently appeared in the Paterson News, one of New Jersey's most prestigious newspapers, which tells the story, as it is, of the man himself at the other end of Ronnie Gall's learned pen and provides some insight of the quality of his leadership and the depth and scope of his exemplary achievements on behalf of his fellowman. The Paterson News story was written in tribute to Mr. Gall's having been awarded the highly coveted honor of the U.S. Aviation Writers' Association and reads as follows:

RONALD GALL VOTED LIFE MEMBER OF U.S. AVIATION WRITERS' ASSOCIATION

WAYNE.—A man of many honors in the fields of aviation as well as in county and state public activities, has been awarded one of the most significant recognitions.

Ronald S. Gall, of Pines Lake, long active in aerospace journalism, has been unanimously voted a life member of the Aviation/Space Writers Association, one of only six persons so honored in an organization of 900 members, to all of whom he is well known and highly respected.

Presented recently by the association's secretary, William F. Kaiser, the citation read: "To Ronald S. Gall, in recognition of his more than four decades of outstanding activity in the field of aviation-space journalism, his leadership programs for the advancement of peace through air power, his continuous promotion of better relations between industry and the press, his insistence on maintaining the highest standards of integrity and veracity in writing and reporting, and especially for his many contributions to and his ardent support of the association since its inception . . ."

Gall retired two years ago after 32 years with Curtiss-Wright Corp., Wood-Ridge, where he was corporate director of public relations and advertising and assistant to the president. A former newspaperman and an associate member of the North Jersey Pica Club, he has long been associated with aviation-space journalism. He was on the board of directors of the Aviation/Space Writers Association and publisher and pictorial director of its manual published in 1970.

Called the dean of aviation public relations executives, Gall was given a special citation in 1969 by the Aviation/Space Writers Association for "distinguished and consistent practice of high integrity public relations for Curtiss-Wright . . ."

Earlier that year, Gall was cited by Vice Admiral V. J. Semmes, chief of naval personnel for his "dedicated service to the U.S. Navy." He is a past vice president of the Passaic-Bergen Council of the Navy League of the United States and has held membership in the Air Force Association.

Other than his naval and space-oriented affiliations, Gall has been a member of the Paterson General Hospital Board of Trustees, served on the New Jersey State Resource Development Council of the State Department of Conservation and Economic Development, the Wayne Board of Education, and the Wayne Advisory Board of the New Jersey Bank. He served for many years as a Passaic County jury commissioner and as a foreman of a Grand Jury.

The much-honored writer resides at 1208 Pine Lake Drive West with his wife, Helen, who is a lawyer as well as a noted poet and author of many articles published in nature magazines.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Gall and his wife, Helen, were strong conservationists long before the Nation's conscience was awakened to the day-by-day threats to our environment and throughout the years, through their writings and, by example, through their highest standards of excellence, have expressed their deep

concern and actively pursued a resolution to the growing problems confronting the integrity of our environment and ecological system. I know I am deeply honored to be numbered amongst their many, many friends and am pleased to have this opportunity to join with you and our colleagues here in the Congress in a national salute to all of their good works.

FRENCH MINISTER SUGGESTS WOMEN'S BENEFITS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the need to recognize as legitimate the work of nonpaid housewives in our society is apparent. Fourteen percent of all elderly women compared with 1 percent of elderly men have no income. Among those age 65 or over who do receive an income, the median annual income of men is approximately $3,750, while that of women is $1,900. Inequities exist in our social security and pension systems—not to mention credit, estate and gift tax laws, unemployment insurance, income tax laws, and welfare programs—which must be reformed in order to meet the survival needs of countless older women. To this end, I have introduced H.R. 252 which would amend the Social Security Act so that housewives would be covered and credited as performing services for the purposes of benefits. Legislation such as this will improve immensely the lot of older women.

I wish to draw to the attention of my colleagues an article recently published in the Washington Star-News. Although French public health minister Poniatowski's suggestion does not extend pension benefits to French women who have contributed a lifetime of housework, it does constitute a step in recognizing the economic contribution of women. His plan would give pensions at age 65 to mothers who have at one time worked in paying jobs. Officials in the French Health Ministry are already implementing his suggestion and drafting legislation to expand the social security system to include these women. Furthermore, there are hints that the French Government will soon extend benefits to all elderly women—to those who have worked hard but never been paid. We should likewise show that we value the contributions of our working housewives.

The article follows:

FRENCH MINISTER SUGGESTS WOMEN'S BENEFITS

(By William Stelf)

PARIS.—French public health minister Michel Poniatowski wants the government to treat motherhood as a job, entitling a mother to a pension at age 65.

He proposed the idea in a weekend interview, and today officials in the Health Ministry confirmed they were drafting legislation to expand France's social security system to include mothers. They said it will be ready for parliament late this year.

"I will make sure that in the future mothers will enjoy a true social status," Poniatowski said, "and that they will be able to benefit from a pension."

While the idea seems startling—one health ministry official said France would be "the first country anywhere to have such legislation"—it actually represents only an expansion of what already is on the books here.

Eighteen months ago about 760,000 mothers who at one time worked became beneficiaries of government contributions to the social security fund. The 760,000 mothers are those with incomes low enough to qualify for government contributions on behalf of an employer who doesn't exist and an employee who doesn't earn an amount sufficient for the contribution to be computed. The government contributes about $16.25 a month for each of the 760,000. Total cost to the government is around $200 million a year.

Now Poniatowski wants to expand the system to cover all mothers who at one time worked in France. There are about 2.6 million; adding them to the system would quadruple the cost.

That still leaves 1.9 million French mothers who have never worked at any job but motherhood and who still, presumably would not be covered. But there are hints from inside the government that these would be next to become beneficiaries of the government largesse.

GAO WATCHES FOR BIG SPENDERS

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, one of my major concerns as a Member of this body is the need for fiscal responsibility in government.

As a member of the Government Operations Committee, I am constantly reminded of the excesses in Federal spending and the need for keeping the Federal budget under control. I am also constantly aware of the excellent job done by the General Accounting Office, which merits high praise for its efforts as a congressional fiscal watchdog.

Recently an article about the General Accounting Office appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. At this time, under my leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include that article in the RECORD.

"FISCAL FBI" HUNTS BIG SPENDERS IN WASHINGTON

(If Congress has the power of the purse, who watches how the money from the purse is spent? Who sees that funds are spent as they should be—wisely, efficiently, economically? The answer: Congress's little-known "fiscal FBI"—the General Accounting Office.)

(By Lucia Mouat)

WASHINGTON.—Economy-minded congressmen such as Sen. William Proxmire and Rep. Les Aspin wouldn't be without it.

Neither would less well-positioned taxpayers if they knew what it was doing for them—saving their government $263 million in cash during 1972, for instance.

Operating in gray semianonymity for most of its half-century existence, it recently has been breaking into the black newsprint of Page 1 headlines several times a month.

Give up?

It's Congress's fiscal FBI—that investigative auditing agency with the somewhat stodgy name: the General Accounting Office (GAO)

Actually the more than 1,000 reports this federal financial sleuth issues each year on everything from cost overruns on defense contracts to sanitation conditions in food-processing plants are anything but stodgy in conclusions and impact.

Though carefully couched in the most discreet language and always accompanied by the criticized agency's own view of the facts and comments, these blue-and-gray-covered reports enjoy rare esteem in the capital city as accurate, objective, and increasingly influential.

INFLUENCE EXTENDS FAR

Technically, GAO's enforcement power is almost nil. However, in a city where information is as valued and often as tightly guarded as gold bullion at Ft. Knox, this auditing agency's influence extends far beyond its legal powers.

Often fact-finding alone spurs reform. In the GAO's annual finger-pointing at federal agencies in hundreds of specific cases of wasted taxpayer dollars, onetime exposure to the spotlight is usually enough.

Among the many savings last year for instance were more than $1 million when the Department of Defense (DOD) shifted to buying surplus American butter (rather than buying its European counterpart) and more than $131 million when the Army followed GAO's suggestion to reduce heavy-equipment purchases and instead repair equipment already on hand.

Sometimes, though, changes are long in coming. GAO officials suggest that here, their reports' efforts to stir thought along new lines, considering alternative means to desired ends, is service enough to Congress and the taxpayer.

A bulky report on health facilities' construction costs issued last fall is, so far, a case in point.

Over the years, GAO has slowly but steadily been extending the scope of its probes—all with Congress's approval.

Formally set up in 1921 to keep close watch over congressionally appropriated funds, the agency at first assumed a clerical preoccupation with whether or not agencies balanced their books and spent what they said they did for declared purposes.

EFFECTIVENESS SOUGHT

Twenty-three years ago, Congress authorized the GAO to look beyond mere fiscal accountability to efficiency and, three years ago, to delve even deeper—into the sensitive area of program effectiveness.

This ever-broadening interpretation of auditing is implicit in the original legislation, in the view of Elmer B. Staats, GAO's Comptroller General, and well within the bounds of at least the Latin definition of the term—oversight—which he prefers to use.

Strict fiscal accounting now takes 10 percent of the 4,800-member GAO staff's time. Establishment of internal audits in various federal agencies and department (about half have them so far) has helped to lighten this load.

Also, as the prospect of more lump sums of federal money going directly to state and local governments grows, the GAO has been working with these governmental units to establish sound, uniform audit standards.

The Comptroller General, a tall, red-haired Kansan who has a PhD in public administration from the University of Minnesota and enjoys the independence of a 15-year presidential appointment (he is midway through), is openly eager to move the office into areas in which the GAO is "more uniquely equipped" to serve Congress and which are more "relevant" to the national legislature's needs.

HOW ROLE IS VIEWED

He envisions the GAO's rule not as that of a "think tank" for Congress, assessing national program priorities and advocating one solution over another, but rather as one

pointing out areas of waste, inexpensive alternatives, and of assessing whether or not specific programs meet their legislative objectives.

At a time when the legislative branch has been rapidly losing ground in its tug-of-war with the executive branch, the scope and clout of the auditing agency's role as a congressional helpmate are considered crucial.

Accordingly, an effort is reviving on Capitol Hill to strengthen the GAO's legal muscle as a fiscal investigator. One such effort passed the Senate in 1969 but was never even reported out by the House Government Operations Committee.

One of the GAO's major problems in collecting data for Congress is the stone wall of noncooperation it meets in some agencies.

Two of the biggest withholders of information are the Treasury (though the Comptroller General stresses that the situation is improving) and the Internal Revenue Service.

In the case of Treasury's refusal to provide the working papers behind the Lockheed loan transaction of the department's Emergency Loan Guarantee Board, congressional committee intervention secured the data, but as Mr. Staats says, "They [Treasury officials] still contend officially we have no legal right to it."

DIFFICULTY SPOTLIGHTED

Crux of the difficulty here is that when the GAO has a difference of legal opinion such as this with an executive-branch agency, it is effectively the Attorney General and the Justice Department which become the counsel for both. Almost invariably, according to GAO officials, the executive-branch version of the law gains the upper hand.

One current case in point involves GAO's relatively new job of gathering data on presidential campaign contributions and monitoring campaign media spending. Several times in the course of its investigatory work, the GAO came across repeated failures of finance Committees for the Re-election of the President to report certain contributions.

Interviewing a number of individuals reported to have made such political gifts, GAO investigators in most cases were told in the affirmative that contributions had been made. Although the Justice Department has levied fines in a few instances, Mr. Staats repeatedly has called on the Office of the Attorney General to "take the initiative" in prosecuting more of the many alleged violations.

"How can you get separation of powers under such conditions?" asks Mr. Staats. "We think it's essential not to have to depend on the executive branch to say whether or not we can bring a case to court."

The GAO also seeks power to subpoena records of the many contractors who supply goods and services to the government. Although the law is quite clear on this point, insisting that such records be provided, reluctant contractors often opt for delays rather than outright refusals to stave off the GAO. "They don't say 'no' but they don't say 'yes.'" says Paul Dembling, GAO's general counsel.

CLUB IN THE CLOSET?

Bills introduced on the Senate side by Sen. Abraham A. Ribicoff (D) of Connecticut and Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D) of North Carolina would award the GAO both of these valuable legal tools.

In GAO's view, the mere possession would be a deterrent. As Mr. Dembling puts it, "Having a club in the closet could prove to be very useful."

No such legislation has yet been introduced on the House side, and it is considered less likely to vote the GAO the new powers. However, as one GAO staff member says, "The House voted to cut off funds for U.S. bombing of Cambodia this year—who knows what they'll do on the GAO?"

Proponents of a stronger GAO insist the congressional auditing arm will be no less discreet in treating information as classified (if it is) and/or including the agency's comments in reports than before.

As a former employee of the executive branch—serving as deputy director of the Bureau of the Budget under four presidents—Mr. Staats concedes he well understands agency reluctance:

"They are concerned that if we have the information physically it may get distribution or taken out of context." However, he says he has no sympathy for this position because he feels GAO precautions are such as to leave it no basis.

In the meantime, as GAO auditing functions have broadened at least in theory, so has the nature of the staff. In the last four years, more professionals, such as lawyers, engineers, sociologists, and the like, have been hired than accountants. In addition to a headquarters and 50 on-site audit offices in various governmental agencies in Washington, there are 15 field offices around the United States and 4 overseas.

BUDGET FAIRLY SOLID?

The GAO network operates on a $90-million-a-year budget, slim by some standards but generally considered fairly solid.

About 70 percent of the legislative agency's reports are self-initiated. Congressional requests from both individuals and committees have quadrupled over the last six years since Mr. Staats has been in office and now keep about 25-to-30 percent of the staff fully occupied.

Despite its reputation for accuracy and nonpartisanship, the GAO does have its critics. For the most part, however, they are few, and the criticism is muted.

Understandably, executive agencies sometimes bristle at charges leveled at them, but since GAO findings are usually based on their own records, they are often hard-pressed to refute them.

There are a few on Capitol Hill who say they think the GAO is too friendly with the executive branch. "I don't think they're really digging as much dirt out as they should be," says one Republican committee aide.

REPORTS DEBATED

If the reports are too cautious and bland for some, devoid of "purple language" and "desk pounding," Mr. Staats insists it is strictly intentional.

Though admitting this one subject on which there is constant internal debate, the Comptroller General sees it as the prerogative of the individual congressman to add such peppery adjectives when a report happens to suit his purposes.

The timing of reports is a more universal concern. Everyone would like to see them come out faster and be more closely timed to congressional appropriations and authorization decisions. With access delays a substantial factor, the average GAO report takes six to nine months before the agency's printing office (it has its own) puts out the final version. However, as Mr. Staats points out, so-called "letter" reports, a few pages long, can often be issued within a week or two, and GAO staff members can always brief congressional committee members well before any GAO reports are finished.

Some who commend the nonpartisanship of GAO reports themselves are critical of the politics involved in the congressional follow-through or lack of it.

Recalling the days in the mid-1960's when he served as a member of the House Government Operations Committee, and majority staff members greatly outnumbered the minority, Rep. Robert McClory (R) of Illinois says:

"The committee deliberately sidestepped investigations of discrepancies and irregularities which might reflect on the [Democratic] administration."

Whatever the politics of Congress's choices of action, Mr. Staats considers the GAO's objectivity and credibility among its main strengths. As time goes by in this political city, the GAO may find itself increasingly hard-pressed to preserve that reputation for neutrality. As it moves further into the sometimes subjective area of evaluation, it may trigger some charges of partisanship.

VEYSEY URGES END TO BEEF PRICE FREEZE

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to direct the attention of all Members of the House to the beef supply situation and the need for an end to the freeze on beef prices.

I have received evidence that up to 25 percent of the beef processing employees in the Los Angeles area are now unemployed.

Nationwide, beef marketing and beef supplies are down 26 percent from last week and 32 percent from last year.

During the last week in July last year, American farmers marketed 469,000 head of beef. During the same week this year, that figure was down to 323,000 head.

Yesterday, only 80,000 head were marketed, only a week ago yesterday, 116,000 head were sold.

Across the country, 45 packingplants have shut down completely. Some of the smaller ones will not be able to open again unless the freeze is lifted soon.

Another 31 packingplants, including many of the largest in the Nation, have curtailed production by as much as 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, these figures spell out clearly, why one-fourth of the beef processing industry employees have been laid off their jobs, why many large restaurants are rationing their beef, why the American housewife across the country is struggling to find enough beef to feed her family, and ironically, why the White House this week was unable to buy a full beef order.

Beef producers are not likely to release any more cattle for slaughter than they absolutely have to until the freeze ends. They reason that it would be foolish to sell if they can wait until September 13 when the freeze is scheduled to be lifted.

And they are holding cattle—they're holding them out of the feedlots as long as possible, and those which are already on feed are getting their feed cut back. The idea is simply to wait this freeze out, and count on sharply higher prices to offset the extra cost of holding on to the cattle.

Mr. Speaker, the dangers of keeping this freeze on through mid-September are numerous. By drying up the beef supply between now and then, and holding prices frozen, we are inviting black marketing on a grandiose scale.

Of course, with the supply of beef sharply down, the price of other substitute foods is going to go up accordingly, thereby increasing, rather than lowering the food bill for many consumers. And

that has already happened. With the freeze scheduled to last another six weeks, pork, lamb, and poultry prices will rise to all-time record levels.

On another front, such distortions in the normal pricing and marketing machinery, can wreak havoc with the supply-demand relationship in the intermediate future.

Every steer that gains 100 pounds extra because of the freeze induced holdout will be substantially overweight when he is finally marketed. And if one out of every three head normally sold is off the market until after September 12, we can project a supply of beef above normal immediately following the September 12 freeze cutoff.

Conceivably such a substantial temporary oversupply could bring economic chaos to the beef industry, as well as to producers of other livestock whose prices would fluctuate accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to take the initiative in attempting to convince the President and the Cost of Living Council to end the beef price freeze as soon as possible. It was economic folly to maintain the freeze on beef while eliminating it on other products.

And it is pure foolishness to continue the freeze on beef when we can see so clearly the detrimental impact that it is having, and will continue to have.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Senate voted 84 to 5 to end the freeze on beef prices by legislation. I appeal to each of my colleagues to show the same judgment and take a leading role in bringing the freeze to an early end.

STATEWIDE RECYCLING PLAN

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, the Washington Star-News featured an article on a statewide plan in Connecticut for recycling garbage. This reuse of solid waste provides metal, glass, and fuel, while reducing disposal problems. I insert the article along with my approval and recommendation that this program be a model for other States:

TRASH: THE ANSWER

HARTFORD, CONN.—Short on dumping grounds and tired of smoky incinerators, Connecticut has announced a statewide recycling plan that eventually will convert all its garbage into electricity, fuel and reusable metal and glass.

The state Department of Environmental Protection earlier this week unveiled a 20-year, $295-million blueprint for solid waste disposal that relies heavily on still unproven technology being tested in other parts of the country.

A spokesman for the federal Environmental Protection Agency said the plan was unique in its scale.

It calls for Connecticut to build 10 "resource recovery plants" at the rate of one each year beginning in 1976. The plants will separate bulk refuse into reusable materials such as aluminum, glass and ferrous metals, which will be sold.

What little remains will be carted away to landfills.

The state plans to build 45 centers where garbage will be collected and shipped to the recovery plants by truck, barge or rail. The plan also calls for 18 new landfills.

The state hopes to increase the amount of waste recovered from the present figure of less than 5 per cent to more than 60 per cent by 1985.

By 1975, they anticipate recovering enough from iron and steel to build 200,000 automobiles, enough glass to make 450 million bottles, 23,000 tons of aluminum and enough energy to generate 10 per cent of Connecticut's energy needs.

Pulverized, combustible refuse will be mixed with oil in a conventional power plant boiler and burned to produce electric power.

More than 3.3 million tons of garbage—more than a ton for every man, woman and chid in the state—went to Connecticut dumps, landfills and incinerators in 1972. The amount is expected to double in 20 years.

State environmental officials say only one incinerator in Connecticut presently meets federal air pollution standards and only 14 of 144 landfills meet federal pollution standards.

Once the system is built, annual operating costs are expected to be around $50 million. The system is to become self-supporting through user fees and the sale of recycled waste. The General Electric Co., received more than $1 million to create the Connecticut plan.

Briefly, here is how it is supposed to work:

Incoming refuse will be shredded to eight-inch particles, then sent through a series of vertical zig-zag passages where an upward blast of air will separate it into light and heavy materials.

Lighter materials such as paper and plastic will be carried up to a storage bin while dirt, rocks, glass and metal will fall into another.

The lightweight matter eventually will go through a "combustible separator" where embedded glass and inert particles will be removed. What's left will be shredded to one-inch particles and stored for fuel.

FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIONS TO THE GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT PROJECT OF THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, Congressman SAYLOR and I opposed the appropriation for fiscal year 1974 of the Bureau of Reclamation's Garrison Diversion Unit project in North Dakota. Our opposition was based on both environmental and economic factors.

Since that time, we have received a copy of a letter from Russell Train to Secretary Morton which expresses strong opposition to the continuation of the project on environmental grounds.

Now, additional information opposing this project has become available. I would like to enter into the RECORD a memo from the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—a Bureau of the Department of the Interior—concerning the draft environmental impact statement for the Garrison Diversion Unit. It now appears that even within Interior itself, there is growing recognition of the disastrous environmental consequences of this project.

The memo follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1973.

To: Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation.
Through: Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.
From: Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.
Subject: Review of Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Garrison Diversion Unit.

This is in response to a memorandum from Mr. W. H. Keating, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation, dated April 9, requesting our review and comments on a draft environmental impact statement for the Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota. We have reviewed this statement, and, as a result, we have reached the following conclusions:

The draft environmental statement does not provide an adequate assessment of the impact of this project on the fish, wildlife, and recreational resources in the project areas, not does it provide sufficient information to make such an assessment possible.

Major exclusions are (1) a description of the environment and the associated flora and fauna in a level of detail that would provide a base for assessing the impacts of the project, and (2) a description of the various habitats that will exist after the project and a description of the fauna that might occupy such habitats.

The mitigation of adverse impacts of the project on fish and wildlife resources and enhancement of such resources through the development of the 36 fish and wildlife development facilities must be reexamined because of new knowledge of the northern prairie pothole ecosystem and new directives of this Department on wetlands and their associated flora and fauna.

The following comments address general topics which we believe must be addressed in the final EIS. Specific comments on the draft EIS are appended.

FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES

Our review of the fish and wildlife facilities has shown that emphasis was placed on providing permanent fresh water areas for ducks. However, factors of importance to waterfowl, shore birds, and other species of birds and animals were not sufficiently analyzed in light of today's knowledge of the prairie pothole region. Some of these factors are:

1. The importance of brackish and saline marshes to migratory shore birds.

2. The relative value to all species of migratory birds of those wetlands presently found in the proposed fish and wildlife development areas to the proposed managed marshes.

3. The impact of carp and other rough fish species on waterfowl production areas throughout the project area. It should be mentioned that National Marine Fisheries Service has advised that screening technology is available which may prevent entry of rough fish into the McClusky Canal.

4. The impact of project waste water on waterfowl production areas.

5. The adequacy of presently planned water supply systems and schedules to provide water to control or prevent botulism outbreaks associated with managed marshes.

All of the above factors must be examined before an adequate environmental assessment of the impact of the proposed fish and wildlife facilities can be made. A comprehensive assessment of the relative values of

wetlands should include consideration of water permanency, depth, salinity, and associated vegetation and invertebrate communities.

Construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit will take place over a period of several years. During this period, new techniques in marsh development and management may appear. These techniques would influence the development and management proposals for the fish and wildlife areas. We would like to emphasize that present plans for these areas are not rigid and could be modified if modifications appear desirable. Language to this effect should be included in the final statement.

National Wildlife Refuge (NWR's) and Game Management Areas (GMA's)

An analysis of the impact of the project on existing NWR's and GMA's must be made. This analysis should include J. Clark Salyer NWR, Sand Lake NWR, Tewaukon NWR, Audubon NWR, Arrowwood NWR, plus GMA's in the project area. The present statement does not examine the impact of increased flows, increased levels of dissolved solids, increased levels of pesticides and nutrient loads, the potential introduction of carp, and other changes in the productivity and carrying capacity of these areas. A particularly significant problem is the increase in total dissolved solids that will occur in J. Clark Salyer NWR. Should Canada refuse to allow the quality of the water entering their country through the Souris River to be degraded and J. Clark Salyer NWR is used as an evaporative sump for project waste water, the value of this area to fish and wildlife would be lost.

Natural Wetlands

In addition to the above questions on NWR, GMA, and proposed fish and wildlife areas, impacts on rural wetlands are not quantified. One concern is the impact of ground water level changes induced by project canals intersecting various aquifers. What is the zone, of influence of these canals? Will wetlands be drained through such actions? If wetlands are created by raised water levels as has occurred in other areas, will they be maintained or drained? Other concerns are the extent and location of direct wetland losses due to drainage for farm land, routing of canals through wetlands, and changes of water quality and volume in natural wetlands modified for water conveyance or storage.

In any reexamination of the values of wetlands to migratory birds, the technique described by Stewart and Kantrud in "Classification of Natural Ponds and Lakes in the Glaciated Prairie Region," *U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife Resource Publication 92*, may be used for guidance.

This resource publication along with other technical data and publications, such as those found on the appended bibliography, could be used to describe all the wetlands to be impacted by the projects. Such a description should provide a comprehensive chemical, physical, vegetational, and faunal description of each wetland complex. The productivity of these areas should be quantified wherever possible. At a minimum waterfowl, shore bird, and furbearer production should be estimated. The relative value of each major complex as resting and feeding grounds for migrating birds should be described. Once such a baseline description has been accomplished, the changes caused by the project can be similarly described, and the losses or gains in productivity and other wildlife values can be estimated.

Uplands

The impact on the wildlife resources of modifying upland habitat of the project area has not been examined in sufficient detail nor has it been quantified. Of particular concern to our Bureau is the impact of land use changes on migratory birds that utilize the uplands during the breeding season A complete accounting of the present upland habitats, including quantification of native and domestic pasture and hayland, cropland, idle land, and other land types, should be made for each segment of the project. Estimates of the species composition and abundance of breeding migratory birds inhabiting each of these areas should be made. Post-project conditions should be described at the same level of detail.

Riparian Habitat

The riparian habitat and associated woodlands found along the Souris, Sheyenne, and James River systems provide limited but unique wildlife habitat in North Dakota. Modification of these areas through such project activities as channelization, riprapping, and increased volumes of flow and nutrients, in adjacent streams will have an impact on the value of these areas for fish and wildlife. We believe this impact should be assessed in detail.

Fisheries Resources

The potential for enhancing the fisheries' resources of North Dakota through the development of the Garrison Diversion Unit appears to be significant. Restoration of Devils Lake and stabilized flows in various rivers are examples of project actions that will enhance fisheries potential. There are project impacts that may reduce or prevent the realization of this potential. Some of these impacts are the possible introduction of carp and other rough fish, increased concentrations of agricultural chemicals and feedlot effluents, increased dissolved solids, channelization, and installation of numerous pumping stations.

We believe a more comprehensive description of the various aquatic habitats found in the project area is needed. Where applicable, these descriptions should provide profiles of flow velocity and volume, dissolved solids, nutrient levels, dissolved oxygen, temperatures, and other water quality measurements. The flora and fauna of these aquatic areas should be described giving special attention to fish species composition and abundance. By providing such background information, the changes in the environment can be described and the impact on fish and wildlife resources estimated.

We believe such an analysis would have the added advantage of identifying actions that could be taken to minimize adverse impacts or enhance fish and wildlife values.

Enhancement of Fish and Wildlife Resources

In any water development project, unexpected habitat changes occur. While some of these may be detrimental, many times the changes have the potential for significantly improving fish and wildlife production. A good example of this is the wetlands that were created by various water developments in the Columbia Basin Project.

Development of the Garrison Diversion Unit will undoubtedly create unexpected habitat changes that will directly benefit fish and wildlife, or through management will have the potential for benefiting fish and wildlife. Some of the changes we can anticipate are the creation of wetlands adjacent to project storage and conveyance facilities and increased riparian habitat along project conveyances, storage facilities, and drains.

To fully realize the potential benefits of these changes, it may be necessary for these areas to be dedicated to and managed for fish and wildlife use. As an example of the need for management to realize the potential of these changes, we noted that no mention was made in the statement of the increased demand for hatchery-reared fish generated by development of new fishing areas created by the Garrison Diversion Unit. Demands on production from existing hatchery facilities exceed present production capabilities. New facilities or expansion of existing facilities may be needed if anticipated stocking requirements created by the Garrison Diversion Unit occur.

We believe that the potential for enhancement of fish and wildlife productivity beyond the fish and wildlife development facilities should be recognized in the statement. We also believe that the methods that could be employed to realize such potential benefits should be discussed in the statement.

It is fully recognized that the Bureau of Reclamation has not previously been made aware of some of the foregoing. It appears that in some cases, additional studies will be required if the deficiencies are to be corrected. Our regional planning staff stands ready to elaborate on these matters and to assist you in the preparation of a final statement.

KENNETH E. BLACK.

FLIGHT PAY FOR SENIOR OFFICERS: A DIALOG

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, last month the House voted to instruct its conferees to insist on disagreement to title III of the Senate amendment to H.R. 8537 amending the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950. The issue was flight pay for officers of the armed services who are qualified pilots of the rank of colonel and above who are not assigned to flying jobs. Following the vote of the House refusing to accept the Senate amendment which would have authorized such pay, I received a thoughtful letter from a naval aviator reflecting a point of view not discussed during debate. I believe our dialog served a useful purpose and may to each of my colleagues. I, therefore, insert the text of our correspondence for all to read:

LETTERS

DEAR MR. REGULA: I am taking this opportunity to write to you concerning the vote by the House on June 28, 1973 on bill HR 8537 to disagree with the amendment of the Senate concerning flight pay for senior officers.

I was born and raised in Canton, Ohio, and my permanent home address is 2743 Blackfriars Drive, NW, Canton, Ohio. I entered the naval service in 1942 and have been a naval aviator since 1947, so you can see I have an interest in the final decision of the Congress concerning subsequent revisions to the flight pay issue.

I would like to present to you some aspects of this issue which were not debated and which might be of assistance to you in the future. In the 26 years that I have been a designated aviator, there was never a question in my mind or in the minds of my compatriots that I would ever be denied flight pay except for one reason, i.e., unable to pass a flight physical. My financial base (investments, college programs for my children, etc.) has always been predicated on the reasonable assumption that the Congress would not arbitrarily reduce significantly my income. Needless to say, the decision to reduce my income by 10% has created financial problems.

Be that as it may, I believe the decision to terminate flight pay for senior officers not involved in flight operations, per se, will have an adverse impact on the efforts of the Services to induce young men to make a career out of military flying, and in the long run will cost the taxpayers significantly more

than the immediate short term savings. The young aviators can't help but observe that the Congress has "changed the rules in the middle of the game" so to speak, and that they too could be subjected to arbitrary decisions which would impact unfavorably on their financial status. They know that if they fly for the airline companies that the Teamsters Union will assure them of financial stability.

As a result, it is my belief that in order to provide for the air power necessary to ensure that the United States can have some control over its destiny with relation to other countries, it will be necessary to provide sizeable bonuses to aviators, just as we are now doing today for submariners.

One other aspect of this issue which warrants discussion is the fact that an overwhelming majority of the senior officers who are not actively flying were forced to do so involuntarily. They were directed not to fly in order to cut down on the cost of maintaining aircraft. A large majority of these relatively young senior flight officers would no doubt be ordered back into a flying status in the even of a national emergency requiring full mobilization.

Mr. Regula, I ask only that you review carefully this most complex issue when it returns to the Congress for further consideration, and that your decision be based upon something more relevant than the somewhat frivolous argument that was presented June 28th, and that was alluded to in the Washington Post as having a decided impact on the House in their decision to terminate flight pay for senior officers not engaged in combat flying.

Respectfully yours,

Capt. DELMAR H. EVANS,
U.S. Navy.

DEAR CAPTAIN EVANS: I would be interested in your thoughts on why you feel that those who fly should receive more compensation than an officer of comparable rank assigned to artillery or some other type of military responsibility. The floor discussion did not really speak to this question and yet it seems to me that this is a basic issue.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. REGULA,
Member of Congress.

DEAR MR. REGULA: This is in reply to your letter of July 12, 1973, in which you indicated that you would be interested in my views as to why those who fly should receive more compensation than an officer of comparable rank assigned to artillery or some other type of military responsibility.

First I would like to state that the views herein are mine alone and do not necessarily represent those of the Navy. I would further hasten to add that I am not qualified to comment on the amount of compensation considered appropriate for those officers assigned to artillery or other type responsibilities.

The issue as I see it is that the government spends approximately two years and about $800,000 to train a pilot. There is a civilian market for this skill, and I have a strong feeling that a vast majority of the nation's airline pilots are former military pilots. So there is a situation somewhat like that in the medical profession. Additional compensation has to be offered in order to encourage these service members to make a career out of the military. An additional cost factor in this nebulous equation is the aircraft accident rate. As the quality of pilots go down the accident rates go up. With the cost of military aircraft approaching one million dollars each it doesn't make much sense to look for ways to save money by cutting costs for pilot compensation.

In peacetime, there aren't too many factors which would encourage a pilot to make a career out of the military rather than the civilian airlines under the current compensation rules. The 45 year old service pilot takes a 10% pay cut at the time in his life when his family's financial demands are at a peak. The 45 year old airline pilot can look forward to 15 more years of flying with steady increases in salary, a salary significantly higher at the onset.

The military pilot is forced to accept his reduction in income or retire and face considerable financial instability while seeking a new occupation, here again at a time in his life when he needs considerable financial stability.

The military pilot also realizes that his profession is considerably more hazardous as evidenced by his high insurance rates and the periodic loss of close personal friends—losses that occur during routine training flights as well as in combat. In fact, most of my close friends that were killed in aircraft accidents were killed during *routine* training flights.

In summary, I believe that in order to save money in the long run, more compensation to military pilots, not less, will be required, and I believe it will be significantly more than what was required in the past, because in peacetime the military career probably will not appeal to many of our citizens. As you know back home in Ohio we have a saying, "Penny wise and pound foolish." I believe the decision to terminate flight pay for senior officers fits that saying very aptly.

Yours most respectfully,

Capt. DELMAR H. EVANS,
U.S. Navy.

DEAR CAPTAIN EVANS: Thank you for your reply to my letter about flight pay.

You cite some cogent reasons why senior pilots in the service should be compensated more than those who are not flying. Flight pay is incentive pay. If the purpose is to provide senior officers with financial stability and to retain them in the service, then lets do that and call the pay something other than flight pay. If the purpose is to provide a monetary compensation for dangerous activities, and flying is considered a dangerous activity, then only those that actually fly should receive the pay.

If you have no objections, I would like to publish the text of our dialogue in the Congressional Record in the hopes of sparking greater national interest in this matter.

With best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. REGULA,
Member of Congress.

DEAR MR. REGULA: This is in reply to your letter of July 24, 1973, in which you expressed a desire to publish the text of our dialogue on flight pay for senior officers in the Congressional Record.

I am flattered that you consider my comments worthy of such recognition and I would be honored to have our dialogue included in the Record.

Yours most sincerely,

Capt. DELMAR H. EVANS,
U.S. Navy.

HILL UNIT REVISES U.S. EVIDENCE RULES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Post of August 3, 1973, is helpful in describing the activities and program of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice of the House Judiciary Committee, in its work on the proposed Evidence Code.

I would like to correct one error, the occurrence of which is easily understandable since the reporter and I discussed the matter over an eight-party country telephone line.

The article quotes me saying:

Everybody already knows the law of privilege.

What I actually said was "everybody already thinks he knows the law of privilege."

The article follows:

HILL UNIT REVISES U.S. EVIDENCE RULES

(By John Field)

A House Judiciary subcommittee has revised the Supreme Court's proposed Federal Rules of Evidence to eliminate the most controversial sections from the standards under which federal judges will admit testimony.

The Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, chaired by Rep. William L. Hungate (D-Mo.), deleted from the new rules a much-criticized provision which would have protected confidentiality of state secrets and eliminated provisions that would have drastically restricted the privilege against testimony by spouses and the doctor-patient privilege.

The new evidence code, adopted last fall by the Supreme Court and originally scheduled to have gone into effect July 1, was to have provided for uniformity among the U.S. District Courts in admitting evidence in civil and criminal cases, but many of the changes made by the subcommittee would hamper that goal.

The revised rules, which were open to comment by the legal community and the general public last month, are a key topic of conversation among trial lawyers attending the annual convention of the American Bar Association here this week and next. At least two ABA panels—one for lawyers and one for judges and magistrates—will be discussing the new evidence rule specifically.

The normal procedure for adoption of court rules was suspended by Congress when it received the proposed Federal Rules of Evidence early this year from the Supreme Court. Normally, court rules go into effect if either house of Congress has not vetoed them within 90 days of receipt.

This year, however, Congress suspended enactment of the rules to give it more time to study them, and the Hungate subcommittee has been working under some time pressure to get the revisions completed as soon as possible.

In the key area of privileges against testimony, the House subcommittee revisions substitute a general rule on privileges for specific rules drafted by the Committee on Rules and Practice and Procedure of the U.S. Judicial Conference and adopted by the Supreme Court.

The general rule, except in the area of Fifth Amendment rights against self incrimination or other congressionally enacted privileges, provides that state law will apply if the state where the district court is located has a law on the subject, and in other cases so-called common law as interpreted "in the light of reason and experience" will apply.

That is how existing law applies on all questions of admissibility of evidence in federal courts, and the rules draftsmen, headed by attorney Albert E. Jenner of Chicago, had sought to eliminate the ambiguity of the "in light of reason and experience" standard.

Congressional critics of the new rules, however, feared that the Supreme Court was, in effect, making new law in adopting the specific privilege rules.

Hungate, explaining why the subcommittee dropped the privileges rules, said many of the witnesses who testified in six days of

hearings felt "everybody already knows the law of privilege," so that it didn't need to be in the proposed evidence rules.

The rules dropped by the subcommittee included:

Lawyer-client privilege, which was generally the same as most current state laws.

Husband-wife privilege which was much more restrictive than most state laws and was criticized as having a profound effect on family relationships.

Psychotherapist-patient privilege substituted for the more general doctor-patient privilege, which was left out of the rules by the drafters.

State secrets, which also included "official information" in addition to secrets relating to the national defense or foreign relations.

The last privilege was especially controversial amid the debate over executive privilege as it relates to the Watergate scandals and the dairy co-op case, in which milk price supports were increased while substantial contributors by the dairy co-ops were being made to President Nixon's re-election campaign.

The Supreme Court however, could adopt a ruling similar to the evidence rules' state secrets provision when the Watergate subpoena cases reach the high court.

The federal rules route, however, would have had the acquiescence of Congress, and therefore probably would have carried greater weight and been more definitive than a disputed Supreme Court ruling on the subject of official secrets and executive privilege.

Hungate noted that the main criticism of the rules, other than on the privileges issue, was a lack of notice to the legal community and the general public. To eliminate this, the tentative revised rules were open to comment last month.

Hungate expected the subcommittee to resume work on the rules after Congress' August recess, with hopes of reporting the revised rules to the full Judiciary Committee by Oct. 1. He said floor action is expected by the House before this session of Congress ends.

Since the bill provides that the rules won't take effect until six months after enactment, the new rules will not be in use in federal courts until at least a year after the Supreme Court originally intended for them to become effective.

In revising the rules into an act of Congress, the subcommittee was also careful to make technical changes in the wording of the rules to make it clear that the Supreme Court cannot make law when it "prescribes" rules "pursuant to statutory authority," in the wording of the revised rules. To this end, the new provision for the Supreme Court to amend the evidence rules gives either house of Congress 180 days, instead of 90, to veto any amendment.

STATEMENT ON REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S WAGE-PRICE POWER

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to repeal the Economic Stabilization Act which gives the President the authority to impose wage and price controls. Recent experience with the phase 3½ price freeze has clearly demonstrated that price controls tend to create shortages and distortions. Furthermore, the phase 3½ freeze as well as the earlier freeze which the President announced on August 15, 1971, have shown that short-term freezes are not effective in permanently slowing the rate of inflation.

In examining the President's economic program, it is essential to point out that the two freezes within the past 2 years were announced amid vastly different economic conditions. In 1971, the economy was recovering from a recession. There was substantial overcapacity as the unemployment rate in August 1971, stood at 6.1 percent overall and 5.7 percent among experienced wage and salary workers. The inflation rate was not very severe prior to the imposition of the freeze. In the 9 months from December 1970, until August 1971, the overall rise in the Consumer Price Index was 3.8 percent while the rise in food prices was 4.8 percent. The economy on which the President imposed the August 1971 freeze was thus not greatly overheated and controls might have been expected to work.

The announced purpose of the August 1971 freeze was to slow the rate of inflation so that we might return to a free market economy with a lower rate of inflation than prior to the freeze. The freeze was successful in holding down prices during the freeze period which is not really surprising. The significant statistic is the rate of price increase which occurred in the post-freeze bulge. From November 1971, until February 1972, the Consumer Price Index rose at an annual rate of 4.8 percent while food prices rose at a 9.7 percent rate. No one can tell what the rate of inflation would have been in the absence of a freeze, but most economists agree that much of the price increase pressure was merely postponed during the freeze and showed up afterwards when the freeze was lifted.

In mid-1973, the economy was operating very close to capacity. In May 1973, the overall unemployment rate was 5 percent and the rate among experienced wage and salary workers was 4.6 percent. In the first quarter of 1973, GNP increased at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 15.2 percent including a 17.8-percent rise in consumer expenditures for food products. During the phase III period prior to the imposition of the latest freeze on June 18, the CPI increased at an annual rate of 8.3 percent while food prices increased at the rate of 20.3 percent. In this setting, a price freeze could be expected to be disastrous as well as ineffective. This is exactly what happened.

Immediately after the imposition of the freeze, it became evident that distortions were appearing in many sectors of the economy. The food industry was by far the hardest hit because demand had been surging and wholesale and commodity prices were rising sharply in the period prior to June 13. At the same time, retailers and wholesalers had not yet adjusted their prices to reflect their increased costs and a squeeze resulted.

Raisers of livestock and poultry received the most publicity on their problems, but the hardships extended to many industries. Vegetable and fruit wholesalers were forced to sell products at a loss since raw farm prices were not frozen. Margarine producers were faced with losses if they continued production and flour millers were faced with a similar problem.

Since July 18, when the President lifted the price freeze on all food products except beef, the detrimental effects of controls on the beef industry have been highlighted. Slaughter figures are down sharply this week and there are widespread reports of beef shortages.

The post-freeze price bulge will apparently eat up most of the slowdown which was accomplished by the freeze. A Newsweek survey this week of prices in five major cities reported price increases of up to 22 percent on pork chops, 18 percent on lamb chops, and 35 percent on bacon. These are admittedly extreme examples, but Herbert Stein, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has warned that further food price rises are in store. All experts agree that the beef price will rise substantially whenever the freeze is lifted on that product.

There are those who argued for the imposition of direct wage and price controls on the grounds that there is no other way to prevent runaway inflation. This proposition overlooks the fact that the Federal Government has been pursuing an extremely inflationary monetary-fiscal policy.

If our past experience of the last 2 years has taught us anything it is that our economy defies simple solutions to complex monetary problems. With the economy in its current expansionary state it is essential that the Federal Government pursue a policy of fiscal restraint.

The freeze of August 15 turned out not to be a short temporary action, but the story of a long drawn out policy that is now in phase IV. There cannot be a phase V, we must move to completely eliminate wage and price controls and let the pressures of the marketplace work.

The period since August 15, 1971, has seen some of the sharpest increases in the cost of living, an unprecedented attack on the dollar abroad, and now policies to restrict the export of American products. It is my opinion that the U.S. economy and the interests of the consumer, of labor, and of industry will be better served by a lack of direct economic controls. I am, therefore, introducing this bill to repeal the Economic Stabilization Act.

STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS D. KINNEY

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Thomas D. Kinney, director of Medical Education, Duke University Medical Center, intended to testify on July 26 before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor-HEW, chaired by Senator WARREN MAGNUSON. Because of the large number of individuals who requested invitations to testify before the aforementioned subcommittee, it became apparent that witnesses would have only

about 5 minutes to present their testimony. Dr. Kinney, therefore, is submitting his statement to the committee staff for insertion in the RECORD of the hearings. I would also like to place his very cogent statement into the RECORD.

I believe Dr. Kinney's remarks commending the budget of the National Institutes of Health, one of our greatest national resources in the field of medicine, are particularly timely and I commend Dr. Kinney's statement to all who are concerned with medical research:

STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS D. KINNEY

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Committee, I am Thomas D. Kinney, M.D., Professor and Chairman of the Department of Pathology, Duke University, and Past-President of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology. The Federation consists of the American Physiological Society, the American Society of Biological Chemists, the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, the American Society for Experimental Pathology, the American Institute of Nutrition, and the American Association of Immunologists, with a membership of 13,000. Approximately one half of the members of the Societies teach in the Nation's 110 medical schools. The remainder are members of the faculties of universities and colleges, work in nonprofit research institutions, in the pharmaceutical industry, or are employed by the Federal Government. As experimental biologists, we provide most of the basic discoveries which undergird the improvement of medical care for the Nation.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this Committee for the support of the budget for the National Institutes of Health.

I reviewed the Administration's budget for fiscal year 1974 and I am deeply concerned that the proposed budgets for all Institutes, with the exception of Cancer and Heart, have been decreased. The largest decrease, over 13 million, was in the National Institute of General Medical Sciences. I am also alarmed at the obvious trend to increase funding for "targeted" research through contracts at the expense of grants. The grant mechanism has prevailed for more than 20 years with an enviable record of success.

The National Institutes of Health represents a Federal establishment which, since World War II, has built a reputation of excellence, both nationally and internationally. NIH supported most of the Nobel Laureates awarded prizes during this period in the fields of Chemistry, Physiology or Medicine.

During the past several years, there has been an effort to industrialize research and to do away with the peer-review system, to phase out training grants and to dismantle NIH. I find it most difficult to understand this reasoning or to comprehend its justification. Contracts have led to reduction in the work load of many study sections where a merit review and a critical evaluation of program objectives by outstanding Federal and non-Federal scientists have recommended awards based upon quality and promise toward the improvement of the health of the American people. History has proven that the grant system has worked and has been successful. Now we are faced with the proposition that scientific merit and quality should give way to an evaluation system through the contract mechanism and that awards should be made on the basis of the low bidder. Loss of faith in the old system will produce pedestrian science and will lead to higher costs, and, very possibly, to overruns.

The Office of Management and Budget has suggested a dissolution of study sections. In proposing this surgery, OMB has suggested that reviews of grant applications be made by in-house staff. Most Institutes lack the trained professional personnel to carry out this most important function properly. In-house reviews divorced from outside peer review of both contracts and grants can lead to no less than the support of mediocre research.

The rate of discovery of new biomedical knowledge essential to the health of the American people will suffer if the Administration's proposed—

1. Elimination of training grants and fellowships,
2. Reduction in research grants,
3. Funding in capitation grants below levels recommended,
4. Elimination of construction funds,

are allowed to stand. A gradual erosion of our entire health system will occur at a time when we need to improve the delivery and application of research findings.

Let me say an additional word about contracts. We are not at a point where all fundamental knowledge has been delivered. We are, therefore, not in a position to offer "crash" programs for delivery of a service or a product when the product is unknown. Contracts, for the most part, are for procurement purposes or product delivery. Research grants provide the information by which services and products can be delivered. I urge that grant and contract funds be a single line item for each Institute budget. The study sections and advisory councils of the individual Institutes should determine, based on relevancy, quality and merit, the mechanism for funding. Such a system would improve flexibility for funding both programs and peer review for all.

The Federal budgetary "pinch" is with us. The scientific community is well aware that economies are required. Science for science's sake is no longer saluted, but we need not make scientific research the scapegoat for our budget deficits. We admit the need for careful selection and we should not invest in marginal risks and long shots. We are the taxpayers too. Nevertheless, biomedical research has delivered better drugs, better surgery, better vaccines. Research has also led to prevention and cures for diseases and afflictions that two decades ago crippled the population. The rapid return of sick individuals to the work force has more than repaid the costs of research.

The Administration's budget for fiscal 1974 proposes drastic shifts in priorities for support of research and training of biologists. The medical schools and universities are being heavily affected by this precipitous action. I am sure you have read about the dilemma faced by two of the leading medical schools of the District of Columbia—Georgetown and George Washington. The same situation prevails at Duke, as well as at most other schools and universities which have been engaged heavily in biomedical research. The situation looks grave for 1974; it would appear worse in years to come. We could easily be set back a decade by the loss of trained manpower alone. Biomedical research knows no boundaries. Many of the breakthroughs which have contributed to the improvement of the health of mankind have emanated from among the various Institutes, regardless of the categorical designation or the area of research of a particular scientist.

The Administration is interested in more trained physicians, national health insurance, better health care, while at the same time abolishing training grants which over the years have provided the manpower this country needed to produce the doctors required to take care of the rapidly expanding population in the United States. Reduction of funding for research grants and training grants has already seriously affected most of the medical schools throughout the country. The trend must be reversed. This matter deserves the most serious consideration of this Committee. American medical schools, because of lack of funding, facilities, etc., have been forced to turn away many of the best student applicants. Because of the doctor shortage, this country now depends on foreign-trained physicians. Of the 54,600 interns and resident physicians in the U.S. hospitals, 17,500 are foreign trained.

I think it foolhardy to reduce the support of other NIH activities in order to provide increased funding for Cancer and Heart —a reshuffling of the budget is not the way to go. I support adequate funding for the two major Institutes, but certainly not to the detriment of other research endeavors.

The basic tenet of the Hippocratic doctrine urges physicians "to hold fast to that which is good." The present crisis in the funding of medical research may destroy that which most of us think is good and may turn out to be the worst decision in recent years.

I recommend, therefore, that long-term national harm be avoided and that this Committee restore support to each of the NIH programs, at least to the fiscal 1972 levels.

This concludes my testimony. I will be pleased to answer questions.

SOUTH VIETNAMESE POLICE AND PRISON SYSTEM

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the abuses that the South Vietnamese Government has made of its police and prison system have been well documented by investigative committees of the Congress, as well as by numerous private organizations. Nothing that I could say would express the mentality of the regime in dealing with dissent as well as a communique I received from the South Vietnamese Embassy. The communique accuses those who have brought to light the excesses of the prison system of being Communist-led. It is the kind of accusation we thought was abandoned by civilized societies more than a decade ago. Its presence in an official statement by the South Vietnamese Government indicates one of the sources of the intolerable political conditions that exist in that country today. I commend this to all my colleagues' attention.

Excerpts from the communique follow:

During the recent months, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Viet-Nam has received many private letters and petitions from various communist or leftist organizations which purposely distorted the truth about the treatment of prisoners in the Republic of Viet-Nam. Other letters were intervening for the release of some detainees.

After carefully studying the contents the Ministry realizes that nearly all of these letters and petitions are written or cyclostyled under the same formula and signed by members of related organizations. This fact proves that this is a campaign of intoxication directed and orchestrated by International Communism. Under the label of peace and solidarity movements, International Communism has exploited the name of justice and humanity to foment a campaign of denigration and pressure aiming at forcing the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam to release their comrades.

To answer the communists once and for all, as well as to enlighten those who are innocently poisoned by the communist dis-

torted propaganda, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs attaches hereafter its views regarding the baseless denunciations of the communists.

The problem of the return of Vietnamese civilian personnel is governed by Article 8(c) of the Paris Agreement and Article 7 of the related Protocol and is under the competence of the Two Party Joint Military Commission. Both Sides have agreed upon the designation of National Red Cross of Canada and Poland to visit all places where the captured and detained Vietnamese civilian personnel are held in conformity to Article 9(b) of the same Protocol. . . .

While speaking of the so-called "political prisoners" in South Viet-Nam, the communists as well as misinformed people purposely negate the existence of democracy and freedom in the RVN, two principles for which this country has been fighting.

If by "political prisoners" one means people detained only because of their opposition to the policies of the Government, then there are no "political prisoners" in South Viet-Nam. Nobody has been arrested merely for having expressed his views against the Government. On the contrary, as shown by facts, South Viet-Nam members of the opposition are freely advocating their views in Parliament and in the press.

If by "political prisoners" one means those people belonging to organizations whose main aim is to overthrow the elected Government of South Viet-Nam, such as the NLF, and who performed subversive activities on behalf of these organizations, then the fate of these prisoners will be determined by Article 8(c) of the Agreement and Article 7 of the related Protocol.

That is all the excerpts.

HON. MENDEL DAVIS ADDRESSES PRAYER GROUP

HON. TOM S. GETTYS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges that Capitol Hill staff employees have is to attend the weekly Wednesday breakfast prayer meeting. At each such meeting the discussion is led by a Member of the House or a House employee.

Members of the House hold our weekly prayer group breakfast on Thursday and at which a Member always leads the discussions.

Representative MENDEL DAVIS of South Carolina addressed the Capitol Hill employees prayer group on August 1. I heard so many complimentary comments concerning the remarks of Congressman DAVIS from those in attendance that I asked for a copy of his address, and I am so impressed with the thoughts expressed by my friend and colleague that I am placing his entire talk in the RECORD for the benefit of all to read. Nothing is more important in our world today, Mr. Speaker, than having sincere, dedicated and Christian men in Government service. I recommend the reading of the thoughtful remarks of Congressman DAVIS.

The remarks follow:

CAPITOL HILL EMPLOYEES PRAYER GROUP

The Bible says . . . in 2nd Corinthians . . . "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

I would like for all of us to think of those words today as we are gathered here . . . and what those words have meant to Americans for generations. As we approach the 4th of July in the year 1976 . . . the 200th celebration of our liberty as a Nation . . . it is important that we think once more of "The spirit of the Lord."

The founders of this Nation had no doubts about the spirit of the Lord being caught up in the daily workings of the United States Government and its people. When the Declaration of Independence was framed on July 4, 1776, God was everywhere a part of the daily existence of those great men . . . and they naturally included the Lord in their declaration . . . a document which has gone on to become one of the most outstanding statements on the condition of man the world has ever seen.

"When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the Earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them. . . ." they said in opening.

And they said . . . "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights . . ."

And in closing, they said . . . "We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America, in general Congress, appealing to the supreme Judge of the World . . ."

And finally, knowing that what they were about to sign amounted to a declaration of revolution against the King of England . . . and realizing, also, that their future was uncertain . . . and uncharted . . . and fraught with danger and suffering . . . they turned again to the Lord. They said:

"And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

There were no questions of faith . . . or of God's overwhelming influence . . . in the colonial America of 1776. The founders of this country . . . the leaders of our revolution for freedom . . . knew that the future safety of this Nation lay with the wishes of God. They accepted that as a matter of course.

And the spirit of the Lord permeated the Government they created. No one ruled the United States by divine right. Man, they said, was created equal before the Lord . . . and, therefore, he ought to be equal before the law, if that law reflected the Lord's will. And, they held, the average citizen of this country should run his country . . . because each citizen was a creature of the Lord . . . and this Nation was created by men with faith in God.

God was very real to such men as Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson. Men such as those signers of the declaration understood that a Nation starting out forgetful of God's law and God's absolute power could not long survive.

We have survived now for nearly 200 years . . . and maybe it is time that we look again at our responsibilities to God as American citizens. If we have forgotten our reliance on the Lord, maybe this is the day when we shall hear His commandment to us again.

In the Book of Micah, in the sixth chapter and the eighth verse, there is a quotation which I think sums up pretty well what God would have us do as Americans. To me, the words have always had special meaning. If the founding fathers had chosen one passage from the Bible to express their duties to God as the country left the fold of Great Britain to sail alone, I think they would have chosen these words from Micah:

"He hath shown thee, O man, what is good: and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

To do justly . . . to love mercy . . . to walk humbly with thy God.

The Lord asks that we do justly. He is speaking to all of us as individuals in our daily lives. He is asking that we do unto others as we would have them do unto us. He is telling us to do *good* in our dealings with each other . . . that we remember to be just in our daily lives.

Government in this great land of ours ultimately means government by individual citizens. If the United States is to do justly . . . if it is to be known in the world as a land of justice and good . . . then it is the responsibility of each one of us to see that justice prevails . . . that moral rightness pervades our day-to-day lives . . . and that God's law is practiced by each one of us in our dealings with each other.

Not just when the heat's on. Not just when it suits us. Not just when we agree with justice. But always. We must not surrender justness . . . and we must not compromise it for the quick reward of the moment.

People speak today of immorality in government. They look on the Congress and the executive branch and their politicians in general, and they say that morality has departed the government.

But in our democratic society, government only reflects the mood of the people . . . no better, no worse. If our government does not abide by God's law . . . if it is not just . . . then the people must make it so. We must do justice to ourselves, our fellow man, and our God if we are to live a life that will be worthy of heavenly reward.

If justice and right do not prevail in our land . . . it is up to all of us to live as God would have us live to make it so.

And God would have us love mercy, also Does this mean that we should love the criminal who escapes his penalty because of a technicality? Does it mean we should lay down our arms overnight in order to be kind to our enemies? I think not.

I think it *does* mean that we should have room in our hearts to forgive those who wrong us . . . that we must not forget our ability to be gentle when violence is all around us. The most merciful man who ever walked the Earth was Jesus Christ . . . the Son of God. He loved his fellow man . . . saw him as an imperfect creature . . . and was able to forgive him, even as he died on the cross. His lesson to us is that we must overcome generations of hate and remember that a merciful man follows in the footsteps of Jesus.

It is easy to strike back in anger. It is hard to turn the other cheek. Jesus turned the other cheek time after time . . . and he did not equivocate on the matter. Being merciful does not connote weakness. We are the strongest, most powerful people on earth in terms of arms and treasure. But Jesus spoke of another kind of strength . . . an inner fortitude that made it possible for him to be kind to his enemies and to those less fortunate.

We are all God's children on this earth. We were all created in his image. If we are strong but have no mercy to show . . . no charity in our hearts . . . then we are working to dissolve that image.

Jesus showed us how to be merciful. "Go and do thou likewise" he said. We can make America a merciful nation and include all mankind in our tomorrows.

Certainly, the signers of the Declaration of Independence in the year 1776 understood God's mercy. It was because the King of England showed no mercy on his American colonies that those brave men decided the time had come for the American people to strike out on their own.

"In every stage of these oppressions" . . . the signers declared . . . "we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince, whose character

is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be a ruler of a free people."

This Nation was founded on mercy. If that fundamental precept has departed our national character, we must work . . . you and I . . . to see that it returns.

And we must walk humbly with our God. If a man cannot walk humbly with his God . . . in his own way and at his own speed . . . he cannot walk with his fellow man. God taught us peace through the life of Jesus . . . the most splendid life ever lived on this earth. Jesus taught us not to worship violence . . . any kind of violence, be it looting and burning or neglect of our poor and homeless. If we are not men of peace, we are not walking humbly with our God.

We cannot imagine ourselves as being God's equal . . . but there are many among us in this land today who think they are. They despoil what God created. They dispute God's word. They disobey God's laws. They are not humble before God.

Being humble before our Lord does not suggest weakness. Nor does being merciful. Nor does practicing justice. They reflect an inner strength . . . A realization of our power and our goodness as a Nation.

If we do justly . . . if we love mercy . . . And if we walk humbly with our Lord, this great Nation will last forever. . . . And the world will take note again of the greatness of the American people.

On July 4, 1776, the signers of the Declaration of Independence had no question about the greatness of the American people . . . because they did not question that this was a Nation under God . . . and a Nation under God's laws.

It is for us today to rededicate ourselves in their belief. To say to them . . . "We have listened . . . and we have heard . . . and what you planned for us so many years ago is still coming true."

The spirit of the Lord is still with us . . . and there is still liberty burning brightly in this Nation.

FREEDOM OF EMIGRATION

HON. HAROLD V. FROEHLICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. FROEHLICH. Mr. Speaker, I have been somewhat concerned by a recent Evans and Novak column which disclosed that the President had issued a warning to certain congressional leaders not to allow the issue of the Soviet Union's emigration policy to interfere with his efforts to establish a working trade relationship with Soviet officials. The thrust of the column appears to be that, in the President's view, enactment of the Jackson amendment or the Vanik-Mills bill, which I have cosponsored would impede his pledge to Chairman Brezhnev to grant most-favored-nation treatment and Export-Import Bank credits to the Soviet Union.

It is apparently the position of the administration, as enunciated by Dr. Kissinger, that even if Moscow needs U.S. trade and credits so badly that it will permit the U.S. Congress to dictate its emigration policy, the United States should use this advantage to extract concessions affecting the entire United States, not one "favored group" or foreign country.

Dr. Kissinger's statement suggests that he and his cohorts may not be familiar with the actual text of the proposals before Congress. The Vanik-Mills bill and the Jackson amendment prohibit most-favored-nation treatment and commercial and guarantee agreements to any nonmarket economy country which denies to its citizens the right to emigrate or which imposes more than nominal fees upon its citizens as a condition to emigration. Note the terms—"any nonmarket economy country" and "its citizens." These proposals do not regulate trade with Russia alone. They would apply to any country with restrictive emigration policies, including the Soviet Union. They would apply to Romania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany, to name but a few. In addition, the term "its citizens" does not mean one favored group. It means all citizens within a country, regardless of race, religion, or creed.

The plight of the Soviet Jews has made headlines and it has proved to be the impetus needed for the legislative proposals now pending in the Congress. But restrictive emigration practices, in addition to not being limited to the Soviet Union, are not limited to Jews. Statistics indicate that there are more than 1,000 gentiles presently in Romania who desire to emigrate to the United States in order to join close relatives here. They are being prohibited by the Romanian Government from doing so. There are also approximately 3,000 people in Poland, very few of whom are Jewish, presently being denied the right to emigrate to the United States to be reunited with their families. The legislation I have co-sponsored is designed to rectify these injustices as well as those which presently exist in the Soviet Union.

There are two other points that should be considered. The first deals with most-favored-nation treatment and credit guarantees. It should be remembered that the pending legislation does not prohibit all trade. It only prohibits subsidized or preferential trade such as that granted under most-favored-nation treaty clauses. The legislation simply provides that countries with repressive emigration policies and procedures will not be granted all rights and privileges which are granted to the "most-favored-nations" in the area of international commerce.

The second point deals with an inherent human right which, to my mind, transcends man-made laws and statutes. It is the right of the individual to live free from repression and suppression. When such freedom is denied him, when a person is prosecuted or persecuted because of his beliefs or convictions, be they religious or political, he should have the right to remove himself from the country which binds him. When he can no longer live in peace, then he should have the right to leave in peace.

To those who deny the existence of such a moral law or such an inherent human right, however, the written record is clear. Freedom of emigration is reinforced by existing international law. The Universal Declaration on Human Rights—regarded by international lawyers as the authoritative interpretation and extension of the U.N. Charter—in article 13, paragraph 2, sets forth the right of everyone to leave any country, including his own. A declaration sponsored by the Soviet Union, the Declaration on Colonialism, which was adopted by the United Nations in 1960, calls upon all states to observe faithfully and strictly all the provisions of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. This would, of course, include article 13, paragraph 2.

The International Convention on Racial Discrimination, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly in December 1965, specifies in article 5, paragraph 4, subsection 2, that contracting parties obligate themselves to respect the right of anyone to leave any country. The Soviet Union ratified this Convention in January 1969, thus making it binding law in that country.

Article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted unanimously by the U.N. General Assembly in December 1966, calls for the right of anyone to leave any country. The Soviet Union signed this covenant.

Thus, the public posture of the Soviet Union is public knowledge. How can valid objections be made to a proposal which is but a reiteration of these agreements.

Our country's commitment to the cause of aiding those who flee repression and persecution is inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty. It should also be inscribed in our hearts.

Let us search our hearts as we ponder this issue and let the conscience of our country decide, on the basis of our heritage and tradition, not on the alleged threat of a breach in détente.

TAX ANALYSTS AND ADVOCATES CALLS FOR INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF NIXON PAPERS GIFT

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, people outside of Congress have forcefully brought to the public attention questions concerning matters that may involve the President's tax return.

I realize that this is a very serious matter. So that all of my colleagues may know what these questions are, I am attaching to the end of my statement a copy of a press release dated July 30, 1973, from Tax Analysts and Advocates, a public interest tax law firm located here in Washington.

In addition to this press release, I am including a letter signed by Mr. Thomas F. Field, executive director of Tax Analysts and Advocates, dated July 30, 1973, and addressed to Donald C. Alexander, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

I hope all Members will give close attention to the issues raised in these two documents.

The material follows:

TAX ANALYSTS AND ADVOCATES CALLS FOR INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF NIXON PAPERS GIFT

WASHINGTON.—Tax Analysts and Advocates has called upon Internal Revenue Commissioner Donald C. Alexander to consider the appointment of independent auditors to determine whether President Nixon was entitled to a $570,000 tax deduction for pre-Presidential papers his spokesmen claim were donated to the National Archives ahead of a deadline set by the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

Ira L. Tannenbaum, Director of Tax Advocates, a public interest law firm here, has conducted a detailed analysis of the Presidential papers question based upon publicly available information. He concludes that the President is not entitled to a tax deduction because he "did not give over control of his papers to the Archives," so as to constitute a valid gift by the cut-off-date.

On the basis of the 16-page Tannenbaum study, Thomas F. Field, Executive Director of TA/A, recommended in a letter to be formally delivered on Monday (July 30) to Internal Revenue Commissioner Alexander, that he "investigate these issues thoroughly" and "give serious consideration to placing the investigation in the hands of independent tax auditors appointed for this purpose." Appointment of such auditors would be similar to Attorney General Elliot L. Richardson's appointment of special Watergate prosecutor Archibald Cox.

Assuming a 50% tax bracket for the President, the $570,000 deduction would be worth $285,000 in tax savings spread over a maximum six year period. Because the statute of limitations already has run out on the tax return filed for 1969, as much as $75,000 probably cannot be collected by the IRS if the deduction proves to be invalid.

According to published reports in The Washington Post, and not contradicted by Presidential spokesmen, President Nixon transferred 1,217 cubic feet of pre-Presidential documents to the National Archives in March 1969, about four months prior to the effective date of the 1969 tax law provisions that limited to the cost of the items themselves, tax deductions for papers and other memorabilia created by the donor. Ultimately, 382 cubic feet of papers were specifically selected after the cut-off date as a gift.

Not only has there been no delivery or acceptance of the documents in a manner to qualify as a gift under the law, but the deed purporting to make a gift to the United States of the documents was never delivered to the General Services Administration, the custodian of federal property, before the deadline for making the gift.

Thus, Tannenbaum argued, the $570,000 tax deduction the President claimed for the alleged gift is not proper.

Tannenbaum acknowledged that, unless fraud were proved, the three-year statute of limitations already had run out on the President's 1969 tax return. But a carry-forward provision in the 1969 tax act makes it almost certain that portions of the deduction were taken in tax years 1970 through 1972, which are still open for tax assessments. "In the normal course of events," Tannenbaum wrote, "if IRS agents determined, as we have, based upon the preliminary evidence available, that full charitable deductions taken in 1970 and subsequent years, stemming from the 1969 purported gift of Presidential papers, were not justified . . . a thorough audit of the tax returns in question would be made."

If the audit showed that the facts were to be substantially similar to those outlined in the press reports, Tannenbaum continued, "the Internal Revenue Service would file a notce of deficiency."

"However, it is obvous that Internal Revenue Service agents and their superiors . . . would be extremely reluctant to audit the tax returns of the President of the United States as if he were an ordinary taxpayer. Or even if the IRS were willing to conduct such an audit, in view of the fact that the results of such an IRS audit would be questioned as to whether they were reached in the proper disinterested manner. We have no knowledge whether any previous incumbent presidents were subject to IRS audits."

In view of all this, Tannenbaum said, "the retention of special, independent auditors would appear to be preferable to an ordinary IRS invesigation to evaluate the correctness of President Nixon's personal tax returns for those years in which charitable contribution deductions were taken for the papers transferred to the National Archives in 1969."

"The value in subjecting the President's tax returns to such an audit obviously is not merely in attacking in an additional manner a man, a number of whose actions currently are subject to criticism and investigation," he continued. "Rather, there is an important need to make clear to the American public that income taxes of Americans in positions of power and high visibility are being assessed correctly, and that the tax laws are being fairly applied to them. If clear cases of non-compliance, such as permitting charitable deductions for the 1969 donation of Nixon papers, are permitted to occur without challenge by the Internal Revenue Service, the Service will run a substantial risk of greater non-compliance with the tax laws by average taxpayers. American taxpayers are willing to pay their fair share under our self-assessment tax system only if they believe more visible taxpayers are also paying their legal share."

The Tax Reform Act of 1969, in effect, limited tax deductions for gifts of letters and memoranda by federal officials to the cost of the paper on which they were written instead of the value to collectors of such memorabilia. The provision contained an effective date of July 25, 1969, so delivery and acceptance of President Nixon's papers before that date were necessary for him to be eligible for anything more than what probably would have been a nominal deduction.

Tannenbaum said that the applicable criteria for determining whether and when a gift was made which would qualify for a charitable contribution deduction under Section 170(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code and the relevant regulations are those developed under the common law of gifts. Under this law, there are three basic requirements for the making of a valid gift:

The donor must possess the intent to give.

There must be a physical transfer of the gift to the recipient coupled with the relinquishment of dominion and control over the property or, alternatively, there must be a deed or gift executed by the donor and delivered to the donee.

The donee must accept.

These conditions were not fully met in the purported gift of the pre-Presidential papers, Tannenbaum asserted.

Tannenbaum does not discuss the question of the President's intent, because little evidence concerning this requirement has been made public. However, he said, there is much evidence that there was no delivery for the purposes of making a gift prior to the July 25, 1969, deadline.

The mere fact that the papers were transferred to the Archives in March 1969 is not proof of a delivery for purposes of determining whether a gift was legally made, Tannenbaum said. The Archives also serve as a storage facility for the papers of public officials, he noted, and transfer of the papers could have been merely a preliminary step to the making of a gift to the Archives or else a temporary move preparatory to transfer elsewhere. As of the July 25, 1969, deadline, it appears the President legally could have regained possession of any or all of the papers delivered earlier to the Archives.

There was no delivery by deed, Tannenbaum went on. He said court precedents show that for transfer of a gift to have legally occurred, the instrument of transfer, if one is used, must be outside the control of the donor. The deed, unsigned by President Nixon, was not transmitted to the Archives until some time in 1970, well past the July 1969 deadline.

The requirement that the gift be accepted by the donee still is unmet, Tannenbaum asserted, because the Archives has given no formal acceptance of the proffered papers which apparently were offered to the Archives subject to numerous conditions which might cause the Archives ultimately to reject the papers. The deed, forwarded to the Archives in 1970, still has not been countersigned by the General Services Administration, the official custodian of such gifts, to signify its acceptance of the Nixon papers.

The General Services Administration has not complied with TA/A's request under the Freedom of Information Act to produce the relevant documents, including a copy of the deed. Attempts to reach the lawyers who represented the President were not successful. However, since the publication during June of the stories, there have been no press reports contradicting the original statement of the facts.

TAX ANALYSTS AND ADVOCATES,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1973.

Re: Auditing the President's Tax Returns

Hon. DONALD C. ALEXANDER,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: Enclosed is an analysis which has just been completed by Ira L. Tannenbaum of my staff. As you will see, it deals with the tax deductions claimed by President Nixon in connection with a 1969 transfer of papers to the National Archives. This analysis will appear in today's edition of our publication, *Tax Notes*.

We have not undertaken this study in a partisan spirit. Our job is to analyze tax issues for the press in response to inquiries—and there have been many press inquiries since the Washington Post first published the basic facts relating to the President's 1969 transfers of papers. The enclosed study represents our professional response to those questions.

As a tax lawyer, I see no adequate basis for the claim that the President is entitled to a $570,000 tax deduction for his 1969 transfer of papers to the National Archives. The reasons for this conclusion are set forth in the enclosed analysis. That analysis indicates quite clearly, I think, that there are strong grounds for proposing audit adjustments in connection with the President's recent tax returns.

Due to the lapse of time, the statute of limitations now bars any adjustment of the President's tax liabilities for the year 1969. But the year 1970, and subsequent years, are still open for assessment, and it appears that the carryover deductions available to the President in those years with respect to his transfer of papers almost certainly exceed those claimed in 1969.

The complete facts regarding the President's 1969 transfers of papers are not in the

public domain. But, if the same facts were known in connection with an ordinary citizen as are now on the public record in connection with the President's 1969 transfer of papers, an audit would almost certainly be undertaken by the Internal Revenue Service. Under the circumstances, anyone interested in maintaining public confidence in the fairness of the tax system must necessarily be concerned about the possibility that nothing will be done to audit those of the President's tax returns that are still open under the statute of limitations.

The audit of a President's tax returns is obviously a highly sensitive business, and a President is certainly entitled to the same procedural safeguards in this connection as are other citizens. However, the problems connected with a Presidential tax audit can be lessened, without lessening public confidence in the fairness of the proceedings, by appointing independent tax auditors. This proposal is explored in more detail in the enclosed analysis. You are, of course, in a better position than I to judge what audit procedure is most appropriate in the circumstances.

I agree with your view, recently reported in the press, that the principal challenge facing you as Commissioner is maintenance of public confidence in the integrity of the Internal Revenue Service. This goal cannot be achieved unless the very serious questions relating to the tax treatment of the President's 1969 transfer of papers are resolved in a way that is perceived by the public to be fair and impartial. I therefore urge you to investigate these issues thoroughly and to give serious consideration to placing the investigation in the hands of independent tax auditors appointed for this purpose.

Best regards,

THOMAS F. FIELD,
Executive Director.

THE "TRUCE" IN VIETNAM

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a report to the International Commission for Control and Supervision—ICCS— in Saigon by a Canadian truce supervisory team. In a straightforward and absolutely clear manner, this report accuses North Vietnam of continuing its troop infiltration of South Viet-Nam in deliberate violation of the Paris truce agreement.

The news accounts of the contents of this report quote sections of the report in sufficient detail to provide solid evidence that repeated continuous deliberate truce violations by North Vietnam is and has been occurring since the signing of the cease-fire agreement in January 1973.

It should be noted and emphasized that the Canadian Government has withdrawn from participation in the ICCS, because of flagrant truce violations by North Vietnam. This Canadian report explains that government's decision to end its participation in the ICCS, a decision also prompted by what the Canadian Government has asserted is the intransigence of the ICCS Polish and Hungarian members to supervise the cease-fire in a fair and impartial manner.

The ICCS was created early this year as an international "third party" agency to administer the truce which was supposed to be brought about by the Paris agreement signed last January 27. Since then, the United States has withdrawn its troops from Vietnam in accordance with this agreement and a later one signed June 13, also in Paris. But as every Member of the House most surely is aware, blood still is being shed in Viet-Nam. That war continues despite the agreements to end it. Too little publicity has been given to the responsibility of North Vietnam for this situation and these events.

A number of allegations have appeared in the news media concerning whose fault it is that the fighting in Vietnam has not been halted. Scores of accusations against all parties to the Paris agreements have been lodged with respect to violations. These allegations and accusations have some from the parties themselves, which tends to lessen their merit in the eyes of skeptics.

But now comes the Canadian report with accusations and allegations of its own, which must by any fair-minded person be considered impartial, for the Canadians have no advantage to gain by this action, and indeed have criticized the United States on many occasions.

According to the report, North Vietnam has engaged in "massive" and "unrelenting" infiltration of troops into South Vietnam's Mekong Delta since the January cease-fire. Thousands of fresh troops, it says, have come and are coming into South Vietnam, never having heard of the Paris accords, the various peacekeeping forces, or the departure of the U.S. troops.

These North Vietnamese soldiers left their own country just about the time the Paris agreement was signed in January, the report says, and they were instructed to keep coming, even though article 7 of the agreement expressly prohibits such troop movements.

This Canadian report was based on interrogations of captured North Vietnamese soldiers, who said they entered South Vietnam in June after a 5-month march down the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos and Cambodia. In addition, the report says, large groups of North Vietnamese civilians—including doctors, lawyers, and engineers—are entering Vietcong-held territory in South Vietnam "to practice their professions."

The Canadian report has been quoted:

> Based on the testimony of captured North Vietnamese soldiers—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 (South) 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, according to news accounts, says the North Vietnamese have conducted an "unrelenting" drive to move men and equipment down the Ho Chi Minh Trail system. Interrogated prisoners said they had crossed into South Vietnam from Cambodia in the second week of June, swimming a canal into Chaudoc Province.

The prisoners, according to the report, said they had almost no contact with any officials or soldiers of the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front during their trip. Yet these North Vietnamese troops changed into Vietcong uniforms at the border, which the Canadian report concludes is evidence once again that the military operations in South Vietnam's Mekong Delta are controlled by the North Vietnamese, not the Vietcong.

The Canadians indicated they were not sure how many North Vietnamese troops moved into the Mekong Delta since January. Captured North Vietnamese soldiers said that 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" at a rest station, because U.S. bombing had interdicted the trail ahead.

These infiltrators since captured said they hiked south along a narrow jungle trail. Truck and tank traffic used hard-surfaced parallel roads. At various places along the trail, the infiltrators would rest and receive supplies at stations operated by North Vietnamese support troops and decorated with banners welcoming the soldiers. These stations were undisturbed by bombing in Laos, they said, but often were hit by air strikes in Cambodia.

These same troops told the Canadian team that they saw at least six groups of about a hundred civilians each also heading south along the Ho Chi Minh Trail. About 8 percent of the civilians were women, they said.

Mr. Speaker, this report by an impartial Canadian truce team deserves careful consideration by this Congress and the U.S. public. It indicates that the North Vietnamese persist in their objective of conquering South Vietnam—cease-fire or no cease-fire. It indicates that North Vietnam has no intention of seeking merely a political status in South Vietnam, but rather still is determined to take over South Vietnam through force of arms—agreement or no agreement.

SHORTAGES OF BEEF

HON. BARBARA JORDAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, the sorry state of our economy is no more clearly illustrated than in the growing shortages of beef in supermarkets across the country. Phase after phase of new economic policies have failed to stem what now seems to be an irreversible tide of inflation, with higher prices and increasing shortages of critical products. The most serious problems are now apparent in the supply of beef. The National Association of Food Chains has estimated that beef supplies in the Nation's supermar-

kets are 40-percent below normal. Slaughterhouses and packing plants are shutting down across the country. Price gouging and black markets are cropping up in many areas. Many cattlemen are either holding their beef off the market in anticipation of higher prices once the freeze on beef is lifted, or are selling to the Canadians, Japanese, or Mexican markets which are unencumbered by the freeze. Harris County in my home State of Texas has reported that cattle rustling is occurring at double last year's rate.

The proximate cause for this acute shortage of beef is the Cost of Living Council's decision to maintain a freeze on beef until September 12. Why that magic date was chosen no one seems able to explain. While other prices of other food products have been allowed to rise to reflect cost increases, beef has an absolute ceiling price which is now far below the actual cost to beef suppliers of bringing meat to market. If current trends continue, beef may not be available at any price. What good is a ceiling price if there is no meat available at that price? The Nation is now confronted with an unpalatable choice—either we immediately allow the price of beef to rise, or we face increasing beef shortages.

Yesterday, the Senate chose to allow beef prices to rise so that beef suppliers would continue to bring their products to the American marketplace. In an 84–5 vote, the Senate adopted Senator JOHN TOWER'S, Republican of Texas amendment to remove the price freeze on beef and allow suppliers the passthrough of increases in raw agricultural product costs since June 8 on a dollar-for-dollar basis. The same day, the House Rules Committee voted 9–6 against allowing the House to consider this amendment today, deferring it instead until after the August recess. So, Mr. Speaker, the House will not have to make any difficult decisions on this critical problem today, and by the time we come back to Washington in September it will be too late. The only remaining hope for early action to avoid further shortages and black markets in beef is for the administration and the Cost of Living Council to heed the warning of the Senate vote and lift the freeze on beef. Let the American consumer at least have a choice between higher priced beef or no beef, rather than no choice at all because beef is not on the grocery shelves.

If we abdicate our responsibility today to act on this issue, let us not also abdicate our responsibility to assess the economic and agricultural policies of the Federal Government which have allowed such shortages and skyrocketing prices to occur. The entire Nation is in a state of shock as we watch the steady deterioration of the most powerful economy in the world. The Congress must discover why this has happened and help to fashion remedies for it. What are the explanations for the as yet unexplained collapse of production and the economy, the spreading crisis in food supply and cost? Why have we experienced this year the most rapid rise in retail food prices in more than 20 years? Why did inadequate competition in the food industry, in an estimate by the Federal Trade Commission, cost American consumers some $2.5 billion in higher prices in 1973? Answers to these questions and many more which we hear every day from our constituents have only been hinted at, not fully and openly addressed in the course of a thorough inquiry into the state of our economy and how to bring it back to health.

The House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law has been undertaking part of that inquiry in the past few months. These hearings on Competition and Enforcement of the Antitrust Laws in the Food Industry have raised more questions than they have answered about U.S. agriculture and its recent performance. But they have also underscored for me the Federal Government's deep involvement in regulating the food industry. Few areas of the economy can match agriculture in the number and extent of Federal controls placed upon their operation, from enforced price-fixing to strict limits on output. Thus the Federal Government must assume a large share of the blame for inadequate food supplies and high prices, and must immediately undertake the investigations and the changes needed to restore balance to the food industry.

OBJECTIONS TO SONNENFELDT CONFIRMATION MUST BE ANSWERED—PART VII

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, I began a series of RECORD insertions concerning the nomination of Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt as Under Secretary of the Treasury, which nomination is before the Senate Treasury Committee. Mr. Sonnenfeldt now is listed as Director, Operations Staff-Europe of the highly sensitive National Security Council which handles foreign policy and national security matters in the Executive Office of the President.

On May 17, the New York Times ran a first-page story by Mr. Seymour M. Hersh which began:

Henry A. Kissinger personally provided the Federal Bureau of Investigation with the names of a number of his aides on the National Security Council whom he wanted wiretapped, Justice Department sources said today.

The account went on to say that Mr. Sonnenfeldt was one of those whose phones were tapped in order to learn the source of leaks of sensitive information from within NSC.

Also mentioned in the Hersh article was John D. Hemenway who opposed the Sonnenfeldt confirmation before the Senate Finance Committee on May 15 and who listed a number of people who were familiar with other alleged leaks by Mr. Sonnenfeldt in the past.

On May 20, Mr. Hemenway wrote to the New York Times to correct misstatements which he claimed were made in the Hersh piece. As far as I can ascertain, the New York Times did not print Mr. Hemenway's letter.

On May 29, I inserted the Hersh article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 17183 and, to complete the record. I include the Hemenway letter, along with the editorial from the Evening Star on Soviet Anti-Semitism, be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 20, 1973.

THE EDITOR,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR EDITOR: Mr. Seymour M. Hersh's May 17, 1973 page one story on wire taps which were authorized by Dr. Henry A. Kissinger also contains highly misleading and inaccurate information concerning my Senate testimony opposing the nomination of Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Hersh's primary source for this material was given as Mr. Michael M. Stern, Assistant Chief Clerk of the Senate Finance Committee. Mr. Stern told me on May 19th that he viewed as inaccurate the published material concerning the Sonnenfeldt Hearing that was attributed to him. Mr. Stern was present during the entire period Mr. Sonnenfeldt and I testified.

Mr. Hersh acknowledged to me that he had not read my testimony concerning Mr. Sonnenfeldt, nor did he have a copy at the time he wrote his story. Pressed by the filing deadline for the story, he depended upon telephonic information from Mr. Stern.

In my testimony I did *not* challenge Mr. Sonnenfeldt's confirmation because Sonnenfeldt, as stated by the *NYT*, was ". . . responsible for at least two security violations in the nineteen-fifties . . ." although that seems to be a fact. In Mr. Hersh's report, an unnamed White House source ". . . noted that Mr. Sonnenfeldt 'prides himself on his brilliance and his intellectual capability' and added, 'In a very innocent way, a man like that can let things slip.'"

However, I did challenge Mr. Sonnenfeldt's confirmation for four clearly-stated reasons appearing prominently on page one of my ten-page written statement for the Committee (24 pages, counting annexes):

(1) Mr. Sonnenfeldt's professional judgement is faulty;

(2) Mr. Sonnenfeldt's personal standards of integrity are unacceptably low;

(3) Mr. Sonnenfeldt has performed acts that violate his oath of office;

(4) Mr. Sonnenfeldt's confirmation will place the Senate in the position of seeming to condone illegal acts and violations of conduct for Federal Service set by the Congress itself.

With respect to (1), Mr. Sonnenfeldt himself admitted to the Committee that his judgment on Cuba was dead wrong (a number of other episodes referred to have not been discussed by Mr. Sonnenfeldt, as yet). With respect to (2) and (3), the public record as published in the Congressional Record and the press over the years was cited by me; additionally, three episodes known to me of my own first hand knowledge were cited, but these were not in the "late nineteen fifties", as stated by Mr. Hersh (or Mr. Stern) and did not all concern security breaches. In fact these other episodes—which may not be all of them—occurred in 1963, 1971, and 1972 and all bore directly on Mr. Sonnenfeldt's integrity. Finally, with respect to (4), I cited the available evidence to establish that Mr. Sonnenfeldt's lateral entrance into the US career diplomatic service (at the relative rank of major general) was fraudulent. I introduced a statement by a senator, written at the time, citing the nomination as a crass violation of career standards, since Sonnenfeldt never had

served in a diplomatic post of any kind, domestically or overseas.

Morever, on the day Mr. Sonnenfeldt testified and again on May 17, the Senate Finance Committee was informed in writing by knowledgable persons present in the Hearing Room that Mr. Sonnenfeldt was not truthful or fully candid in his testimony on May 15. Several senators present, by their questioning of Mr. Sonnenfeldt, indicated their intention to be thorough, since the matters I had raised were either true or false and are easily capable of being proved or disproved.

No evidence was produced by Mr. Sonnenfeldt or anyone else on 15 May suggesting that Mr. Sonnenfeldt was qualified for the post of Under Secretary of the Treasury by virtue of his training, or experience, or proven wisdom. In this connection, we have only the *NYT* references to Mr. Sonnenfeldt who ". . . prides himself on his brilliance . . ." and "Henry (Kissinger, who) had (past tense in original) a high regard for Sonnenfeldt."

As the NYT knows, because of the extensive reporting on incidents connected directly or obliquely with the Watergate, Mr. Sonnenfeldt's wire was "bugged" by Dr. Kissinger. This was not the only time in his bureaucratic career that Mr. Sonnenfeldt's telephones were "bugged." Since the substance of these conversations can be proved to relate to my own personal matters I intend to demand access to the Sonnenfeldt tapes at a Civil Service Hearing now scheduled to be held later this month.

It will concern me if the NYT does not publish this clarification, since the Seymour Hersh story is the second instance in 1973, so far, containing highly misleading innuendoes about me in the NYT. For example, on January 31, 1973 (p. 14), in an article on John Stewart Service by Eric Pace, the NYT reported that ". . . newly mimeographed tracts . . . were strewn across the white napery at todays luncheon by John David Hemenway, a former Foreign Service Officer with conservative views. . . ." The 'tracts' were characterized by O. Edmund Clubb as "very vulgar". (Clubb, the NYT reveals was accused of security violations in the McCarthy era. Some source concerning such a matter!) In fact, the one-page information sheet which I handed out contained citations from Mr. Service's own dispatches from China. The quotations were presented as questions for a question period that never came. Ask "Scottie" Reston, who was present and to whom I personally gave a copy. The questions were embarassing to "old-China-hands" who wish to re-write history, perhaps; "vulgar", they were certainly not.

For the information of the NYT, I am an independent-minded American from the middle-west with moderate views, not "Conservative" as the NYT uses that term. My only previous denouncements in the press have come from the Soviet press when, in 1963, I was denounced in the virulently anti-Semitic "Judaism Without Embellishment", by the notorious Jew-baiter, Trofim K. Kichko. That book, you will recall, is something straight out of the Third Reich of Hitler, but it was published by the Ukrainian Academy of Science of the Uk.R.S.R., USSR. (The Evening Star recalled Kichko's contribution to 'science' on May 14, 1969, tear sheet attached.) On p. 99 and subsequent of that infamous book, US diplomat John David Hemenway and two Japanese companions are denounced for using their initiative to investigate the facts of the state policy of the USSR of anti-Semitism. (That was more than ten years ago, before it became fashionable.) In my view, such interests on the part of a US official in the USSR were totally consistent with the best liberal traditions of America, even if this might not jibe with the NYT image of Hemenway as a "Conservative". I hope the NYT will understand why I do not wish to be tabbed with its labels unless the paper is prepared to go into my views in greater depth than a superficial phrase.

If the NYT does not correct its inaccurate article regarding my role in the Sonnenfeldt confirmation hearings, it will cause me to wonder anew whether the two inaccurate articles are part of a pattern established by the NYT in boycotting any reports of the Hemenway Hearing at the Department of State. Your Washington reporters and your New York office have been informed over the past three years. Even the Washington Post belatedly published a page on the case (December 11, 1972). But then, Mr. John W. Dean III, in what might have been his last official act—turning down Hemenway's appeal to the President—may not be the kind of news that the NYT feels is 'fit to print'.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. HEMENWAY.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

In 1963 a Ukrainian writer named Trofin K. Kichko published a crudely anti-Semitic book called Judaism Without Embellishment. The work fit into a long tradition of Ukrainian anti-Semitism. In that province occurred the worst of the pogroms conducted by the Czarist government. In that republic took place the warmest welcome the Nazi invaders received from any Soviet group.

With that background, Kichko's book was actually a sign of Russian progress, for it was disowned and suppressed by the Soviet government.

But now the author has done it again. And his new work, Judaism and Zionism, was published by the Enlightenment Society of Kiev, a government sponsored agency for the increase and diffusion of knowledge. In the Soviet Union books, like tractors, are the product and instrument of the state, which gives the official change of heart a sinister aspect.

Anti-Semitism seems to have been used by the Czars as a kind of sop to the population, to give the peasants something to think about besides their misery and someone to blame the misery on besides the obvious causes of greed and incompetence in the ruling class. The Soviets may be using traditional anti-Semitism in the same way.

There is also a disturbing international aspect to the appearance of the book at this time. Kichko sees the state of Israel as embodying what he calls the vengeful and destructive nature of the "God of the Jews." This Jewish God, of course, is also the God of the Christians, the God of the Moslems and, even in a distorted way through the Old Testament prophetic style of Karl Marx, the God of the Communists.

As the Middle East hovers on the edge of a new war, as conversations continue about the intervention of the major powers, it is deeply distressing that the Soviet state should see fit to present such tired old travesties of thought as Kichko's.

BURN TREATMENT CENTERS

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the most agonizing injuries which our citizens experience is the burn injury resulting from fire. The pain and disfigurement which burn injuries produce, and the prolonged period of recovery which they require clearly suggest that the maximum amount of information about both fire prevention and about injury treatment should be made available to every American.

In the hearings on fire legislation just concluded by the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the Committee on Science and Astronautics testimony was heard from Dr. Curtis P. Artz of the University of South Carolina. Dr. Artz is one of the country's outstanding experts in the field of burn treatment, and has been one of the leaders in the establishment of burn treatment centers in several parts of the United States.

One of the most interesting and useful facts pointed out by Dr. Artz is that both the chances of recovery and the speed of recovery are measurably increased if a patient with burn injuries is treated in an established burn center. Furthermore, the transportation, either by air or by other means, of a burn-injured patient in the first 24 hours after the injury is sustained, does not adversely affect his or her chances of recovery. As a result it can be of critical importance that information about the existence and location of such burn centers be widely known. For that purpose I include below an abbreviated version of Dr. Artz' statement and an article listing the burn centers and related types of facilities in this country. I believe that this information can be of value to every citizen.

STATEMENT OF DR. CURTIS PRICE ARTZ

Each year in the United States about eight persons per thousand are significantly injured by fire. About 8,000 individuals die from burns each year. There are approximately two million burn injuries annually and of these about 300,000 are classified as bed disabling injuries. During the past several years there has been a rapid increase in the number of burn care facilities and an expanding interest in the large number of physicians, nurses, and paramedical personnel concerning burns. The number of burn treatment facilities has increased from a half dozen to more than 90 hospitals that now have some type of specialized burn program. It is generally estimated that we need about 7,000 burn intensive care beds. It is the primary goal of every burn surgeon to work for the establishment of sufficient special care facilities to provide all major burn victims the availability of our current resources and improving expertise. It is universally accepted and documented by a number of studies that better survival with less morbidity results when treatment of patients with major burn injuries is rendered in special treatment centers by trained personnel rather than in community hospitals. It is also recognized that this improved care shortens hospitalization so much that the actual cost is less when the patient is treated in a specialized facility.

To emphasize the importance of improved care for burned victims it would seem wise to point out that accidental injury destroys about 17 years of human life for every one thousand inhabitants in the United States. Cancer is really less destructive in that it only takes about 15 years of life per one thousand persons each year. Although burns is the most severe form of injury to which man is liable, they do not represent all accidents. They are a significant entity, however, and account for about 8% of man

years lost due to accidents in the United States. A severe burn is a very catastrophic illness. It is catastrophic due to its effect on the family, catastrophic in its physiologic effect on the individual and catastrophic in cost. Since the burned patient is such a major form of injury, he has served as an ideal model for the injured man in our studies. Many things learned in the burned patient have been major breakthroughs for other forms of injured people.

Currently a partial and full thickness burn that covers half of an individual's body carries a 50% mortality. Obviously, much research needs to be done if we are going to salvage many patients who die today from burns. The best place to accomplish research is in a specialized institute. Fruitful new ideas come from individuals who are intimately associated with the day-to-day care of burn patients. Thus, specialized burn centers not only provide better treatment but also an experience and environment in which fruitful research can be accomplished.

Thus, the greatest single need in the care of burned patients today is the development of a large number of specialized treatment centers. To be able to do this, however, we must provide well-trained personnel. In fact, it is extremely important that we first train the personnel. Without trained personnel specialized facilities cannot be developed. It must be remembered that a large number of various disciplines form the burn team. These include not only the surgeons but also nurses, physical therapists, occupational therapists, anesthesiologists, dietitians, inhalation therapists, laboratory technicians, psychiatrists and many others. Thus, the great current need is for support in the training of the burn team. This undoubtedly is the first phase in the development of any type of burn facility, center or program.

It is generally believed that a major burn facility that can handle difficult problems associated with burned victims is needed for about every two million people. Certain geographical areas can support and should have specialized centers or institutes where research and teaching are as important as patient care. Other areas should have a burn unit in a large general hospital and others should have specialized burn programs in one ward or section of the hospital. All require a well-trained team of highly specialized individuals.

The value and yield of burn research can only be evaluated objectively in limited ways. One yardstick is the presentation of research results at our national meetings. During the past five years the National Institutes of Health funded projects resulted in 26% of all research papers presented at The American Burn Association meetings. Of the remaining sources of research contributions the bulk came from the U.S. Army Institute for Surgical Research Unit at Brooke Army Medical Center and the three Shrine burn institutes. These considerations point out the needs for expansion of quality research programs. In depth training programs to assure a broad foundation in the fundamentals of research are a prerequisite for implementation of expanding quality research.

For productivity in the development of personnel in burns one can look with pride at the track record of the U.S. Army Institute for Surgical Research. It was founded in 1949. It has furnished the only organized training ground for physicians in burn care or research on a large scale basis. It has produced four chairmen of departments of surgery, seven professors of surgery, nine professors in other disciplines, fifty-one associate and assistant professors. Fourteen of these now supervise burn units throughout the country and twenty-five others are involved part-time in burn care. Such an extensive program is vital to our balanced growth and development. More are needed but equally as vital are the programs designed to improve clinical care, expand their teaching and establish small research programs of quality.

Classification of Burn-Care Facilities in the United States

(By Irving Feller, MD, and Keith H. Crane, MS)

The concept of specialized care facilities for the burned patient is relatively new. The first "burn units" were established in 1947 at the Medical College of Virginia, and at the Army Surgical Research Unit in San Antonio, Tex. These units were organized to provide, within their walls, almost all of the resources required for these severely injured patients. Additional units were established in the next two decades. In 1969, a survey of the short-term general and children's hospitals in the United States was completed, to determine the availability of facilities for the care of the burned patients. Only 32 such facilities could be identified. In addition to the hospitals that provide special facilities for burned patients, 46 others are identified with improved care. These facilities and special programs are not alike, and a classification of them is provided to differentiate the levels of care provided.

Of the 6,062 hospitals initially contacted, 4,000 responded. Of those, 539 either claimed to provide specialized burn care or were considered as burn referral centers by other hospitals, or both. The remaining hospitals indicated that they had no special provisions for care of burned patients.

The results of this study indicated that "specialized care" was a very general term which covered a range from hospitals exclusively for burns to doctors specializing in burn patient care, but working within general hospital facilities.

In order to describe precisely the spectrum of treatment, five levels of burn care were defined in order of increasing specialization: (1) general care, (2) general intensive care, (3) burn program, (4) burn unit, (5) burn center. They are defined as follows:

"*General care* is defined as treatment given in a hospital with no specialized facilities or areas for burn care and no consistent plan for management of the patient.

"At the *general intensive care* level, burns are often treated in a specialized facility or area, such as an intensive care unit, with other patients, but no consistent plan for management of burns is followed. However, the problems associated with more-severe burns are recognized, and the patient is placed in the available intensive care area.

"*Burn programs* are found in the hospital that has no specialized facilities or areas for burn care, but in which a consistent plan, conducted by an interested and experienced physician (or jointly by many physicians), is followed for management of burns. As a measure of experience, it was assumed that the physician is treating at least 25 burns per year.

"A *burn unit* is a burn program being conducted in a specialized facility which is used only for burns. It was assumed that this facility has at least four beds and in which at least 35 patients are treated each year.

"A *burn center* is basically a larger burn unit, with special emphasis on research and teaching as well as on patient care. It was assumed that the facility has at least six beds and in which at least 50 patients are treated yearly."

Starting in July 1968, a second questionnaire was sent to the previously located 539 hospitals, as well as to all medical schools. These questionnaires were followed up by telephone calls and site visits or both when the questionnaires were either not returned, incomplete, or contradictory.

This second survey revealed that out of 6,062 short-term general and children's hospitals, only 78 provided some form of specialized burn care. This group includes 12 burn centers, 20 burn units, and 46 burn programs. There are also 300 hospitals that use their intensive care areas for burn patients. Interestingly enough, 160 of the general-care hospitals were considered as burn referral centers by other hospitals, even though they provided no specialized burn care. These results are summarized in Table 1.

The 12 burn centers are individually listed in Table 2. This listing shows the burn center location, doctor(s) in charge, hospital(s) administratively responsible, bed capacity of the facility, and the number of annual admissions. The listing is alphabetical by location (city within state). Table 3 lists the 20 burn units in an identical fashion.

In Table 4, the burn programs are presented alphabetically by state, listing the city, physician, and hospital. The geographic distribution of the burn centers, burn units, and burn programs is shown in the Figure. (Figure not printed.)

During the past 20 years, the understanding of the complex medical problems presented by seriously burned patients has increased. Over 9,000 published articles and books on various aspects of burn treatment testifies to the increasing interest, research, and activity in this area.[1] In the few burn-care facilities within the country, statistics on high mortality and morbidity rates are being challenged and changed.

Unfortunately, there has not been a matching growth of burn centers or other facilities where new concepts in treatment can be consistently carried out for the patients' benefit. In fact, of approximately 75,000 annual admissions of patients with burn injuries, only 7,700 are treated in hospitals that have burn-treatment programs. More facilities that offer specialized treatment are urgently needed in every category. A classification and location of the existing facilities within the United States is presented.

This study was supported in part by Public Health Service grant HS00131-05.

FOOTNOTE

[1] Feller I: *International Bibliography on Burns*. Ann Arbor, Mich., American Burn Research Corp., 1969.

TABLE 1.—*Classification of levels of burn-patient care*

Facility:	Number
Burn center	12
Burn unit	20
Burn program	46
Total	78
General intensive care	300
General care	5,684
Total	6,062

TABLE 2.—BURN CENTERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Location, doctor(s) in charge, hospital(s)	Bed capacity, number	Annual admissions, number
Los Angeles: John Winkley, M.D.; Los Angeles County General Hospital	30	325
Atlanta: H. Harlan Stone, M.D.; Grady Memorial Hospital, Emory University Hospital	25	180
Chicago: John Boswick, M.D., Nelson Stone, M.D.; Cook County Hospital	35	425
Iowa City: S. E. Ziffren, M.D.; University of Iowa Hospital	9	75
Boston: Oliver Cope, M.D.; Shrine Burns Institute, Massachusetts General Hospital	30	225
Ann Arbor, Mich.: Irving Feller, M.D.; University of Michigan Medical Center, St. Joseph Mercy Hospital	14	150
Cincinnati: Bruce MacMillan, M.D., Robert Hummel, M.D.; Shrine Burns Institute, Cincinnati General Hospital	55	325
Columbus Ohio: E. Thomas Boles, M.D.; Childrens Hospital	20	125
Dallas: Charles Baxter, M.D.; Parkland Memorial Hospital	12	200
Galveston, Tex.: Duane Larson, M.D., Stephen Lewis, M.D.; Shrine Burns Institute, John Sealey Hospital	30	300
San Antonio, Tex.: Basil Pruitt, Col., MC; U.S. Army Surgical Research Unit, Brooke Army Medical Center	60	390
Richmond, Va.: B. W. Haynes, M.D.; Medical College of Virginia Hospital	36	220
Total	356	2,940

TABLE 3.—BURN UNITS IN THE UNITED STATES

Location, doctor(s) in charge, hospital(s)	Bed capacity, number	Annual admission, number
Mobile, Ala.: John Crosby, M.D., Byron Green, M.D.; Mobile General Hospital	8	150
Phoenix, Ariz.: William Price, M.D.; Maricopa County General Hospital	9	100
Orange, Calif.: Irving Rappaport, M.D.; Orange County Medical Center	8	125
San Francisco: Gerald O'Connor, M.D., Vincent Pennisi, M.D.; St. Francis Memorial Hospital	10	50
Washington, D.C.: John Lilly, M.D.; Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia	6	50
Miami, Fla.: Hiram Polk, M.D.; Jackson Memorial Hospital	16	75
Detroit: James Lloyd, M.D.; Children's Hospital	11	120
St. Paul: James Lefeve, M.D.; St. Paul Ramsey Hospital	10	150
St. Louis:		
Harvey Butcher, M.D.; Barnes Hospital	6	50
William Monafo, M.D.; St. Johns Mercy Hospital	11	90
Albany, N.Y.: Mark Wong, M.D.; Albany Medical Center	10	120
Brooklyn, N.Y.: I.C. Song., M.D., Bertram Bromberg, M.D.; Kings County Hospital	6	175
New York: Ronald Ollstein, M.D., George Crikelair, M.D.; Harlem Hospital Center	20	100
Chapel Hill, N.C.: C. F. Zukoski, M.D.; North Carolina Memorial Hospital	7	40
Akron, Ohio: Clifford Boeckman, M.D.; Children's Hospital of Akron	14	140
Toledo, Ohio: James Sullivan, M.D., John Kelleher, M.D.; St. Vincent Hospital and Medical Center	8	35
Tulsa, Okla: Frank Clingan, M.D.; Hillcrest Medical Center	10	125
Pittsburgh: Charles Copeland, M.D.; Mercy Hospital	6	50
Houston: Melvin Spira, M.D.; Ben Taub General Hospital	12	140
Milwaukee: George Collentine, M.D.; St. Mary's Hospital	30	225
Total	218	2,110

TABLE 4.—*Burn programs in the United States*

Birmingham, Ala; Alan Dimick, MD; University of Alabama Hospital.

Little Rock, Ark; Merlin Kilbury, MD; St. Vincent Infirmary.

Los Angeles; Franklin Ashley, MD; University of California Hospital.

Oakland, Calif; LCNR Dwight Galloway, MC; US Naval Hospital.

Palo Alto, Calif; Donald Laub, MD; Palo Alto-Stanford Hospital.

San Francisco; Thomas Hunt, MD; San Francisco General Hospital.

San Mateo, Calif; (MD not identified); San Mateo County General Hospital.

Sherman Oaks, Calif; Richard Grossman, MD; Sherman Oaks Community Hospital.

Denver; Ben Eiseman, MD; Denver General Hospital.

Washington, DC; William Matory, MD; Freeman's Hospital.

Washington, DC; Maxine Schurter, MD; Gordon Letterman, MD; George Washington University Hospital.

Jacksonville, Fla; Samuel Stephenson, MD; Duval Medical Center.

Tampa, Fla; Joan Fletcher, MD; Tampa General Hospital.

Augusta, Ga; Carl Jelenko, MD; Eugene Talmadge Memorial Hospital.

Chicago; Harvey Zarem, MD; Mark Ravitch, MD; University of Chicago Hospital.

Kansas City, Kan; David Robinson, MD; Lucian Leape, MD; University of Kansas Medical Center.

Lexington, Ky; Paul Weeks, MD; University of Kentucky Medical Center.

New Orleans; Francis Nance, MD; Charity Hospital of New Orleans.

Baltimore, Md; (MD not identified); University of Maryland Hospital.

Boston; Alfred Morgan, MD; Peter Bent Brigham Hospital.

Springfield, Mass; Joseph Baker, MD; Springfield Hospital.

Eloise, Mich; Robert O'Neal, MD; Wayne County General Hospital.

Minneapolis; Donald McQuarrie, MD; Veterans Administration Hospital.

Rochester, Minn; John Simans, MD; St. Mary's Hospital.

Kansas City, Mo; J. G. McDonald, MD; Childrens Mercy Hospital.

St. Louis; Francis Paletta, MD; St. Louis University Hospital.

Hackensack, NJ; Edward Dana, MD; Hackensack Hospital.

Montclair, NJ; William Conroy, MD; Mountainside Hospital.

Brooklyn, NY; Kaj Holmstrand, MD; Brooklyn-Cumberland Medical Center.

Buffalo; Louis Cloutier, MD; Emergency Hospital Diocese of Buffalo.

Buffalo; George Reading, MD; Edward J. Meyer Memorial Hospital.

East Meadow, NY; Leonard Rubin, MD; Meadowbrook Hospital.

New York; Felicien Steichen, MD; Lincoln Hospital.

Rochester, NY; Robert McCormack, MD; John Morton, MD; Strong Memorial Hospital.

Durham, NC; Nicholas Georgiade, MD; Duke University Medical Center.

Winston-Salem, NC; Julius Howell, MD; North Carolina Baptist Hospital.

Oklahoma City; John Schilling, MD; Edwin Smith, MD; University of Oklahoma Hospital.

Philadelphia; George Manstein, MD; Albert Einstein Medical Center.

York, Pa; John Angelo, MD; York Hospital.

Charleston, SC; Curtis Artz, MD; Medical College Hospital.

Memphis; Roger Sherman, MD; City of Memphis Hospital.

Seattle; Donald Hall, MD; Children Orthopedic Hospital and Medical Center.

Seattle; James Cantrell, MD; King County Hospital.

Morgantown, WV; Walter Moran, MD; West Virginia University Hospital.

Madison, Wis; Robert Hickey, MD; University of Wisconsin Hospital.

Neenah, Wis; Eugene Schrang, MD; Theda Clark Memorial Hospital.

MR. WILSON'S SQUALID REMARKS

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to hear the very ugly, arrogant and completely uncalled for racial slur emitted from the lips of that "renowned and respected attorney," John Wilson, in making reference to one of our most distinguished and honored Senators from Hawaii, DANIEL INOUYE.

Quite to the contrary of any thought which might have been hovering in Mr. Wilson's mind, Senator INOUYE and the other distinguished Senators of the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Practices have done a magnificent service to this country by exposing not only the alleged illegal activities perpetrated by members of the Nixon administration and the President's Reelection Committee, but also the disregard for our Constitution and laws of the land exhibited by some high officials and their legal counsel.

Senator INOUYE is helping to restore some decency to our country and its political system in his work in the Watergate hearings. It is quite obvious that we all have a great deal further to go before that goal of true decency is actually achieved.

I think the Washington Post's editorial staff in their editorial in this morning's paper, puts the problem in a nutshell—and I would like permission to have that editorial reprinted along with my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

MR. WILSON'S SQUALID REMARK

"That's just the way I speak. I consider it a description of the man. I wouldn't mind being called a little American." Thus John J. Wilson, lawyer for H. R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman, explained (if that is the word we want) his disdainful allusion to Sen. Daniel Inouye (D-Hawaii) as "that little Jap." As is so often the case with people who perceive their fellow citizens in this way, Mr. Wilson's "explanation" was, if anything, more revealing than his original remark. That is, as distinct from Senator Inouye ("that little Jap"), Mr. Wilson thinks of himself as an American. What, then, does he think Senator Inouye is? A foreigner? A foreigner serving in the United States Senate? A foreigner who lost his right arm in World War II fighting in the American army in Europe? A native-born American who has won the Distinguished Service Cross for heroism in action and who has spent most of his adult life in public service and who is nonetheless . . . somehow . . . a *foreigner?*

Well, whatever else Mr. Wilson may assume about these matters, we think he's got one thing exactly right. "I wouldn't mind being called a little American," Mr. Wilson said. The small and squalid spirit of his remarks suggests to us that the description will do just fine.

ON INTRODUCING RESOLUTION TO CREATE A STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, recent Watergate disclosures, disillusionment by the unauthorized war in Laos, and shades of past operations, such as the Bay of Pigs fiasco, have all caused Congress to focus greater attention on CIA activities. Members of the CIA oversight subcommittees of Congress, who once accepted the word of the CIA almost unquestionably, are now reassessing the role of congressional oversight and should be commended.

It is well established that Congress has failed in the past to provide adequate scrutiny. Too often, it seems to me, we have been misled, misinformed, or have failed to adequately question the CIA concerning its activities. Otherwise many of its more questionable activities, such as the secret war in Laos, could have been prevented.

Because of the enormous scope of CIA activities and operations, standing committees in each House of Congress, with full staffs, will have to be established to provide adequate oversight. Therefore, today Senator PROXMIRE and I are introducing resolutions to create such committees in our respective Houses of Congress. These committees shall consist of members of the Armed Services Committees, members of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs, and the remainder from members of the respective Houses. Their functions shall include consideration of all matters concerning the CIA, exclusive of matters of appropriations of funds for the operation of the Agency within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations.

These resolutions require prompt, affirmative consideration by Congress. Another bill I introduced, along with 28 of my colleagues, H.R. 8592, would amend the National Security Act of 1947 giving Congress greater oversight control over the CIA. Together with the creation of the standing committees, we can assert greater control over the CIA and help prevent future embarrassments, illegal and immoral CIA activities, undermining of legitimate foreign policy, and subversion of American democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a copy of my resolution so that it can be inspected by my colleagues:

HOUSE RESOLUTION —

Resolved, That clause 1 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by redesignating paragraphs (e) through (u) as paragraphs (f) through (v), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (d) the following new paragraph:

"(e) Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency, to consist of fifteen Members as follows: Five Members concurrently serving on the Committee on Armed Services, five Members concurrently serving on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and five other Members."

SEC. 2. Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by redesignating clauses 5 through 33 as clauses 6 through 34, respectively, and by inserting immediately after clause 4 the following:

"5. Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency.

"(a) Central Intelligence Agency."

SEC. 3. Paragraph (a) of clause 3 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by inserting ", other than the Central Intelligence Agency" immediately before the period at the end thereof.

SEC. 4. Clause 2 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "clause 22 of Rule XI" and inserting in lieu thereof "clause 23 of Rule XI".

AUGUST 21, 1968—ANNIVERSARY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA'S LOSS OF FREEDOM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while we are in recess and thus the RECORD will not be available to the Members, I want to express my views on an international date of special significance that will be remembered, August 21, 1968, when Russian troops occupied Czechoslovakia to suppress the liberalization that was developing in that country.

Several years have passed since that date and the peoples of Czechoslovakia remain under the heel of the Soviet Russian goosestep.

I emphasize this point to the Members this afternoon, feeling as I do that this episode demonstrates the rigid and barbaric nature of the Soviet dictatorship. For those people in all parts of the world, August 21, 1968 should be remembered as a day when the blooming of freedom was nipped in the bud and the rights of these peoples remain divided until this day.

TORTURE IN SOUTH AFRICAN PRISONS

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, over the last few years there have been persistent reports of prisoners being tortured, kept in solitary confinement, detained indefinitely without trial, and sometimes dying under mysterious circumstances while in the hands of the South African police. The South African system of apartheid, with complete power held by small white minority, depends on complete repression of all political and civil rights for the Africans, Asians and coloreds, and the use of police terror on a massive scale.

Some of the evidence of the use of inhumane methods of interrogation and punishment has been collected and analyzed by the United Nations Unit on Apartheid. I include a few extracts from this remarkable document, entitled "Maltreatment and Torture of Prisoners in South Africa," in the RECORD:

MALTREATMENT AND TORTURE OF PRISONERS IN SOUTH AFRICA

Maltreatment and torture of opponents of *apartheid,* in prisons and police cells, has become an essential feature in the implementation of the policy of *apartheid* in South Africa in the past decade. Thousands of opponents of *apartheid*—the leaders and participants in the struggle of the oppressed people for freedom and human dignity, as well as whites who have supported and joined this struggle—have been detained and imprisoned for no offense but their participation in the legitimate struggle. They have been subjected to prolonged solitary confinement, threats, abuse and ill-treatment. The Special Branch of the Police has subjected many of them to special cruelty—assaults, electric shocks, "statute torture", deprivation of sleep and sophisticated psychological torture—in order to extract confession or information on the struggle against *apartheid.* More than a score of detainees have died in prison.[1]

The incidents of specially cruel and brutal treatment of the prisoners and detainees, reviewed in chapter III, represent but a fraction of the actual cases. They have occurred in prisons and police cells scattered all over the country. The Government has consistently shielded the officers of the Security Branch and other policemen accused of assaults and torture from punishment or impartial investigation.[2] The conclusion is inescapable that cruelty against opponents of *apartheid* is the application of a deliberate and centrally directed policy, and that torture by the Security Police is condoned, if not actually encouraged, by the Government.

The South African régime has continued to perpetrate such brutality in flagrant defiance of United Nations resolutions and world opinion. The South African régime hopes to intimidate the oppressed people of the country to acquiesce in *apartheid.* But in fact, by its policies and actions the Government is only creating a graver crisis in South Africa and beyond.

The political prisoners and detainees in South Africa are the participants in a long and arduous struggle for the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Leaders

---

Footnotes at end of article.

like Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu and Abram Fischer have won the respect and admiration of Governments and peoples all over the world for their heroism and humanism. They and their fellow-prisoners are, indeed, the genuine leaders and representatives of the great majority of the people of South Africa.

METHODS OF THE INQUISITORS

The treatment of persons detained under the detention laws is governed by special regulations promulgated by the Minister of Justice. They are denied even the minimum protection of the regulations under which prisoners convicted of common law crimes are normally kept. The conditions of imprisonment are laid down by the Security Branch, and not by the prison authorities.

What may be considered unlawful treatment for condemned murderers may be lawful in the case of these detainees. For example, almost all the detainees have been subjected to prolonged periods of solitary confinement, most of them far beyond the 30 days laid down by the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War as the maximum for prisoners of war in exceptional cases. Detainees are often denied even one hour of exercise a day or access to open air. They are not allowed to have reading matter (except perhaps the Bible) or writing instruments to relieve what the courts called "the tedium of their confinement". Such solitary confinement is itself, according to experts, cruel and inhuman treatment.

In addition, available evidence indicates that the Security Police have frequently resorted not only to brutal assaults but to electric shock torture, statue torture, refused to permit sleep for long periods and various other and more sophisticated methods of torture.

The growing impunity of the Special Branch is reflected in the fact that while only Africans and other non-whites were subjected to physical assaults in 1963, white men have also been assaulted since July 1964, when Mr. Alan Brooks, Mr. John Harris and Mr. Hugh Lewin were assaulted. In addition, many others were subjected to statue torture. There remained still some restraint with regard to white women: the assault on Miss Stephanie Kemp and the prolonged interrogation of Miss Ann Nicholson in 1964 may have been isolated cases, as suggested to the *Ad Hoc* Working Group;[3] but the many cases of statute torture in 1965–1966 could only be a deliberate policy. African women have been subjected to deliberate brutality, especially in the case of Mrs. Winnie Mandela and others in 1970.

Allegations of similar torture have been made from so many centres and have involved so many local officers—in addition to certain interrogators who travel from Pretoria to other areas—that there is reason to believe that Security Branch officers have been trained in these methods. Moreover, it appears from the evidence that they have been experimenting with various refinements.

GESTAPO METHODS

Again and again, a parallel has been drawn between torture of political prisoners in South Africa and the practice of the Nazi Gestapo in Germany. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts reported to the Commission on Human Rights in 1967:

"The procedures and methods utilized by the Special Branch and police for interrogation of detainees and arrested persons are very similar to, if not identical with, those reported to have been used by the Gestapo under Hitler's Nazi régime in Germany." (E/CN.4/950, para. 1143.)

In this connexion, it may be noted that the torture of detainees became frequent in South Africa after Mr. B. J. Vorster was appointed Minister of Justice in 1962. During the Second World War, Mr. Vorster had been a General in the Ossewa Brandwag, a paramilitary organization which engaged in acts of sabotage against the war effort, in sympathy with Nazi Germany. He had been interned from September 1942 to January 1944 and then placed under house arrest. Soon after becoming Minister, he promoted Mr. H. J. van den Bergh, a junior police officer who had been detained in the interment camp with him, to the post of head of the Security Branch.[4] He obtained arbitrary powers of house arrest and provided the Security Branch with the detention laws. He has protected the Security Branch by consistently refusing to hold a public inquiry despite numerous complaints of torture and repeated and widespread demands in Parliament and by the public.

MR. RAYMOND EISENSTEIN

Mr. Eisenstein was detained under the 90-day law in 1964.

It was reported that he was punched steadily on one spot on his arm for three hours until it was swollen. He was forced to stand for 28 hours. He then sat down and was kicked and beaten. He was seized by his testicles, lifted up bodily, taken to the window and threatened with dropping. He then made a statement which was false. (E/CN.4/950, para. 917).

MR. DOUGLAS MTSHETSHE MVEMBE

Mr. Mvembe, 73, a pensioner, was detained under the Terrorism Act and subsequently tried with Mrs. Mandela and others.

He said that he was forced to stand on bricks. As he was unable to balance on the bricks, he was handcuffed and tied to a grating above his head, his feet touching the bricks. "It looked as if I was on the cross. I would thirst and ask for water . . . After many pleas for water they would give me a drop and then withdraw the mug from my mouth." He was tortured for three days and nights.

MISS SHANTI NAIDOO

Miss Naidoo, a clerk who had suffered imprisonment and restriction for opposition to apartheid, was detained under the Terrorism Act on 3 June 1969 and called as a State witness in the trial of Mrs. Mandela and others.

She told the court that she had been kept in solitary confinement, subjected to brutal interrogation and threatened with the arrest of all her family. She had had to sleep on the floor of the cell. She had made a statement only after a five-day interrogation during which she had not been allowed to sit or sleep. She said:

"I was interrogated, I was forced to make certain admissions because I couldn't stand the strain of standing on my feet for hours and hours . . .

"My mind went completely blank and I went to sleep standing and I had a sort of a dream in which I was actually speaking to the officers who were interrogating me, in my sleep, and afterwards when I had sort of regained my senses, I was interrogated on this dream I had which was complete nonsense.

"The interrogation went on for five days without any sleep."

She refused to give evidence on the ground that two of the accused were her friends, and was sentenced to two months in prison. After serving the sentence, she was again detained for four months under the Terrorism Act.

MR. AHMED TIMOL

Mr. Timol, 30, a school teacher, was detained under the Terrorism Act on 22 October 1971. He died on 27 October, after a fall from the tenth floor of the Security Police headquarters in Johannesburg. The Security Police claimed that he had committed suicide.

An inquest was held after a delay of several weeks: the magistrate refused the application of the family's counsel for information in the possession of the prosecutor, and the inquest was delayed until an appeal of the ruling was decided by the Supmeme Court.

It was disclosed at the inquest that Mr. Timol had been interrogated by Lieutenant-Colonel W. P. van Wyk, Captain Dirker, Captain Bean, Captain J. Z. van Niekerk and Captain Johannes Gloy. On the day of the death, he had been interrogated by Captain Gloy and Captain van Niekerk from 8 a.m. to 3.30 p.m.[5]

Results of the *post mortem* examination had shown several injuries sustained between three and 10 days before death. Medical specialists testified that these injuries could have been caused by blows and kicks with a boot.[6]

The magistrate, Mr. J. J. L. de Villiers, found on 22 June 1972 that Mr. Timol had committed suicide and that no one was to blame for his death.

Evidence received in 1963 and 1964 from Robben Island prison, where non-white political prisoners are gaoled, indicated brutal and widespread ill-treatment. There were allegations of frequent assaults by warders, attempts at sodomy by hardened criminals, hard manual labour, other indignities and humiliation, and lack of decent medical attention.[7]

Leaders of the people like Nelson Mandela continue to be obliged to work in the lime quarry or to break stones. They are given unpalatable food and are obliged to wear shorts. They receive no bread but only mealie meal.

A letter smuggled out of Robben Island prison in March 1969 indicated a continued lack of medical attention. A prisoner wrote:

"It has become imperative to us to write and report to you the most intolerable conditions to which we are subjected.

"The poor medical treatment we receive is a matter which must receive your first attention. From last year four of our men died mainly through negligence. Practically no treatment was given to them until they were completely helpless. Their ailments became complicated beyond remedy, and then only were they taken to a hospital in Cape Town, Somerset Hospital.

"In a matter of a week, Marks died, Simon Mkele stayed for a few days in hospital. He also died. This one had a medical recommendation to be discharged from prison but this never materialized.

"Headman Sindile Ncaphayi, of Port Elizabeth, is a case that requires special attention. He took ill on August 6 and reported sick. During this time there was an epidemic at Robben Island. About a hundred or more were affected. The doctor did not come until August 26. Only on August 30 was Ncaphayi sent to Somerset Hospital. He died on September 1.

"We have few more of our men who are really seriously ill. And if no action is taken they will definitely die. TB and asthmatic patients are forced to work in the quarry, a most brutal arrangement.

"Please arrange for a commission of inquiry to investigate this position. The food quality is exceedingly poor." (A/AC.115/L.243)

FOOTNOTES

[1] Nineteen persons held under the general detention laws since 1963 have died in detention. The Government has claimed that eleven of these had committed suicide. Hilda Bernstein, *The Terrorism of Torture*, p. 54. In addition, at least two persons died during detention under Proclamation R. 400 in the Transkei. Republic of South Africa *House of Assembly Debates* (Hansard), 11 February 1972, col. 164. All these 21 were non-whites.

[2] The Government has not charged any members of the Security Branch for assaults and torture against detainees, though there has been evidence in numerous cases of assaults, including the death of several detainees. Large numbers of policemen are annually convicted of assaults and other of-

fences against prisoners but the Government has retained many of them in employment.

[3] Communication of Miss Sylvia Neame to the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts, E/CN.4/AC.22/19, annex II.

[4] Suzanne Cronje, *Witness in the Dark*, pp. 3–4; E/CN.4/950, para. 600 (testimony of Mr. A. Sachs). In 1969, Gen. van den Bergh was made head of the newly created Bureau for State Security, with a budget of over 4 million rand. The Security Police budget was increased that year by 200,000 rand to 1.2 million rand. *Cape Times*, 11 August 1969.

[5] *The Star*, Johannesburg, 26 April 1972.

[6] *Rand Daily Mail*, Johannesburg, 5 and 24 May 1972.

[7] Affidavit by Mr. L. R. Galela, a former prisoner, transmitted by the Pan-Africanist Congress on 19 November 1963 (A/AC.115/L.41); three affidavits by former prisoners transmitted by Mrs. Ruth First on 12 May 1964 (A/AC.115/L.73).

SALARIES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, on July 30 I joined with 236 of my fellow Members in voting to defeat the rule which would have provided for the consideration of increases in certain executive, legislative, and judicial salaries.

The President now receives $200,000, the Vice President $62,500, Chief Justice and Speaker of the House $62,500, Associate Justices and Cabinet Officers $60,000. President of the Senate $49,500, and heads of agencies $42,500.

I believe these salaries are more than adequate and I will continue to oppose, in every way I can, any attempt to increase them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial that first appeared in the Montevideo American and was reprinted in the Ortonville Independent on July 18, 1973.

It best explains the way I feel about pay increases for public officials:

SALARIES

In his column recently, Congressman John Zwach states that he will oppose any attempt to raise the salary of our men in Washington. This writer certainly supports Zwach and agrees with him that election to public office is a public trust and that motivation should stem from higher ideals than that of getting rich.

Perhaps when Zwach finishes the job in Washington he'll come to Minnesota and see what he can do for us here.

Mayor Charles Stenvig, for instance, is one of the lower salaried employees in the city of Minneapolis. At $21,800, there are six of his subordinates who receive $30,000 per year or over. Perhaps Stenvig should consider applying for the job of superintendent of schools; the pay there is $7,000 above his present salary at its lowest level.

Only one state official, the liquor control commissioner, receives under $20,000 per year, according to a recent survey done by the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. He is paid $19,000 per year.

Apparently one of the highest paid public officials in the state is Hennepin County medical examiner John J. Coe. He received $54,168. Of those surveyed at the University of Minnesota athletic director Paul Giel was the lowest paid at $30,000.

It is difficult to measure, sometimes, the work done or the worth of a public official. Sometimes we wrongly assume that those who are in the public eye the most should be paid the most because obviously they are doing the most. Such is not the case, to be sure.

But with everything else sprouting up around us, the line against inflation must be held somewhere. It might not be out of the way to suggest that some public officials, both elected and appointed, begin the move by paring their own salaries a bit and follow through by cutting costs in their departments or areas of responsibility.

And it is this point that Zwach's point becomes valid. When one holds public office, no matter how he got there, he is holding a public trust. While no one expects him to work for free or at a personal sacrifice, one must not expect to reap huge financial gains.

Aside from some healthy five-figured salaries, many of the officials surveyed also receive automatic salary increases, mileage expenses for travel and some even receive their homes.

With such benefits abounding in high places, it is a minor miracle that more people aren't clawing their way up the ladder to success. This writer is not suggesting that the jobs of these officials are easy or that many are not earning their salaries.

This writer is merely questioning the dramatic heights some salaries have achieved. It is time to question at what point one reaches the point of diminishing returns. How much is a man, in a given job, worth? Is there a point at which the cost of maintaining that fellow in that position outweighs his being there? Simply put: Is it possible for us to one day find ourselves paying our public officials too much, more than they are worth?

It is something to think about.—Montevideo American.

PETÖFI EXHIBITION AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, recently an exhibition about the life and works of Alexander Petöfi was held at the Library of Congress lasting for over a month.

The exhibition featured an excellently selected number of books, facsimiles and other materials about the life of this literary genius, who, despite dying at the age of 26, is considered to be the greatest Hungarian poet, and certainly one of the great European poets along with Heine, Byron, and Tennyson.

Translations of his work into various European and Asian languages were also featured, as were many of the American editions of his poems starting with the 1850's and ending with publications around 1969.

Credit for this display of Hungarian culture and of the man whose ideals of freedom and democracy were closely in line with those of Abraham Lincoln should be given to the Finnish-Ugrian Specialist of the Library of Congress, Dr. Elemer Bako, and to the leadership in foreign cultural presentation so often displayed by the Library of Congress as a whole. Dr. Bako's work on Petöfi has been commented upon by many of us earlier this year.

RESOLUTIONS BY COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last month the Communications Workers of America held their 35th annual convention at Miami Beach. During the course of the convention, the 2,500 delegates adopted a number of resolutions on major issues facing the United States.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include a letter from Joseph A. Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America, and relevant material pertaining to five of the resolutions adopted on a recommended legislative agenda for 1973, housing, energy crisis, cutbacks in social services, and the abuse of technology:

COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Last month 2,500 men and women of the Communications Workers of America met in Miami Beach at the Union's 35th Annual Convention. As a part of the Convention proceedings, these delegates adopted resolutions setting the policy of the Union on a variety of issues of national concern. Five of the resolutions—Legislative Agenda for 1973, Housing, Energy Crisis, Cutbacks in Social Services, and the Abuse of Technology—I feel would be of interest to you.

This Union's leaders for a number of years have been concerned over the problems of individual privacy, occasioned by the many advances in communications technology of the last several decades. Our Convention Resolution, "'Abuse of Technology': Freedom's Enemy Corruption's Ally," addressed itself to the erosion of the cherished concept of privacy. The Convention Resolution noted that "national security" has been used as a pretext for undue use of eavesdropping and corruption of our American political process. The Resolution calls on the Congress to establish standing committees on individual privacy, which would undertake complete reviews of the state of the technology which can be abused. The Union's Convention asks for "appropriate legislation to interpret Fourth Amendment guarantees in the light of present technology, so as to move the Nation away from the invitation to the massive corruption of our liberties."

In our Resolution on "Housing" we call upon the Department of Housing and Urban Development "to rescind the moratorium on subsidized housing and community development programs," and to return to the goal set forth in the Taft-Wagner-Ellender Act of 1949 of "a decent home for every American family." CWA realizes there have been widespread abuses and failures in the federal housing program, and we call upon Congress to enact comprehensive housing reform legislation to insure the success of the program.

One of the great tragedies of the federal government's current fiscal policy is the attempt by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to curtail or eliminate social service programs for children, adults, and the aged, blind and disabled. Again, CWA acknowledges there have been abuses in this program, but in 1972 Congress enacted amendments to the Social Security Act which set a $2.5 billion ceiling on the amount

of money that could be spent on social services. This figure permits the continuance of most of these vital services while at the same time bringing needed reform to the program. In our Resolution on "Cutbacks in Social Services," CWA calls upon HEW "to cease its dismantling of the social services programs, and urges it to work with the Congress to design new programs and to improve the present ones."

The Communications Workers of America feels one of the most critical problems facing the American consumer today is the availability of energy. Adequate energy to fuel our nation's growth is essential. None of the current sources of energy—oil, natural gas, coal, nuclear energy, or water power—is in such abundance as to satisfy demands for the future. Furthermore, the United States must turn away from dependence upon foreign sources of petroleum products, and concentrate on tapping the vast potential of the Alaskan North Slope and the Continental Shelf. Our Resolution on "The Energy Crisis" supports the building of an Alaskan pipeline, but only after all environmental risks have been minimized and "stringent anti-pollution controls put into force." CWA also supports "Congressional efforts to establish a Council on Energy Policy, which will have the purpose of drawing up a coordinated program to meet our nation's energy needs, both now and in the future." In addition, we feel the federal government should launch a comprehensive, high-priority research and development program "to study ways to increase and diversify our energy supply."

Finally, our Resolution entitled "Legislative Agenda for 1973" calls upon Congress "to renew its efforts in 1973 to enact into law legislation supported by CWA dealing with tax equity, national health insurance, trade reform, and pension reform." We believe 1973 should go down in history as a year of great social progress, rather than as a year marked by tumult and scandal. We feel the four legislative goals set forth in our Resolution are attainable, but only through hard work on the part of our Union and the Congress. Therefore, we ask "that as a sign of good faith and dedication to these four legislative goals, Congress forego its 1973 August recess to work for their enactment."

Attached to this letter you will find copies of the five resolutions mentioned. I hope you will take the time to read them.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. BEIRNE,
President.

HOUSING

"A decent home for every American family" was the general goal set forth in one of the pioneer pieces of housing legislation, the Taft-Wagner-Ellender Act of 1949.

This federal commitment to ensure decent housing for all Americans was further strengthened when Congress enacted the Housing Act of 1968. For the first time, specific housing goals and timetables were established—26 million units, including 6 million units for low- and moderate-income families—to be built during the ten years from 1969 to 1978.

But in the intervening five years since the national housing goal was established, these high expectations have failed to reach fruition. The glowing promise of decent housing for all Americans has given way to bureaucratic corruption and the criminal indictment of FHA officials. Congressional failure to enact the 1972 Housing Act, and finally, a federally-imposed moratorium of subsidized housing projects.

On January 8, 1973, the Nixon Administration dealt the final blow to federally-supported housing programs. On that day the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development announced a massive moratorium on subsidized housing and community development programs.

This unilateral action by HUD has ended the federal commitment to provide "a decent home for every American family."

The action was not taken because the problems of the cities have been solved. Nor was it taken because the 10-year housing goal had been met. HUD simply gave up trying to administer the federal housing program. HUD was unable to reform itself, or, with the help of Congress, bring about the needed reforms in the federal housing programs.

Now, hundreds of thousands of Americans will be deprived of decent housing. Thousands of workers in the construction industry and thousands of workers in industries related to housing—furniture workers, appliance manufacturers, and maintenance personnel—will lose their jobs.

The moratorium will also mean that nonprofit sponsors—churches, labor unions, civic and minority groups, who have built over 40 percent of all subsidized housing—will have to cancel their proposed projects. No longer will the federal government be a potential source of funds for projects such as the CWA Retirement Housing Project.

In conjunction with the moratorium on subsidized housing, the Nixon Administration has impounded large sums of money needed to operate existing public housing projects, and has cut back the amount of money available for their operating budgets in the coming fiscal year. In order to continue operation, public housing groups will be forced to reduce services and eliminate needed personnel. Groups like the Nashville Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency, of which the CWA Apartments is a part, have been told by HUD to raise their rents to make ends meet. This will force low-income tenants—people for whom public housing was primarily built—out of the public housing projects.

Both the moratorium and the cutback in public housing operating funds will impact on those people who most desperately need good housing—the lower income group. These actions can only bring about bitterness on the part of this group, and a feeling that they have been betrayed by their government.

The Communications Workers of America realizes that the federal housing programs are not perfect. But we also recognize the great need that exists for quality housing.

Therefore, be it resolved: That the Communications Workers of America urges the Department of Housing and Urban Development to rescind the moratorium on subsidized housing and community development programs.

Be it further resolved: That the Union calls upon the Congress to enact comprehensive housing legislation to reform the existing federal housing programs and to meet the continuing need for quality housing in our nation.

And be it finally resolved: That the Union calls upon both the Nixon Administration and the Congress to provide the funds necessary to ensure adequate operation of the nation's public housing projects.

LEGISLATIVE AGENDA FOR 1973

While 1973 will forever be remembered as one of tumult and scandal, it also can go down in history as a year of social progress. The Congress, in 1973, has a unique opportunity to enact four vital pieces of legislation, which would improve the lives of all Americans. The four legislative proposals are:

Tax Equity.
National Health Insurance.
Trade Reform.
Pension Reform.

Tax equity is both a necessity and a right owned to the American taxpayer. Hard-working men and women for decades have unjustly borne the brunt of the Federal tax structure.

Now is the time to stop those who legally avoid billions in tax liability, those who were able in 1969 to stop the momentum toward a genuinely fair tax system. The taxes avoided by corporations and wealthy individuals must be made up somewhere. That "somewhere" is the pockets and purses of American working men and women.

All of the so-called "tax preferences," otherwise known as "loopholes," must be examined on a case-by-case basis to determine if the national interest is better served by their repeal. Many bills now pending in Congress purport to be tax reform. Only those pieces of legislation which call for the examination and correction of tax loopholes will be supported by CWA.

Now is the time for a comprehensive program of national health insurance as the only solution to the twin problems of skyrocketing medical costs and delivery of essential medical services to all Americans. Such a program must meet all the challenges of health care delivery—financing, control of costs, manpower and facility development, and distribution reform.

Many pieces of pending legislation are masquerading as national health insurance programs. Only the National Health Security Act, sponsored by Senator Edward M. Kennedy and Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths, provides a truly comprehensive program of national health insurance and deserves the support of CWA.

Now is the time for a solution of the nation's foreign trade problems, but not in a retreat into a position of neo-isolationism. American jobs must be protected without erecting barriers to free trade. A major aspect of trade legislation must be to eliminate the incentives encouraging American companies to export jobs. American-based multinational corporations must be made to pay appropriate taxes on earnings. The flow of imported goods must be adjusted to maintain a steady proportion of the market in competition with domestic goods. The Nation needs tariff policies coordinated with industrial adjustment, worker retraining, and relocation needs. The interests of consumers and industries threatened by increased imports or decreased exports must be protected.

Now is the time for Congress to enact pension reform legislation. CWA supports the Williams-Javits "Retirement Income Security for Employees Act," which provides long-needed structural reforms. The bill would set high standards for funding and vesting of workers' pension, and would guarantee that many millions of workers who are employed for 8 years would have vested rights. An essential part of the Williams-Javits bill is plant termination insurance, to guarantee that workers whose companies are sold or dissolved would not lose pension rights.

It is vital that these four pieces of legislation be enacted into law, and 1973 is the most opportune time. Legislative history indicates that Congress tends to do its most important work in odd-numbered years, when legislators are less worried about election campaigns.

Although 1973 is nearly half over, none of these four key pieces of legislation has made any significant progress through the legislative process.

Therefore, be it resolved: That the Delegates of the 35th Annual Convention of the Communications Workers of America call upon the Congress to renew its efforts in 1973 to enact into law legislation supported by CWA dealing with tax equity, national health insurance, trade reform, and pension reform; and

Be it further resolved: That as a sign of good faith and dedication to these four legislative goals, Congress forego its 1973 August recess to work for their enactment.

THE ABUSE OF TECHNOLOGY: FREEDOM'S ENEMY, CORPORATION'S ALLY

The question of privacy of the individual has reached its most serious point since the pre-Revolutionary period, when British-mili-

tary men were able to invade and search homes.

The Declaration of Independence cited ". . . a long train of abuses . . ." and "Despotism" suffered by the Colonies at the hands of George III. The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution guarantees that:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, house, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated. . . ."

The noble intentions of the founders of the Nation appear to have been vitiated in recent years, not by a King of England, but by native Americans who seek such a degree of leeway as to invade by technological means.

The ever-present wish to pry into others' personal business has been aided by the abuse of technology. Literally and figuratively, "bugs" have been eating their way into the body politic.

Electronic and optical devices, available in the mid-1970s, are capable of allowing snoopers to overhear telephone conversations, to operate "mail covers," to retrieve bank account and medical history information, and to have two-way television in the home. Using certain telephone equipment and the proper codes, an eavesdropper can dial a citizen's number and listen in at will. CWA files contain the details of other abuses of communications technology, including the illegal tap of a telephone used by an employee of the Federal Communications Commission, a closed-circuit TV camera in a restroom of a telephone building, and a chief operator's monitoring console in the bedroom of her home. A device on the market allows a telephone set not in use to become an "open microphone" for eavesdropping.

Detection of these devices is difficult, usually impossible. Thus the existence of such devices and practices is an open invitation to corruption. The citizen appears to have little protection of law.

In an awareness of the dangers, CWA gave testimony in 1965 and 1967, when a Senate Subcommittee held hearings on "Right of Privacy" legislation. The CWA position has historically been outright opposition to wiretapping and other forms of eavesdropping, except when a clearly defined and genuine national security issue is involved.

Numerous major events since 1969 have shown that "national security" has been used to justify wiretapping and attempts to corrupt the American political process. Felonies have been procured and condoned by high government officials, with "national security" now used as the reason. The situation now has taken on the mark of a "secret snooperstate."

Presently, no single Committee of Congress and no single Executive Branch Department or Agency has entire jurisdiction over the questions of individual privacy. The responsibilities are fragmented.

The time has come, CWA believes, for a comprehensive review of the state of communications technology which can be abused in the area of privacy. The time has come, CWA believes, for a complete review of the statutory provisions against such abuses.

Be it resolved: That this Convention call upon the Congress to establish standing committees on individual privacy, with mandates to study the problems and report the appropriate legislation to interpret Fourth Amendment guarantees in the light of present technology, so as to move the Nation away from the invitation to the massive corruption of our liberties.

CUTBACKS IN SOCIAL SERVICES

For more than a decade, the federal government has recognized and accepted the major responsibility for curing the social ills of our country.

The assumption of this responsibility was necessary when it became evident that although state and local governments could perform a share of this function, they could not adequately handle the national problem. Only the federal government with its resources and organizing ability could maintain and coordinate a national social services program.

The great pieces of social legislation that were enacted by Congress in the 1960's brought the social services programs into existence. Since then these programs have served to raise the level of aspiration and the level of attainment for thousands of unfortunate and needy Americans, and given them something they had never had before—hope.

Hope for working mothers, who without adequate day care facilities for their children, would be eating up the taxpayers' dollars on welfare rolls.

Hope for the elderly confined to their homes and frequently suffering from chronic illness.

Hope for the mentally retarded, who can be helped to achieve the maximum development of their capabilities.

Hope for young people, who might otherwise end up as juvenile delinquents.

And hope for those persons suffering from the illness of alcoholism or drug addiction, and who again want to know human dignity and lead productive lives.

Now, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, through administrative fiat is seeking to curtail or eliminate these social services programs as part of the Administration's effort to cut back government expenditures. The effect of this action will be to force back upon the state and local governments the added burden of caring for these needy persons abandoned by the federal government.

Many federal programs were designed to cure centuries old problems in the quickest time possible, and in the process there have been some abuses. CWA recognizes the need to bring about reform in the social services programs, but not in such a way as to kill the programs.

It was never the intent of Congress that the greater part of these programs should be wiped out leaving thousands upon thousands of children, adults, and the aged, blind, or disabled without hope. But that will be precisely the effect if HEW has its way.

Congress has already taken the first steps toward reforming the social services programs. In 1972, Congress enacted amendments to the Social Security Act which set a $2.5 billion ceiling on the amount of money that could be spent on social services. This figure was carefully chosen because it would permit the continuance of most of these vital services while at the same time reforming the programs. An example of the Administration's attitude toward Social Security beneficiaries is the plan to cut $616 million for Medicare payments from the Fiscal year 1974 budget.

The Communications Workers of America feels that curtailing these social services programs with the sole purpose of cutting back on federal expenditures will in the long run result in greater expenditures on the part of state and local governments to maintain these needed services, and increased taxes for their residents.

Also, should the programs be eliminated, many of the people who have been able to get off the welfare rolls because of the programs will be forced to go back on the welfare rolls to the detriment of the working, taxpaying public.

And finally, a curtailment of the social services programs will result in lost jobs for the thousands of men and women who are employed by the states and localities to administer the programs.

Therefore, be it resolved: That the 35th Annual Convention of the Communications Workers of America calls upon the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to cease its dismantling of the social services programs, and urges it to work with the Congress to design new programs and to improve the present ones.

ENERGY CRISIS

Among the most critical problems facing the American consumer today is the availability of energy. American industrial and economic growth has been so rapid that increased demand for more energy has severely strained the capacity of the energy-producing industry. The result has been an ever-widening "energy gap."

In some parts of the nation, schools, factories, and businesses were forced to close due to a lack of heating oil for their furnaces. The shortage of gasoline has already become acute in some areas of the country with the rationing of gasoline a very real possibility.

Americans have always felt that their day-to-day use of energy was as readily available as the flick of an electric switch or the starting of an automobile engine. This has led most Americans to take for granted the continued supply of all the energy they need.

The nation's population, by conservative estimate, will increase by 37 million between 1970 and 1985 to 241 million. The 20–35 age group during that period will increase by 19 million—or 44 percent. Members of this group influence economic activity more than any other. Most of them marry, start families, and buy the whole range of consumer goods from new houses and automobiles to toasters and television sets. It is this group, more than any other, who will demand more and more energy.

While the country grows in population, the per capita use of energy also is expected to increase. In 1955, each American used the energy equivalent of 40 barrels of oil. By 1985, this figure is expected to increase to 100 barrels. Although adequate energy is absolutely essential to the welfare of the United States, none of the five domestic sources of primary energy—oil, natural gas, coal, nuclear energy, and water power—is today adequate to meet the nation's needs.

The United States depends upon petroleum—source of oil and natural gas—to satisfy three-fourths of its overall energy. But petroleum has become the energy source in shortest supply. To satisfy the needs for petroleum products, U.S. suppliers have began to rely heavily upon foreign sources, a fact which will create two serious problems for the United States, regarding the balance of payments and national security.

Currently, the cost of imported petroleum runs to $4 billion. If the United States is forced to import the amounts of oil and natural gas necessary by 1985, the dollar outflow is expected to run to $30 billion a year. Such a huge balance of payments deficit could not be borne by the American economy at home and abroad.

National security implications are involved because the Middle East and Africa are emerging as the major suppliers of our petroleum imports. Because operating facilities are so highly concentrated in these areas, they are vulnerable to both sabotage and military action. In the unfortunate event of a large scale armed conflict between nations, the entire petroleum production of the Middle East and Africa could halt.

The United States must turn away from its growing dependence upon foreign petroleum sources, and increase the development of its proven domestic sources, primarily the Continental Shelf and the North Slope of Alaska. Before a means of transporting the oil from Alaska's North Slope is devised and before extensive drilling operations are undertaken on the Continental Shelf, all environmental risks must be minimized and stringent anti-pollution controls put into

force. If the industry is to meet the petroleum needs of our country, a trans-Alaska oil pipeline is a necessity, but its construction should only be undertaken with adequate environmental safeguards.

While coal has proven the most abundant source of energy, about one-third of the recoverable reserves has a sulphur content too high to meet current air pollution standards. Stringent environmental protections must be adhered to in either the mining or the burning of coal. Strip mining operations must be accompanied by effective restoration of the land. The burning of high sulphur content coal must be accompanied by proper air pollution controls and filtering devices. Also, extensive research must be undertaken in the fields of coal "gasification" and liquefaction—two processes by which treated coal can be used to replace oil and natural gas.

Nuclear reactors offer a great potential source of primary energy. Nuclear power is virtually limited to the generation of electricity, in the steam cycle. Nuclear power cannot now be used directly for industrial, commercial, transportation, or residential purposes. Nuclear energy poses serious environmental questions, including safety of wide areas near nuclear generating plants. Again, adequate environmental and engineering safeguards must be incorporated into each nuclear generating plant. The Atomic Energy Commission acted wisely when it established its Bureau of Safety, to enforce safeguards in use of nuclear energy.

While electricity produced by water power is pollution-free, the construction of dams may raise serious ecological questions. Since a relatively few hydroelectric sites that can be developed and effectively utilized still remain, the amount of electricity generated with water power is not likely to increase significantly. However, scientists see a great potential source of primary energy in the tapping of geothermal steam areas located in the West. This free source of energy that can be harnessed to produce electricity still requires a great deal of research before the use of geothermal steam is proven feasible.

If the United States ever is to solve its energy problems and increase the available supply, a comprehensive, high-priority research and development program to study ways to increase and diversify our energy supply must be undertaken for the first time by the Federal Government. The present energy shortage proves that the President needs expert advisers on energy matters, and Congress needs better information.

There is the need today for an independent voice to examine the performance to date of Government and industry, and to tell the people why Government and industry have allowed the energy shortage to develop.

To date, the single response by Government and industry appears to be efforts to increase oil and gas prices and strike down environmental protection laws and regulations dealing with the petroleum industry. A few forward-thinking Members of Congress have validly questioned whether the energy shortage is genuine or imaginary.

Therefore, be it resolved: That the Communications Workers of America supports Congressional efforts to establish a Council on Energy Policy, which will have the purpose of drawing up a coordinated program to meet our nation's energy needs, both now and in the future.

Be it further resolved: The Union calls upon the Congress to enact legislation which will mobilize the nation's scientific and technological resources for a long-term, large-scale program to ensure the full utilization of the nation's proven energy sources and the development of alternative energy sources.

ALL THE PIGS ARE MORE EQUAL

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Sunday, July 29, New York Times concerning the economic status of women in the United States.

The article focuses on the extremely productive hearings of the Joint Economic Committee, organized and chaired by Representative MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS. The committee has heard expert testimony about discrimination against women, and has heard witness after witness charge that the Federal Government itself overtly discriminates against some women and fails to enforce its own antidiscrimination laws on behalf of others.

I am pleased to share this timely article with my colleagues:

WOMEN AND MONEY—ALL THE PIGS ARE MORE EQUAL

WASHINGTON.—In 1971, a milestone was passed all but unnoticed. For the first time, more than half of the married women in the United States worked in paid jobs for at least part of the year.

This fact, only recently published, was cited over and over again last week by witnesses before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. And so was another statistic from the Census Bureau: three-quarters of all the women who work for pay either have no husband or a husband whose income is under $7,000 a year.

The working wife has become the norm, not the exception, and working women, married or unmarried, are for the most part working for one reason: need.

Yet, witness after witness said, the laws and public policies and business practices of the nation are still based in large measure on the assumption that only a minority of women work outside the home (especially married women) and that those who do are largely working just for "pin money."

The hearings by the Joint Economic Committee marked the first time that any committee of Congress has attempted to take a comprehensive look at the economic status of women in the United States. They were organized and chaired by Representative Martha W. Griffiths, Democrat of Michigan, one of the senior members of Congress. It was Representative Griffiths who worked out the strategy that finally got the Equal Rights Amendment through Congress two years ago after forty years of failures.

For six days, Mrs. Griffiths and a few of the male members of the Joint Committee, who wandered in and out of the hearings, heard expert testimony about discrimination against women in virtually every aspect of their economic lives: jobs, pay, education, taxation, insurance, credit, unemployment compensation, social security and private pensions. And witness after witness charged that the Federal Government itself overtly discriminates against some women and fails to enforce its own antidiscrimination laws on behalf of others.

The two-income married couple pays more in Social Security taxes than the one-worker family with the same income, but it gets less back when the husband and wife retire.

Only 48 per cent of the back pay that has been found to be owed to women because of violations of the Equal Pay Act has ever been paid, partly because courts have sometimes reduced the awards, but mostly for reasons Government officials could not explain.

On the average, women live six years longer than men. But the insurance industry charges women for life insurance as if they only live three years longer.

Savings and loans and other mortgage lenders generally refuse to count even part of a married woman's income when considering a home mortgage. The theory is that the wife might get pregnant or, for other reasons, decide to quit work, leaving her husband unable to meet the monthly payments. The fear is not supported—in fact, it is contradicted—by studies of mortgage delinquencies.

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance, which is supposed to make sure that Government contractors do not discriminate against women or minorities, has no women in professional positions in any of its field offices.

THE GASOLINE SHORTAGE

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the gasoline shortage in our country has become a critical problem. Rising gasoline prices, the closing of smaller gas stations, limits on purchasable gas—all indicate a situation that requires prompt action.

My colleague, Mr. LUJAN, has discussed with me the gasoline shortage and possible solutions. He pointed to the fact that the government—Federal, State, and local—is the biggest consumer of gasoline. In 1972, about 60 percent of the gasoline used in this country was used by the Government. I agreed with Mr. LUJAN that we should consider as a partial solution that all Federal Government agencies cut back on gasoline use at least 10 percent.

For the review of my colleagues, I insert a letter I recently sent to the President on this very matter:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My colleague, the Honorable Manuel Lujan, has discussed with me the critical gasoline shortage facing our nation. The situation appears to be getting worse, and it is time for some positive action on the part of the government.

The government is the biggest consumer of gasoline. During 1972, about 60 per cent of the gasoline used in this country was used by the government—federal, state, and local.

The American Petroleum Institute estimates that our present rate of gasoline consumption will result in a 10 per cent increase of the 131 billion gallons used in 1972 this year. The Institute projects that 1973's consumption will be between 10 and 12 per cent higher in 1974.

My state, Illinois, uses about 7 per cent of the non-military gasoline in the United States, and about 21 per cent of the gas used for the military.

If something is not done to conserve gasoline, vital public services will be hampered. Police and fire protection, farm production, transportation, construction, trash and garbage collection—all would be jeopardized.

I am taking this opportunity to join Mr. Lujan in urging you, in view of the crisis, to consider an executive order calling on all federal government agencies to cut back gasoline use by at least 10 per cent. Such a nationwide cutback could save an estimated eight to ten billion gallons of gasoline a year.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

TOM RAILSBACK,
Member of Congress.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY ANNOUNCES SCHEDULING OF PHASE II PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NUCLEAR REACTOR SAFETY

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I am pleased to announce the scheduling of phase II of the committee's public hearings on nuclear reactor safety. During phase I of these hearings on January 23, 1973, the committee received testimony from outgoing AEC Chairman Dr. James R. Schlesinger.

Phase II of the safety hearings have been scheduled for September 25, 26, and 27, 1973, with sessions beginning on each of those days at 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. The objective of phase II is to develop a complete public record of the present status of the safety of civilian nuclear power reactors and related matters. The committee plans to receive oral testimony from Atomic Energy Commissioners, representatives of the Commission's regulatory staff, Directors of Commission reactor safety research programs, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, and representatives of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board panel.

In announcing the scheduling of phase II I want to note that the Atomic Energy Commission has completed its work on the nuclear safety report requested by the joint committee—The Safety of Nuclear Power Reactors and Related Facilities—WASH 1250—and has made it available to the committee and the public. I believe that it is timely for the joint committee to now receive oral testimony and hold discussions on the subject matter of this report and, in particular, the substantive current issues of importance to nuclear reactor safety.

The committee is aware of several significant safety-related issues now being considered under the AEC's rulemaking procedure. In some cases, the records of these proceedings have been referred to the Commission for decision. In other cases the records are nearly completed. The committee does not intend to foreshorten the Commission's deliberations in connection with these rulemaking cases and would not expect discussion of the ultimate judgments to be reached by the Commissioners. It is clear, however, that the Commission witnesses can and should be prepared to discuss the factors which must be considered in reaching decisions on important matters such as acceptance criteria for emergency core cooling systems and effluents from nuclear power reactors.

The committee intends to conduct a third phase of the nuclear safety hearings during the fall of this year. In phase III, testimony will be received from representatives of the nuclear community, environmental organizations, and the public at large. The committee is especially interested in obtaining the views of those persons outside the Government having expertise in areas important to the consideration of the safety of nuclear power reactors.

An announcement providing further information concerning the conduct of the phase III hearings will be made at a later time.

ST. ALBANS SHOULD BE NEW QUEENS VA FACILITY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I and other members of the New York delegation from Queens visited the St. Albans Naval Hospital which is due to be deactivated by the Navy. I disagree strenuously with this plan; however, in the event that the Navy intends to go through with it, the best alternative would be to convert the facility to a Veterans Hospital.

The Borough of Queens in New York City has no veterans facility at the present time. Between it and its neighboring county, Nassau, there are over half a million veterans.

There has been some positive movement in Congress toward authorization of a veterans facility for Queens. The cost for a new facility, of course, would be extremely high. The cost of conversion, however, would be a great deal less. Estimates put such a cost at roughly $5 million. The Hospital itself is an ideal facility. It has extensive research facilities, where the first open heart-lung machine was built by hand and where the first operation of this kind was performed successfully in the New York area. The hospital is an accredited teaching facility for surgery, medicine, and dentistry.

St. Albans has an ideal capacity of 1,000 beds and was able to handle 2,000 patients during the Vietnam conflict. It has a brand new building that is to house WAVES and that could easily be converted to provide housing for medical students. The 120 acre park-like grounds also include a 1,200-seat auditorium, a recreation building, and a swimming pool.

The minor conversion needs for the complete project could be accomplished quickly and the hospital can be put into speedy service to meet the needs of a large veteran population.

There has been some talk that this facility could be substituted for the construction of a new facility in the Bronx, which has already been authorized. This, too, would be ill-advised. Both facilities are needed and both should be constructed. The existing Bronx facility is greatly outmoded and should be replaced with a new, modern facility to meet the needs of the many veterans in the Bronx and lower Westchester County.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House Veterans Affairs Committee to take quick action to assure that if St. Albans is finally abandoned by the Navy Department, it will be converted to a Veterans facility immediately thereafter.

AEC STATEMENT OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks a new barrage of sensational statements concerning the handling and management of radioactive wastes has appeared in many of the Nation's newspapers. The context of much of this material is that the AEC has been and is irresponsible in its program for handling of such wastes, and that because of such irresponsibility there is a threat of radioactive poisoning to the population of certain areas of the country.

Nothing could be further from the truth. If ever there was an outstanding program for exercising caution and safety, it has been in the AEC's program for handling radioactive material. I know that to be a fact because I worked as a nuclear research scientist for 20 years in a major AEC laboratory. Much of that time I worked with very large quantities of highly radioactive materials. I know from personal experience that because of the AEC's standards for safety it is far safer to work in an AEC laboratory than it is to work in an average industrial facility in the United States.

In addition to providing safe programs, the AEC has for years assembled and made available to the public a vast library of authoritative documented information on the proper handling and management of radioactive material. This includes documentation of the hazards associated with every single radioactive nucleus in existence, particularly with respect to biological uptake and involvement with human physiology. If the AEC can be criticized for anything it would be for not publicizing and sensationalizing its own high safety record.

The AEC has announced today that it will prepare environmental statements on its waste management operations for the three major sites where wastes are stored. These will be based to a very large degree on the wealth of material that has been assembled by the AEC on every aspect of environmental protection during the last 25 years. In addition the AEC has released today a bibliography of more than 1,000 public technical reports on management of radioactive wastes. These have been published every 2 weeks since January 1961.

I am proud that this Nation can boast such responsible management as the AEC provides, and proud also that the AEC's documented records are available to any member of the public who wishes to obtain the facts on radioactive waste management.

The statement released by the AEC today is as follows:

AEC To Prepare Environmental Impact Statements on Three Waste Management Operations

The Atomic Energy Commission announced today that environmental impact statements on waste management operations at the Hanford Reservation in eastern Washington, the Savannah River Plant in South Carolina, and the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho Falls, Idaho, are being prepared.

AEC has always required its site contractors to perform extensive environmental monitoring. A great deal of information on site ecology, meteorology, geology, hydrology, and seismicity, is therefore available, which has been used in the preparation of specific environmental impact statements on discrete waste management projects at AEC sites.

Now, three more comprehensive impact statements are being prepared to cover all aspects of the total waste management program at Hanford, Savannah River, and Idaho Falls. These will be considered by the Commission when making decisions that relate to waste management activities. They should also contribute to a better public understanding of nuclear waste management processing.

The Commission will make draft impact statements available at the earliest possible time so that the Council on Environmental Quality, appropriate federal, state, and local agencies, and the public, may comment.

In addition to preparation of the three statements, the Commission plans to establish, as soon as possible, five information centers where these waste management data will be readily accessible to the public. The centers will be the AEC public document rooms in Washington, D.C.; San Francisco, California; Richland, Washington; Aiken, South Carolina; and Idaho Falls, Idaho.

The Commission also announced today the issuance of a bibliography of literature dealing with waste management at the Hanford Reservation. The bibliography contains abstracts of 1,098 technical reports and articles which have appeared in Nuclear Science Abstracts—issued every two weeks—from January, 1961, through July, 1973. All of the reports are publically available, and most are available for review at more than 50 university libraries around the country.

The AEC publication, "Radioactive Waste Management, a Bibliography of Publically Available Literature Pertaining to the U.S. AEC's Hanford, Washington Production Site," T.I.D.—3340, August 1973, is available free of charge from the U.S. AEC Technical Information Center, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 37830.

ON THE ALASKAN PIPELINE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Alaskan pipeline bill voted on yesterday for numerous reasons which I would like to elaborate on here for the RECORD.

First and foremost in my mind were considerations of national security. With the heightening tensions in the Middle East, it is clear we may soon face a cutoff of our oil supplies from that sector. The Arabs have steadily increased their prices and taken over control of companies operating in the area to the point where they are reaping large economic benefits. This store of wealth will enable them to cut off our supply without suffering serious economic consequences. Without the supply of oil from the Northern Slope of Alaska, we would be unable to respond to this threat and might be faced with the necessity of abandoning our support of Israel.

It is for this reason more than for any alleged oil shortage that I voted for the bill. Along those same lines, I opposed the Canadian pipeline as an alternative. I am convinced that the pipeline can be built in Alaska in an environmentally safe condition. Thus, it is imperative that we maintain complete national control over the pipeline. While Canada has been a most friendly ally over the years, the vagaries of foreign policy in all countries these days makes future predictions unreliable.

In addition, there were other considerations for supporting the pipeline. This project would mean numerous jobs and a substantial economic transfusion for the economy of Alaska and the country at large. For this reason, I also supported amendments that required the employment of only U.S. nationals and the use of only U.S.-made goods in the construction of the pipeline. Both of these provisions will help assure a large benefit for the American economy.

I also supported two additional, worthwhile amendments that deal with the national economy.

The first, which passed, prohibited the export of the crude oil from the pipeline unless Congress adopts a concurrent resolution permitting the export. This is essential to assure that the oil will end up in U.S. supplies. I also supported an amendment, which did not pass, that would have allocated half the oil coming through the pipeline to States east of the Mississippi River. This is where the alleged fuel shortage is most critical. Such an amendment, had it been adopted, would have assured my home State of an adequate supply of fuel oil—particularly home heating oil—for the winters.

There were several amendments introduced to protect the environment and assure that a precedent would not be set by construction of the Alaskan pipeline. Foremost of these was the amendment that would have eliminated the section that exempted the pipeline from judicial review under the National Environmental Policy Act. This would have been the easiest way to assure an end to any precedent. However, this amendment failed. Nevertheless, other amendments that were adopted and the general and specific debate clearly set forth the intent of Congress that no precedent was being set by barring further judicial review under NEPA.

Numerous other amendments offered by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) were also sound and would have tightened up any loopholes that might have developed with respect to violation of the environment.

I supported all of these amendments and regret that most of them did not pass. However, one which did pass removed the dollar limitation on the liability of oil companies for any oil spills resulting from the pipeline oil. This assures that any spills will be the full responsibility of the companies involved. It should also make them more cautious in handling the oil moving through the pipeline.

The pipeline must go forward and it must go through Alaska. I hope the bill can be moved through conference quickly and sent to the President for signature. I also hope that no further delays will result in the construction of this important aspect of our national energy supply.

SHEFFIELD, MASS., CELEBRATES 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, many towns in Massachusetts are known for their famous residents. Sheffield, in my First Congressional District, which celebrates the 200th anniversary of the signing of its "Declaration of Freedom" this year, is one of these towns.

Revered president of Columbia University in the mid-1800's Frederick Augustus Porter Barnard, for whom Bernard College in New York was named; his brother, Civil War General John Gross Barnard; respected botanist and mineralogist Chester Dewey; famed song writer George Francis Root, who penned "The Battle Cry of Freedom," "Tramp, Tramp, Tramp, the Boys Are Marching," and other stirring patriotic songs during the Civil War, and former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate Theodore Sedgwick, are all native sons of this lovely town in the southwestern quadrant of the Bay State.

Sheffield is also well known as the place where the early seeds of freedom—of colony from crown and of slave from master—were sown and nurtured.

To recall the notable events of early Sheffield is to recall some of the finest moments in the history of one of the most beautiful areas of western Massachusetts, the Berkshires.

Sheffield was founded by Matthew Noble, a hardy pioneer, who, in the fall of 1724, traveled west from the town of Westfield to establish a home in the vast, thick forest that was the Berkshire region. The settlement thus begun by Noble was the first in that area.

Much of the early success of the town of Sheffield resulted from the frequent town meetings held to discuss pressing problems. Begun in 1733, the general meetings were occasions when the citizens might gather to devise ways to promote settlement in the area.

In one of its first such meetings, townspeople voted to erect a meeting house and employ a person to preach. Religion was taken and supported seriously in those times, and, at one point, attendance at church was required every 3 months.

The threat that the Massachusetts Colony would fall under the rule of New York's Dutch Colony and the concurrent threat that England's King George III and his Parliament would take away their land rights, led the citizens of Sheffield to take precautions. To protect their rights and to state their beliefs, a statement was drafted that came to be called

the Declaration of Freedom. Without a doubt, that document is the most enduring achievement of the Sheffield general meetings. Basic human rights were asserted for Sheffield residents and for residents of all the Colonies. The document recognized the same principles that were the kernel of the American Declaration of Independence—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I believe it is altogether fitting that the citizens of Sheffield have reserved the weekend of August 18 to mark the 200th anniversary of the signing of this important document.

"All This Freedom Talk," the name of the official anniversary play, written by Arthur C. Chase, retired assistant headmaster of the Berkshire School in Sheffield, will be presented August 18 and 19. It tells the story of Sheffield's "Mum Bett," and her struggle for freedom from slavery. Her famous court case, Brown and Bett against Ashley, in 1781, is a landmark in the fight for individual rights and the struggle for freedom and equality for all.

One might ask, quite appropriately, if there was some quality of geography or climate that made this spirit of independence flourish so in Sheffield. It is a site of great scenic beauty and within its environs are mountains, rolling hills, and the valley of the Housatonic River.

Although the town of Sheffield was never a large industrial center, there was a time when small industries employed many local residents. Today Sheffield, with a population of 2,400, is the leading agricultural community in Berkshire County—the westernmost county in the State. It is the county's center for poultry raising and dairy farming. The Southern Berkshire Regional School District, the first 12-grade regional school district in Massachusetts, is headquartered in Sheffield.

Mr. Speaker, Sheffield residents take a real antiquarian's pride in the history of their town and their Declaration of Freedom, as well they might. They will be rolling out the welcome mat to this lovely and historic spot August 18 and 19 with an arts and crafts exhibition and gala parade. It is with enthusiasm that I enjoin all of my colleagues to visit the town of Sheffield during this time.

WATERGATE AFFAIR

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, despite the prime status accorded such clamoring issues as the Watergate affair, I must remind my colleagues that, while it does not rate extensive television coverage, the question of amnesty still waits to be fully discussed. In six previous statements made before the House, I have highlighted my concern, from both historical and practical standpoints, that we as a Nation begin the inescapable challenge of repairing our tattered self-esteem and unity, which have been the domestic side effects of a tragic war. In short, the amnesty issue cannot be ignored or quickly passed off as unimportant, for as well as being paramount to the lives of those involved, it is also a means by which we can exercise our strength and confidence in the enduring aspects of what I believe to be an essential national cohesiveness.

We are half-way there, if there is any indicator in the response resulting from a recent interview in the Wall Street Journal concerning my attitudes toward amnesty. Since June 18, when that interview was printed, I have received approximately 60 letters, weighed about equally pro and con. Some applauded my nerve and supported my stance—some, were appalled that I could even consider such so-called traitors in the same breath with reconciliation and individual forgiveness. From the angry mother who harshly wrote "I tell you here and now I wish I had told my son this country was not worth serving to preserve the hides of sly, clever men like you," to the Sheriff from Billerica, Mass., who said, "A more sensitive attitude toward amnesty would certainly be a step in recovering some of our strength as a nation for the people, by the people—thank you and continue the courageous effort you have started." The correspondence has been as diverse as the category human emotion.

A sergeant major from World War II wrote, via Rev. Ned Cole, Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Central New York:

"A recent issue of The American Legion Magazine had a lengthy proposal for handling the matter. Roughly, it paralleled the plan used by the Truman administration following World War II. It called for individual screening of each and every draft evader, and I would like to add my own comments to this procedure.

There are really four classes of evaders. For some, if they had gone through the process of induction, would have found that they were physically or mentally unqualified for military service.

Another group, merely by registering, would have identified themselves to certain sheriffs or police departments.

The largest group I really feel sorry for. They, for CO reasons, or for other idealistic motivation have paid a very high penalty. They have wasted the best years of their lives in Canada or elsewhere, years when they should have pursued education, or established themselves in some occupation. The penalty has yet a long way to go. For example, how do any of them account for the missing years on an application for employment? Especially if the employer or personnel manager happens to be a veteran? These men should not have to come back to give equivalent service in the Peace Corps, Vista, etc., but should be just turned loose.

The fourth group, probably a tiny minority, are determined to raise havoc with the American form of government. Subversives, violent radicals, with criminal intent. These should be under surveillance for a long time, possibly for the rest of their lives.

The whole process of amnesty must be one of law, best moved from military law to civil law.

In our relations at this time with Russia, China, and Japan, it would appear that conditions in the Far East are very stable, and that the Vietnam War was entirely unnecessary . . .

No reasonable person wants war, whether he be a Christian or a non-Christian. I am far from alone dreaming of the day when there will be no more war, but I will not see it in my lifetime, I am sure. For to unilaterally lay down our arms, and make war no more, as a few of our most idealistic draft evaders believe, is to crucify the people of the United States. Until every nation renounces war, insurrection, terrorism, subversion, and sanctions—all forms of force—this nation must maintain a large, well-trained military establishment, and I am content that my son is a part of it."

From Wichita, Kans.:

I had opposed this war both on moral and pragmatic reasons since 1963—perhaps because I knew that inevitably my fine son and son-in-law would probably be drawn into it, as they were. My son-in-law, a marine, lost his left arm and suffered many other lasting wounds there. Because of my stand, I felt isolated from my friends and even from some members of my family. I try to be a Christian, have always been an active member of my church. I really carried a burden of guilt about this war; and I wrote repeatedly to my representatives in Congress over the years.

I am most relieved that we no longer have ground forces there, and pray we shall stop bombing Cambodia. We must find it in our hearts to forget, at least, if not forgive those who could not find it in their conscience to participate actively in this very tragic and questionable war.

The tradegy of that war will linger on and continue to divide us as a people if we do not arrange some kind of amnesty. It is so ironic that we can entertain our former enemies in the White House, but we cannot find the compassion to let our own sons return home.

I do not think we are really this lacking in love and understanding; our leaders have failed to give us the proper direction. That is the reason I am so heartened by your brave stand. May God bless you.

From New York City, a Wall Street Journal reader writes:

"Those of our young people who have with great mental anguish and at great material costs to themselves and their families acted to prevent being victimized are not criminals. They deserve acclaim as brave patriotic Americans fighting in the only way open to them to make the Constitution mean something. It is those who allowed themselves to be herded who are the cowards of our time. Civilized Justice demands that these fighters against Presidential usurpation of authority and Congressional impotence be promptly released from whatever punishment of threats of punishment or exile they are suffering."

From Bristow, Okla.:

I note by the Wall Street Journal that you are going to bat for our modern Benedict Arnolds. Don't you realize what a dangerous precedent for future years? . . . If Congress and the Senate had got up like men and stopped Kennedy and Johnson from getting into the war, there would be no amnesty to worry about now. You can't blame the young for running away instead of going and fighting in the jungles. Nevertheless, if granted amnesty, Sweden and Canada would be filled with U.S. deserters in the next war.

From Shelby, Nebr.:

I like the idea that our country is big enough to tolerate people with different ideas. The American Legion magazine had an article this year that told of amnesty boards after World War II. We can surely work out some system to let these young people come back to the U.S.A.

Our country may need some of these people who dare to be different. A lot of those people were among the first settlers in America.

And lastly, from a constituent in Waverly, N.Y.:

You have changed my mind . . . on the Amnesty Problem. You sure make good sense.

Mr. Speaker, while not attempting in any way to "blow my own horn", I sincerely hope I make "good sense," and that those of us in Congress who are willing to grapple with this problem can succeed in underscoring certain blatantly conspicuous needs in this country; in particular, a kind of honesty and impartial reflectiveness that has lately been mowed over by emotionalism. We can begin to nurse back to health our national unity by responsibly tackling this most controversial problem.

BEEF SHORTAGE SERIOUS

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, despite administration claims to the contrary, the country is now faced with a severe beef shortage. The sharp dropoff in the slaughter of cattle which has occurred since the phase IV rules were announced on July 18 gives the clearest indication of the severity of the beef shortage to come.

The following table gives the number of heads of cattle slaughtered weekly since April of this year. The figures for early April reflect the national boycott of meat which occurred at that time.

Slaughter—weekly total followed by daily average, both in thousands of head

Week ending:		
Apr. 7	456	91
Apr. 14	477	95
Apr. 21	571	114
Apr. 28	554	111
May 5	581	116
May 12	621	124
May 19	600	120
May 26	619	124
June 2 [1]	537	134
June 9	607	121
June 16	596	119
June 23	599	120
June 30	601	120
July 7 [1]	500	125
July 14	626	125
July 21	588	117
July 28	538	107
Aug. 4 [2]		81

[1] Holiday that week.
[2] Based on 1st 3 days of this week.

If the pace established the first 3 days of this week is maintained, production this week will be down 25 percent from last week and 35 percent from the previous week. As can be seen from the table, production of beef had been at a relatively high and stable rate prior to July 18.

The slaughter figures show conclusively that a shortage is developing but they do not tell the whole story. The distribution of the available supplies is not normal because of the hoarding which has been caused by the fear of shortages. There are reports that some of the supply has been finding its way into the black market. The Wall Street Journal reported on August 1 that more American beef was finding its way to Canadian processors, only to be returned to the United States as higher priced imports. All these facts mean that less and less beef is going to be available to the normal American consumer who is neither hoarding nor has access to black market supplies.

The irony of the present shortage is that it need not occur. The Department of Agriculture had estimated that total cattle coming to market in the 90-day period from July 1 to September 1 would be about 6,989,000. This would have been an increase of 11 percent over the 6,302,000 which came to market from April 1 to July 1. These are cattle which would be an available supply if the price ceiling is lifted. If the beef ceiling is kept on until September 12, there will be a sharp decrease in total cattle marketed instead of an increase.

The prospect of an end to the beef price ceiling is not a pleasant one. Undoubtedly, there will be price rises whenever the ceiling is lifted. James McClane, Deputy Director of the Cost of Living Council, was quoted in the Wall Street Journal as predicting that an immediate suspension of the beef price ceiling would cause the price of beef to rise 10 percent at one fell swoop resulting in a 1-percent rise in the consumer price index. These beef price index rises would come on top of other recent substantial rises in food prices.

The alternative to lifting the ceiling would be even less pleasant than a suspension of the lid on prices. There would then be shortages lasting for well over a month until the ceiling was lifted on September 12. The fact that beef prices were frozen is not very much help when there is none to buy. Substantial rises in the price of beef will then occur on September 12. We would only be delaying our recovery from economic controls by continuing the freeze on beef prices until September 12.

PRODUCTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the July 1973 edition of the Inland Printer, a publication devoted to stories concerning the graphic arts, has an interesting article about the production of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the Government Printing Office which I am sure Members of Congress will enjoy reading. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD AT GPO—LETTERPRESS/HOT METAL DO THE JOB

Letterpress printing and hot-metal composition are still the methods used for producing one of the world's most unusual publications—the *Congressional Record*. While the U.S. Congress is in session, virtually every word said on the floor of the House and Senate is transcribed, set in type, printed and delivered to Washington's power brokers before most people are having their breakfast coffee the next morning.

The *Congressional Record* is produced at the Government Printing Office. Because of the tight schedule and variations in size, turning out the *Record* makes production of the average newspaper look like a leisure hobby.

Approximately 50,000 copies of the *Record* are printed during each run. Issues range in size from 64 to more than 300 pages. The largest single issue was produced Oct. 10, 1965; it contained 704 pages. One hundred Linotypes are used for composition along with a battery of Monotype machines for tabular work.

The size of each issue is affected by the obvious variable of the length of the daily House and Senate sessions. Also, there is a section of the *Record* called "Extensions of Remarks." This is used for material which was not said on the floor but which the representatives or senators want to appear in the *Record*. This can be anything from speeches they did not give, newspaper clippings, commendatory statements about groups of constituents—or just about anything else.

The words "From the *Congressional Record*" are used to dignify all sorts of special-interest material. In reality, it simply means that someone persuaded his representative to have something printed in the *Record*.

Production of the *Congressional Record* starts with six reporters in the House and six in the Senate. Each reporter has one transcriber and two clerks. Every hour is divided into six 10-minute sections with each reporter and his team responsible for one segment each hour of the proceedings. There is a rather complex numbering system used for keeping track of the material.

Prior to its insertion in the *Record*, each of the legislators quoted is given his own copy to edit. Because of the time squeeze, getting copy back from all these people and delivering it to the GPO for overnight production makes keeping it straight, and in sequence, one of the most difficult problems.

It has been suggested that reporters directly punch tape instead of producing hard copy which must then be set. There seems to be little likelihood of this happening since the legislators insist on being able to edit their own copy.

For inclusion in the following day's *Record*, the deadline for copy with tabular matter is 7 p.m. and for straight copy 9 p.m. When copy does not make the deadline, type-high galley slugs are inserted to reserve the approximate amount of space needed. It is not unusual to have 40 or 50 "outs" from the House copy alone. This obviously complicates makeup.

The GPO schedule calls for the last stereotype plate to be ready for the press at 2:15 a.m. Press time on the double-deck rotary, web-fed presses is about two-and-a-half hours. Currently President Nixon's staffers now get very early delivery of the *Record* to prepare for 7 a.m. briefings at the White House. When you consider the volume and complexity of material, the time schedule is almost overwhelming.

Since the *Record* is produced at night and requires a large number of workers, its schedule, which is tied to the Congressional sessions, obviously creates some staffing problems. When Congress reconvenes, a staff is assembled largely from the day shift. While many of the people seem to thrive on the half-mad rush in which the *Record* is produced, they are also paid a 15% bonus over dayside rates.

Production demands on workers are extremely high. For example, the standard for Linotype operators is 4,250 ems per hour, which is much higher than most newspaper standards. Many experienced Linotype operators simply cannot keep up the pace and leave after a trial period.

The Government Printing Office was founded in 1861 as a result of criticism of the cost and problems resulting from having government printing handled by private

plants. One hundred years ago, in 1873, the first *Congressional Record* was produced by the GPO for the same reason. This is rather ironic as the GPO today buys more than half of all its printing from private plants. Outside procurement was initiated in 1929 and has grown consistently since that time.

From 1837 to 1873, debates and proceedings of Congress were reported in the privately owned *Congressional Globe*. Typographically, the *Congressional Record* really reflects the era in which it was founded. The only really major style change it had was in 1941 when it switched from two- to three-column makeup. Interestingly, this was the original format of the old *Congressional Globe*.

During its entire history, only one illustration, a political cartoon about income tax, has run in the *Congressional Record*. That was in 1913. The furor it created has precluded the use of anything but text material since that time.

Considering the speed and pressure under which it is produced, the *Congressional Record* has remarkably few typographical errors. However, because of the prominence of the persons mentioned and the careful reading the *Record* receives, the errors have generally produced a swift and noisy reaction. For example, when Congressman Blatnik of Minnesota was incorrectly identified as Mr. Beatnik, howls could be heard from as far away as Minneapolis. A headline reading, "President Johnson on a Fun Raising Trip to California," generated an even greater interest in careful proofreading.

DIFFICULTIES AND PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE PRESIDENT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the Sunday, July 29, 1973, edition of the Washington Star-News written by Mr. Bruce Herschensohn illustrates more clearly than anything I have read the tremendous difficulties and complex problems confronting any man who is elected President of the United States.

I commend the text of this article to my colleagues and urge all of you to read it, and then read it again. Its message is surely one that is food for thought and contemplation.

I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Star-News, July 29, 1973]

GIVE NIXON FLOWERS NOW

(By Bruce Herschensohn)

People always like dead presidents. It's the live ones they try to discredit.

That fact has never become more apparent than it has in recent times with the tragic losses of former Presidents Truman and Johnson.

I went to school with someone with whom I am still in contact. Through the years we have discussed politics and, most often, we have taken differing views. He was, from the outset, a professional president-discreditor.

Shortly after Gen. Eisenhower's death in 1969, I received a call from him. He said, "A great man is dead—a great man," he repeated. I agreed. The trouble was that he was giving me a revision from the position he maintained during Gen. Eisenhower's presidential years. I knew from past experience, however, that he didn't like any presidents while they were in office. Out-of-office presidents were fine. Dead ones were great. But if they were alive and in office, they presented some sort of public competition to his own rather unsuccessful and unfulfilling life . . .

Though at this date I cannot quote his words precisely, . . . (I recall that) in his first year of college he told me, "Truman is coarse and ill-mannered. Nothing more than a haberdasher. I wish FDR was back. FDR had dignity. There's no dignity in the White House anymore."

Years later, he said, "I wish Ike would pay as much attention to this country as he does to his golf score. He's a father image. A nice guy. We don't need a nice guy. We need a president with guts—like Truman."

. . . Unfortunately there are those who can only begin to see a president in perspective when the North Portico of the White House is shrouded in black and its flag is at half-staff.

What is it that would give us the means to view any president in true perspective while he serves us? Should there be a change in the demands we insist the President obey?

Of course not. Our expectations are reasonable enough. To the President we simply say:

Help the poor, but don't raise taxes.

Be courteous to the press while they rip you apart.

Raise profits for the farmer while keeping food costs down for the consumer.

Protect our national security while keeping nothing secret from the American public or the world.

Please both management and labor simultaneously.

Insure that communism does not overtake Southeast Asia, but do not defend that area of the world.

Make sure Israel is not overtaken, but keep our weapons out of the Mid-East.

Keep NATO as strong as the Warsaw Pact, but reduce our military strength in Europe.

Do not take sides in the conflicts between Pakistan and India but make sure hostilities do not recur.

Help smaller nations against the forces of aggression, but do not become the policeman of the world.

Keep our Army strong but stop the draft.

Halt subversion in Latin America, but reduce antagonism between the U.S. and Cuba.

Diminish crime but lessen the authority of the police.

Insure school integration but don't allow the federal government to step into local affairs.

Control pornography but do not bring about any form of censorship.

Increase Social Security benefits, but not their rates.

Protect the environment, but ease the penalties of polluters.

Increase guaranteed health care, but don't let socialism encroach upon the free market place.

Give responsibility to others within your administration, but do not delegate authority.

Investigate every accusation of Washington's morning newspaper, though it had cried wolf with false accusations for four years.

Let each person in your administration speak his own mind, but always have their statements be consistent with other members of the administration.

Call for candor on the part of your staff, but allow all their personal correspondence to you and staff members to be read by the media.

Give each voter your unswerving loyalty, but downplay loyalty of your staff.

Live a life of exemplary morality, but don't be a square.

Be a master television performer, but don't use any media techniques.

Do all of these things. And further keep your pledge to work for a generation of peace, but save your time to see all those who want to see you, and read everything sent to you without delegation, for otherwise you will be in isolation . . .

And lastly, for all presidents: Behave like a god but unlike a god, stand unexcused and condemned if one of your associates turns out to be a Judas.

And in the case of this particular President: Tend to all your business of your second term while your first term is put under a microscope in public, exempting from the microscope's lens all of your accomplishments, but examining in the minutest detail anything seemingly negative that can be withdrawn, whether or not it has relevancy to the avowed purpose of the examination.

And tend to all your business while your closest friends answer charges and accusations, real or unreal, in front of millions without benefit of the protections given a defendant in court. And realize, too, that anyone of those senators conducting the hearings who may bring out any fact of defense, can be considered partisan, while the definition of "non-partisan" for a committee member is anyone who opposes you, no matter his political party. Listen to the fairness of the pre-judgment of the chairman who has publicly labeled you in a speech as "the most repressive President in the history of the Republic," after hearing less than half the testimony. Listen to the sugar-coated, homespun philosophies and watch benevolent smiles treated upon anyone who tries to destroy your administration, and watch the hostility and hear the harrassment towards those who defend it. And whether your friends are guilty or innocent, and no matter how much they have done for this country, watch your friends while they are blemished for life.

And don't tell us about your past accomplishments. We have no interest in the fact that you brought about new relations with China, or brought about a detente with the Soviet Union, or signed nuclear agreements, or brought our prisoners of war home, or have taken our troops out of Vietnam, or stopped revolts and fires in the cities. We do, however, care very much about where the money came from for the geraniums in your California garden.

Yes, the rules we set for the presidency are very simple: Only the same rules which we prescribe and observe for ourselves, our families and our closest friends. Who, among us, shouldn't be casting stones?

Who, among us, would not be pleased to have our accomplishments dismissed and replaced with the errors of an associate?

Of course, the word "Watergate" is exciting and some rush to see its revelations in the same way some rush to the sound of a siren, perhaps hoping to see a victim, with the subconscious delight that the victim is not they—because they know it could be.

I have seen smiles when a television viewer hears a witness saying "in hindsight." But if we could all let your forethought advance to hindsight, we could place this moment in the perspective of the 4½ years past, and the 3½ years to follow.

Twenty years ago, when I was a messenger boy at RKO Radio Pictures in Los Angeles, I worked for a man named Edwin Wald. Prior to his entrance to motion pictures he was a shoe salesman. Though he was a very great man, I am sure his name is not familiar to you as, after all, shoe salesmen and heads of messenger rooms are not given much of a place in history. When I knew him he was a man in his seventies, rather small in physical stature, always wore a hat, even indoors, and he was able to walk only by the use of very heavy braces on both legs and with the help of a cane.

He became known as a kind of studio philosopher, a man from whom you would seek advice. His opinions were often given

brusquely, often with toughness, never with diplomacy, always with wisdom.

One day I was standing with him outside the messenger room on one of those long studio streets framed by sound stages. It was noontime and the technicians, artists and craftsmen were walking to and from lunch. With his upraised cane he pointed to some far off walkers and he said to me, "When I'm gone, a lot of these people are going to put flowers on my grave. But," he said, "at that time I won't be able to smell them." Then he paused, lowered his cane and allowed his weight to be supported by it. He looked up the street in the opposite direction and, in an untypically soft voice, addressing no one in particular, he said, "Give me my flowers now."

Mr. Wald died six years later. I do not know if I did or did not give Mr. Wald his flowers while he was alive, but he deserved them. I do know that I have never put flowers on his grave and I never will.

It's too late.

ON THE NEED FOR MENTAL HEALTH PERSONNEL

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the crucial shortage of trained professional personnel to care for the mentally ill and the handicapped. These unfortunate people are too soon forgotten in the busy activities of everyday life. Yet their problems affect everyone.

Approximately 21 million Americans—about one-tenth of our national population—are deficient in speech, language and/or hearing. The U.S. Office of Education reports children with speech and hearing disorders comprise the largest single disability group among persons under 21 years of age. Only 1.4 million of the 2.5 million school-age children with speech impediments are receiving some form of needed speech training; 1.1 million receive no services at all.

There is a shortage of trained professionals in virtually all school districts. The professional-to-pupil ratio in the speech-impediment areas is approximately one pathologist for every 82 speech-impaired children. The situation is worse in the case of professionals who work with children with deficient hearing. Only about 3,900 audiologists and teachers of these children are presently employed in the special education programs in the public schools. Close to 28,000 are needed—seven times the number now providing services.

An estimated 20 million people or 1 out of every 10 Americans is suffering from some form of mental or emotional illness that requires medical treatment. Mental illness or other personality related disturbances are usually significant factors in criminal behavior, delinquency, suicide, alcoholism, narcotics addiction, and very often factors of divorce. In 1970 approximately 338,592 patients were confined to State and county mental institutions. How many people who asked for help were turned away? Where did these needy people find help or were they ignored to suffer alone?

It is estimated that there are approximately 6 million Americans who are mentally retarded, half of whom are under the age of 21. Of almost 3 million individuals only 603,000 are being educated or trained in the public schools. There are only 48,000 full time staff teachers conducting special classes for the mentally retarded. This means there are only 79 teachers per 1,000 pupils, with many children receiving no help at all. In my visits to Rockland State Hospital, Willowbrook State School, and Letchworth Village State School, I found numerous instances of noncompliance with Federal regulations. The wretched conditions could be described as right out of the Middle Ages. The largest problem is the lack of personnel to supervise, care for and train the patients. For a specific example, on Friday, February 4, 1972, following a call to my office from Mr. and Mrs. John Renelli, that their daughter had been severely beaten, I visited the hospital at Willowbrook and accompanied by a member of Willowbrook's medical staff to visit the child and to ascertain the extent and causes of her injuries. She was suffering from massive injuries, with multiple unhealed sores and bruises over her entire body. One eye had been injured and was closed and extremely swollen. Her chin and lip had been cut and stitched, her nose was badly scraped and there were possible skull injuries. Their daughter, Adrienne, had been violently abused by other patients because of lack of proper supervision and personnel.

These children need special love and individual care to be able to lead healthy, useful lives. By encouraging more volunteers to help in our institutions and schools we could free the professionals for problems which necessitate supervision. Further, they could provide the individual attention which encourages children to find their place in society.

My bills H.R. 314 and H.R. 315 would not solve the immense problem overnight, but would aim at decreasing the shortage of trained professional personnel by encouraging college students to opt for a course in this field.

My first bill would amend the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act to allow for partial or total cancellation of loan obligations for full-time professional service in public or private, nonprofit mental hospitals and in schools for the handicapped.

My second bill would encourage the part-time employment of psychology, sociology, and social work students in hospital programs involving the treatment of mentally disturbed patients or the mentally retarded. Each student majoring in those and/or related departments will be required to complete a certain number of hours actually working as a volunteer in a State mental institution. By instituting an "open-door" policy to student volunteers and encouraging active participation by our educational institutions we can provide urgently needed, virtually untapped manpower source. Young people of today are capable, enlightened, and anxious to work. Not only will they be contributing a valuable service but they will be learning about new careers and experiencing life.

As the human problems grow and worsen we are faced with an administration which has chosen to cut back the funding of programs for the mentally ill and the handicapped. But no one has bothered to estimate the cost of these funds cuts in terms of lost human potential, or to put a price on the suffering this policy will cause the families of those afflicted with mental disabilities. It is only through enactment of legislation such as I have proposed that we can expect to make any inroads in the fight to provide decent care and humane treatment for everyone.

DAYTON LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT STUDY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have called to the attention of my colleagues the Dayton Light Rail Transit study in the past. Recently, I addressed some questions on the project to the consulting engineers who are preparing the study. Their answer was most responsive and so that all Members might be advised of the progress of this report, I include my letter to Mr. Louis T. Klauder and Associates along with their answers to be included in the RECORD at this point:

JULY 24, 1973.

Mr. LOUIS T. KLAUDER,
L. T. Klauder and Associates,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. KLAUDER: As a member of the Mass Transit Sub-committee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have been monitoring the Dayton light rail project very closely.

Some disturbing reports have come to my attention and rather than raising these questions after your study has been completed, I thought it best to bring my concerns to your attention at this time to see if these matters could be clarified.

As I see it, the advantages of light rail over conventional rail rapid transit, in applicable situations, involve not only the vehicles size but also the type of rights-of-way, signaling systems, etc., etc.

Indications are that, outside of vehicle size, your study is headed toward recommendations which would make the proposed Dayton route similar to the Lindenwold line, with costs per mile nearly equal to those of conventional rail.

I believe there will be intense national interest in the Dayton project because if the study makes a convincing case that light rail can be installed in medium markets at reasonable costs, there may indeed be a place for this kind of technology in the United States. But if your recommendations should provide for such an upgraded system that there is little difference in cost between conventional rail and light rail, I believe light rail technology will be a dead issue.

Now, it may be that in order to operate freight service on the same line certain cost adjustments need to be made, but in such a case, I would hope your figures would differentiate between those costs required for light rail and those required for a joint passenger-freight operation. Also, perhaps your study contemplates the use of certain high-

way related funds for the elimination of grade crossings and the like. I would hope that these funds would be clearly distinguishable from the real costs of the project.

Accordingly, I would appreciate it very much if you could give me a progress report on your study and comments on these important issues.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP M. CRANE,
Member of Congress.

LOUIS T. KLAUDER AND ASSOCIATES,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 27, 1973.

Subject: Dayton Light Rail Transit Study.

Hon. PHILIP M. CRANE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRANE: Thank you very much for your letter concerning the Dayton light rail transit study, which arrived at our offices in Philadelphia yesterday afternoon.

We were delighted to learn of your interest in the Dayton light rail projects, and pleased that you would take the time to convey your questions concerning it to us.

We agree that the prospects for light rail transit in Dayton deserve national attention, since solutions there may point the way for many other cities of moderate size throughout the United States.

Cities like Dayton have been handicapped in recent years, because they are too large to be able to depend solely on automotive transportation, but not large enough to support full-scale rapid transit similar to the Lindenwold line here in Philadelphia.

The Lindenwold line has been an outstanding success. We think it is the best demonstration yet of how effective and valuable modern rapid transit can be.

Since its opening in early 1969, the Line:

(1) Has operated continuously without mishap.

(2) Has experienced ridership growth of approximately 13% per year, and now carries more than 40,000 riders per day.

(3) Has derived revenues from fares that are approximately twice as high as those charged for subway travel across the river in Philadelphia.

(4) Has achieved the highest level of operational efficiency ever seen in the rapid transit industry, through reliance on modern electronics and automation.

(5) Has had the fewest employees per passenger and per pasenger-mile of any rapid transit line in the country.

(6) Has become the only rapid transit system in the United States meeting all costs of operation from farebox receipts.

(7) Has, in fact, generated an operating surplus to offset some of the capital costs for the system, amounting in the current year to approximately 12% of farebox revenues received.

There are many reasons for this extraordinary record of accomplishment, but the principal ones are high service speeds, frequent trains, an unmatched record of reliability and reduced total expense for commuters. Speeds and expense have had the greatest impact. Daily trip times and out-of-pocket costs were cut in half when the Line opened.

Construction of the Lindenwold line was completed in late 1968, at a cost of approximately $93 million. The investment was financed without assistance from the federal or state governments.

The investment represented an average construction cost of approximately $8 million per mile of new line when built. The same construction today would cost approximately $13 million per mile.

These unit cost figures are lower than typically would be experienced for a new system like the Lindenwold line, because the tunnels in Camden and Philadelphia and the bridge crossing of the Delaware River used by the Lindenwold trains were in place before the new line was begun. Where elements such as these need to be included in new construction, the unit cost for a system like the Lindenwold line is approximately $30 million per mile, at today's prices.

We are not considering a Lindenwold line for Dayton.

Rail transit in Dayton will have to compete in an auto oriented market. High speeds, reliability and low expense will therefore certainly have a large effect on the success of rail transit service, just as was the case with the Lindenwold line.

We are convinced, however, that these objectives can be achieved for the passenger volumes that can be expected in Dayton at much lower cost.

Our feasibility report on the Dayton light rail line is not yet complete, but we expect to be able to show that the line could be built for less than $3 million per mile, including all costs of construction. This represents approximately one-fourth of the current cost of the Lindenwold line, approximately one-tenth of the cost of full-scale rapid transit in most other situations, and an equally small fraction of any highway alternative that would be expected to carry equivalent passenger volumes in the corridor under study.

The low cost for construction reflects major savings related to fixed facilities. The line we have under consideration would lie at grade throughout its length. There would be no tunnels, no elevated viaducts, no grade separations and no large station structures. Traction power and signal systems would be lean and as simple as they could possibly be made and still get the job done safely.

We foresee virtually no costs for construction of the line that would be exclusively related to the preservation of railroad freight service in the corridor.

The rail transit service would offer speed and cost advantages equivalent to those experienced in southern New Jersey as a result of the Lindenwold line. Travel times and out-of-pocket costs for commutation by rail during peak travel periods would be half as large as presently experienced for automotive trips.

As a result, our preliminary figures indicate that estimated ridership on the line would be twice as large as that previously estimated for a busway service in the same corridor. With this volume, revenues derived from a flat fare of 40¢ per passenger would be sufficient to cover operating costs with a comfortable margin.

We don't have responsibility in our study for comparative evaluation of alternative forms of rapid transit for the light rail corridor. We believe, however, that the light rail line offers service and operating cost advantages vastly superior to any alternative we have heard yet discussed for the corridor. And these advantages may be expected to multiply over future years in our chronically inflationary economy.

I hope this review of the situation is satisfactory, and that you will find yourself in agreement that the expected construction cost of the light rail line appears more than reasonable, for a facility that can be expected to serve the people of Dayton and nearby communities so well during the next forty years.

I earnestly hope that this is the case, because the message needs to be carried to your colleagues in Congress and beyond, before it will be possible to get light rail lines in Dayton and elsewhere actually built and into operation.

We do sincerely appreciate your interest.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE R. BEETLE.

STUDENT PAPER ON HEARING AID INDUSTRY

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an interesting paper that has resulted from my summer high school intern program.

Thirty-one outstanding high school students from the Eighth District of Maryland have recently completed a 3-week program of seminars, field trips, and individual research. Each intern selected a topic of current interest, conducted a close study of problems and possible solutions, and submitted a paper of his or her findings at the conclusion of the program.

From these papers, I have selected one that shows especially conscientious research in a neglected but important area: the hearing aid industry. This study, written by Nadine Woodard, of Springbrook High School, discusses the problems faced by consumers in this industry, and its text follows:

Running a close second to Ms. Woodard's paper is a fine analysis of noise pollution effects by Douglas L. Beresford, a student at Landon School.

Ms. Woodard's paper seems to me a valuable contribution to the 93d Congress, and its text follows:

THE HEARING AID INDUSTRY

(By Nadine Woodard, Springbrook High School, July 13, 1973)

"I am just as deaf as I am blind. The problems of deafness are deeper and more complex, if not more important, than those of blindness. Deafness is a much worse misfortune. For it means the loss of the most vital stimulus—the sound of the voice that brings language, sets thoughts astir, and keeps us in the intellectual company of man."

—HELEN KELLER

INTRODUCTION

The blind carry white canes and wear innocent, almost omniscient expressions. In return, they each receive a seven hundred fifty dollar exemption on their federal income tax forms. The retarded and palsied often appear physically "different"; their related organizations sponsor annual telethons which raise millions of dollars for research and individual aid.

However, the hearing impaired receive no exemptions, sponsor no telethons, and do not appear to be physically handicapped. Hearing aids are the only tell-tale signs of their misfortune, bulging under clothing or protruding from the ear. When purchasing hearing aids, the deaf are literally paying high prices to compensate for their handicaps. These high prices help to explain the fact that while fifteen million Americans have significant hearing impairments, only ten percent of those afflicted wear hearing aids.[1] When faced with outrageous prices, the social stigma attached to hearing aid use, the lack of public and consumer education about hearing loss, and the shortage of qualified hearing health professionals, it is little wonder that few hearing impaired persons bother to seek help. Unscrupulous sales techniques coupled with misleading advertising often

---

Footnotes at end of article.

induce those persons who do seek help to make needless or inappropriate hearing aid purchases. Half of all hearing aid users are aged sixty-five or over, the majority of whose family incomes are less than four thousand dollars.[3] Another three to five million hearing aid users are school-aged children.[3] When a forty million dollar industry[4] reaps unjustifiable profits from children and the aged, a situation exists which *must* be altered.

I. HEARING IMPAIRMENT

Hearing loss is the most prevalent physical disability in America. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimated in 1962 that one out of every four health impairments among the civilian, non-institutional population is a hearing loss. In fact, more than twice as many persons suffer from hearing losses than from visual defects.[5] The trend towards hearing loss has been mounting alarmingly during the past few years. This sudden rise is due to an increased life expectancy among the aged, a decline in the infant mortality rate, and the rapid growth of noise pollution.

One would expect that the marked rise in the number of hearing impaired persons would be accompanied by an increased public consciousness of the problems of hearing loss. After all, even partial deafness may cause enormous problems. Undiagnosed deaf children may be labeled "retarded" or "slow-learning". Elderly aunts or uncles may be studiously avoided by family members who are weary of shouting themselves hoarse in order to communicate. But unfortunately, hearing problems which may be alleviated by ear surgery or hearing aid use are largely ignored. Some parents refuse to admit the possibility of defects in their offspring. Middle-aged persons may conceal their conditions in vain attempts to deny advancing years. But the primary reason why people are willing to evade the fact of hearing loss is money. Hearing aids may be purchased at prices ranging from seventy-five dollars to seven hundred fifty dollars.[6] This type of investment is one of great magnitude for families with growing children and adults living on fixed incomes.

It is important to note that not all hearing problems can be alleviated by hearing aid use. The effectiveness of a hearing aid depends to a great extent on the individual's kind of hearing loss. There are two major types of hearing losses: conductive and sensori-neural. Conductive loss results from the inadequate conduction of sound waves to the inner ear. The sound waves may be obstructed by foreign objects (such as marbles or wads of cotton), congenital malformations, infections, fluid in the middle ear, or by bony overgrowth (otosclerosis). Sounds are blocked and muffled uniformly as if the ear were covered with the hand. The quality of sound may be the same, but the loudness or intensity will be reduced. Sensori-neural loss results from abnormalities in the nerve centers of the inner ear, the nerve pathways to the brain, or in the portion of the brain that receives and interprets audio nerve signals. An individual with a sensori-neural loss (also called nerve deafness or perceptive deafness) is unable to hear particular sound frequencies, or tones. As a result, the individual may confuse certain words and letters in normal speech. Surgery can often correct conductive hearing losses. However, since sensori-neural losses can rarely be corrected medically or surgically, persons with sensori-neural loss usually have no other recourse than to be fitted with a hearing aid.

The proper fitting of a hearing aid can give tangible help to the hearing impaired. A 1962 study of twelve hundred deaf persons by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare showed that after a year of rehabilitation, their combined annual income jumped from $308,000 to $2,743,000; an increase of seven hundred ninety percent.[7] It must be stressed, though, that a hearing aid can never "cure" a hearing problem. As a man-made electronic device, it can only help to partially compensate for hearing loss by amplifying the sound that comes to the ear. This compensating function is very important, but it is *not* a replacement for proper medical attention to the causes of the loss.[8] Hearing losses may be caused by tumors, diabetes, allergies, arteriosclerosis, virus infections, or other factors. For this reason, a complete physical examination by the family doctor is a sensible first step to rule out or treat such possible causes of hearing loss before specific testing of hearing begins.[9]

II. PROFESSIONAL AID

The specific tasks of diagnosing the type and cause of hearing loss and fitting the proper hearing aid to the individual concerns three major groups of professionals. Otolaryngologists are surgeons who specialize in ear, nose, and throat cases. Otologists are otolaryngologists who further specialize in ear problems only (for simplicity, both will be referred to in this paper as otologists). Otologists have completed a three to four year college undergraduate program, three to four years of medical school, a year of internship and three to four years of resident training in their specialty.[10] Obviously, no one other than a medical doctor is qualified to diagnose ear diseases, specify the causation of hearing impairment, and treat pathologies of the auditory mechanism.

If an otologist determines that a hearing aid will benefit a hearing impaired person, he will perform extensive hearing tests himself or refer the individual to an audiologist for further evaluation. Audiologists are non-medical, university trained specialists skilled in evaluating hearing loss and recommending hearing aids. They must complete a minimum of four years as a college undergraduate, with a major in speech pathology and audiology, two years as a graduate student studying audiology, and one year of supervised paid professional experience.[11] Audiologists who have met these requirements must pass a written exam before they can possess a Certificate of Clinical Competence from the American Speech and Hearing Association (the professional body that governs the field of audiology). Although some otologists refer their patients directly to hearing aid dealers, one should see an audiologist before shopping for a hearing aid. The audiologist can determine if an aid is necessary, and what particular specifications an aid should have in order to fully benefit the individual. He will include the specifications in a recommendation which the person will then take to a hearing aid dealer. The audiologist may also advise that the individual purchase a certain model or brand of hearing aid from a dealer.

Unlike otologists and audiologists, dealers are permitted to pursue their profession without undergoing any particular training. However, many dealers possess certificates reading "Certified Hearing Aid Audiologist." The 1972 Directory of the National Hearing Aid Association (the dealers' trade association) states that:

"'Certification' is granted only to those (dealers) who have taken advanced training for service to the hearing handicapped. The 'Certified' member (of the Association) has successfully completed a prescribed course of study, passed a rigorous examination and met strict requirements of experience, competence and character."

The "rigorous . . . prescribed . . . advance training" lauded in this statement is a home correspondence course entitled "Basic Home-Study in Hearing Aid Audiology, Revised Edition." The instruction program costs approximately one hundred seventy-five dollars, and consists of twenty lessons contained in fifty and one-half pages of text. The lessons are mailed to the "student" separately in sequence. After reading the text and answering one-half to two pages of questions at the end of each lesson, the "student" mails in the answered questions and receives the next lesson by return mail. After the completion of the twenty lessons, the "student" takes a "final exam" (in the home and without supervision). If he "passes" the "exam" he becomes a Certified Hearing Aid Audiologist" and receives a formal diploma.[12]

The use of this title is deceptive to the unwary consumer. The terms "audiologist" and "certified" imply a medical and professional competence in excess of what actually exists. Consumers are often confused between dealers with this title and actual audiologists with Certificates of Clinical Competence from the American Speech and Hearing Association. For this reason, many consumers think that they have been examined by a doctor or audiologist when they have not.

Certified audiologists and medically-trained otologists have complied with sterner training requirements than a "certified" dealer. Unfortunately, many consumers are unaware of this fact. Seventy percent of all hearing aid purchasers fail to consult otologists or audiologists before making their purchases.[13] When persons go directly to hearing aid dealers, they are placing their future in the hands of salesmen, who, solicitous though they may be, are largely intent on making a sale. Tragically, some dealers never bother to refer their customers to qualified otologists, and take upon themselves the diagnosis and testing of hearing problems and the prescription and fitting procedures. By this action, dealers imply that they are qualified to replace the medical and academic training of otologists and audiologists. A mere correspondence course cannot possibly train a dealer in the scores of complex medical causes of hearing loss. As for the dealers' argument that they possess "training by experience", "it's like saying that because barbers were performing surgery long before surgeons—and without any formal training—we should continue to rely on them. Only adequate training plus experience equals competence; years of experience without proper training equals only prolonged incompetence."[14]

III. HEARING AID SALES

There are presently at least five hundred hearing aid models on the market.[15] Their high cost (typically from three hundred dollars to five hundred dollars each) is probably the single greatest complaint of the hearing impaired against the hearing aid industry. Most hearing aid manufacturers agree that the average hearing aid user gets about two and one-half years' use out of his hearing aid.[16] In addition, the user must also purchase innumerable batteries, cords and accessories.

Hearing aid models can be classified into two basic types: air conduction and bone conduction. The four styles of air conduction aids are those commonly recommended. The all-in-the-ear aid is small, cannot provide powerful amplification, and is used only in cases of mild hearing loss. Body units are large and powerful. They may be carried in a front pocket or strapped to the body under the clothing by a cloth harness. Wire cords deliver sounds from the body unit to the ear. Eighty percent of all hearing aids are of intermediate power. These aids are either the behind-the-ear or the eyeglass type.[17]

Footnotes at end of article.

The final retail price of a typical hearing aid bears little relationship to the aid's cost of manufacture. Consumers Union reported in the May 1971 issue of "Consumer Reports" that the component parts of hearing aids are extremely inexpensive. Their component cost breakdown for a typical hearing aid is as follows:

One magnetic microphone	$6.10
One magnetic receiver	6.10
Three transistors	1.32
Seven resistors	.70
Six capacitors	2.10
Remaining parts (battery, volume control, plastic shell)	8.00
Total	24.32

"Consumer Reports" also stated that: "Labor and all other costs, including substantial advertising and promotion, would bring the total manufacturing cost today, by generous estimate, to about $75 for the average hearing aid."

The final retail cost of a hearing aid to the consumer is typically over three times the cost of the same aid to the dealer. The primary explanation for high dealer margins is not actual selling costs, but rather the limited volume of sales of the average dealer, from which he must derive a reasonable income. About five thousand dealers must divide up annual sales of about five hundred thousand hearing aids.[18] The majority of dealerships, mostly one or two person operations, average eighty-five aids sold per year, or less than two sales per week.[19] In addition, most dealers carry only one line of hearing aids instead of selling a variety of brands competitively.

A convincing sales technique is compulsory if the dealer is to maintain his livelihood. Salesmen obtain "leads" on possible candidates for hearing aid use from previous customers, and from advertisemnets urging persons to "mail this coupon in today for *free* information on how YOU may rediscover the beauty of hearing". When arriving at the prospect's home, a salesman employs a number of "lines" to gain entry. After tossing the prospect a few compliments, the salesman attempts to convince him that he should take a hearing test by using statements such as: "If there is really something wrong that may cause trouble later on, it would be a good idea to find out what it is now so it can be corrected." [20] This statement is misleading because it implies that the salesman is competent of medically diagnosing the problem, that his products are capable of "correcting" the problem, and that the hearing loss will become more severe if not remedied immediately. When taking the individual's "case history", the salesman is actually probing for additional "leads". Next, the salesman tests the prospect's hearing with an audiometer (a device which tells how many decibels of sound are necessary to overcome the person's hearing loss). At this point, a direct quotation from the Beltone "Consultant's Manual" is useful in illustrating the real motivation of the salesman.

"Study the Audiogram. Learn to make silence work for you. Don't say anything for a moment or two. When you think sufficient time has elapsed and it is appropriate to proceed, look the prospect squarely in the eye—and say 'Mrs. Prospect, tell me—what have you been waiting for? Look at this audiogram . . . Do you know that quite a bit of your hearing is gone? You're missing an enormous amount of the sounds of life that are around you. You can't afford to do that, Mrs. Prospect.'

"Mrs. Prospect, you are fortunate that it's not so bad we cannot help you.' (Do not discuss price yet—hold up your hand and go on talking—or say 'We'll come to that in a few minutes—the most important thing is how we can help you.')

"Continue to show your concern as you ask, 'Why haven't you taken care of something as important as this before, Mrs. Prospect?' Keep the prospect's whole attention focused on you. Wait for the answer. This is the key question that should give you the real reason why the Beltone purchase has been postponed. It will help you qualify the prospect and give you clues as to what chances are of making the sale today . . .

"Don't give up easily. Most new Consultants make this error—not realizing that a bit more effort and talk with a prospect will make all the difference between a sale and no sale." [21]

Two "close" techniques advocated in the Beltone Manual are the "ear-impression close" and the "binaural close." The "ear-impression close" is described as a "natural part of the demonstration." The technique comprises getting the customer to sign a sales contract and make a deposit while a plastic hearing aid ear-mold impression is solidifying in his ear. The "binural close" encourages the prospect to purchase two hearing aids instead of one. Virtually no dealer has the equipment necessary to test the objective benefits of a binural fitting. Because of the persistent effort required in learning to use just one aid and the exorbitant price involved (seven or eight hundred dollars), doctors recommend beginning with one aid, and then considering the possibility of a second. Finally, scare tactics and totally deceptive statements are used by the salesman to convince more "difficult" prospects to purchase hearings aids. Individuals are told that "a cold is much easier to cure than pneumonia", and that failure to use a hearing aid will increase their degree of hearing loss. That concept is blatantly false. After the purchase, the hearing aid that the person actually keeps will not be the same one with which he was "tested", and as a result, its performance will differ slightly. Whether or not trial periods are granted and the conditions governing the trial period (such as "rental" costs, if any) is dependent upon the individual dealer. As for repairs: replacements are needed frequently, and they, too, can be a financial burden.

Incompetence, deceptive and misleading statements, inadequate or even non-existent testing and testing facilities and extreme pressure tactics have made the hearing aid industry into what it is today. The industry is analogous to a spider, as it preys on people like flies once they have been trapped in the web of deafness. It is time that its stranglehold on the destinies of the hearing impaired be released.

IV. LEGISLATION

The sole governmental regulation of the hearing aid industry is through the Federal Trade Commission. Its "Trade Practice Rules for the Hearing Aid Industry" are generally quite thorough. However, the rules are lacking in one specific area. Rule Six, Sections A and B under the title "Deception as to Benefit of Services or Advice of a Physician, Etc." states:

"(a) In connection with the sale or offering for sale of industry products, it is an unfair trade practice for any industry member to represent, directly or by implication, that the service or advice of a physician have been used in the designing or manufacturing of industry products, or will be used or made available in the selecting, fitting, adjusting, or testing of industry products relative to the individual needs of consumer-purchasers, when such is not the fact.

"(b) The prohibitions of this rule are applicable to the use of the terms 'doctor,' 'physician,' 'otologist,' or 'otolaryngologist'; to any abbreviations, variations, or derivatives of such terms; and to the use of any symbol, depiction, or representation having a medical connotation."

Section B should be amended to read ". . . to the use of the terms 'doctor,' 'physician,' 'otologist,' 'otolaryngologist,' or 'audiologist.'" This amendment would make the use of the term "Certified Hearing Aid Audiologist" an unfair trade practice.

In its report of the hearing aid industry in Minnesota, the Minnesota Public Interest Research Group cites several incidences where a trade practice rule has been violated. A hearing dealer in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area was harassed and intimidated by other dealers because of his high volume approach to hearing aid sales. His peers' activities appear to be in violation of Rule 2, which states:

"It is an unfair trade practice for any member of the industry, either directly or indirectly . . . to enter any understanding . . . with any other persons to fix or maintain the price of any goods or otherwise unlawfully restrain trade.

"It is an unfair trade practice to . . . use any form of threat, intimidation, or coercion to reduce any member of the industry to become a party to any understanding, agreement, combination, or conspiracy."

If such activities appear to have been found in Minnesota, it is likely that similar practices are occurring in other states. Therefore, Congress should increase the amount of appropriations to the Federal Trade Commission. Increased appropriations would enable the FTC to enlarge its investigative staff, thereby performing its regulatory duties with greater thoroughness and efficiency.

In addition, Congress should appropriate funds to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a public education program centering on deafness. This program would attempt to overcome the social stigmas connected with hearing loss. Films, pamphlets, television commercials, and perhaps television forums would, for example, give general information about deafness and inform people of the steps to take when purchasing hearing aids. In time, hearing loss would become as accepted as myopia.

State laws are presently concerned with the concept of dealer licensure. When Oregon became the first state to require dealer licensure in 1960, the hearing aid industry was a solid front against licensing. However, by 1967, the industry became the foremost backed of licensure proposals. It realized that licensure would lend dealers an aura of professionalism, and that dealers in states where licensure had taken place have more of a chance on cashing in on Medicaid funds. Specific provisions vary from state to state, but generally, licensing laws require that anyone fitting or dispensing hearing aids must obtain a license from a state board of examiners. The board is generally comprised of five to seven members, with one otolaryngologist, one audiologist, and the rest hearing aid dealers. Licenses are awarded subject to the laws' requirements regarding minimum age, residency, high school education, etc. Virtually all of the state laws have "grandfather clauses" which grant licenses to those dealers already in business when the provision took effect.[22] Since it will take years for the number of dealers licensed by examination to eclipse the number of dealers with licenses under grandfather clauses, the presence of these clauses in many state laws has significantly reduced the laws' impacts.

State examining boards should be made available for consumers' complaints. The number of dealers occupying positions on the boards should be reduced. These positions could be filled by qualified parents, members of citizen action groups, or other consumers. Door-to-door sales of hearing aids should be strictly prohibited.

State educational programs should also be established along the same lines as the federal programs. Mobile hearing testing units could be furnished to check the hearing of persons in isolated towns, shut-ins, and the elderly, not to mention diagnostic checks for pre-school-aged children.

The deaf and hearing impaired have been tolerating prejudice and injustice for years.

Previous to this report, congressional hearings have been held, reports have been published, and plans have been finalized. But somehow, effective legislation to aid the hearing impaired has never gotten past the planning stages.

The Ralph Nader-inspired Retired Professionals Action Group, based in Washington, D.C., will "soon" publish a report on the hearing aid industry. Hearing impaired persons throughout this country are hopeful that "maybe this time" beneficial legislation will be enacted.

FOOTNOTES

[1] United States Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, *Prices of Hearing Aids*, Report by Subcommittee, 87th Congress, 2nd Session, on S. 258, October 1, 1962 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 2.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[3] *Statements on Deafness* (Washington: Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf).

[4] United States Congress, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

[5] United States Congress, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[6] United States Congress, Senate, Special Committee on Aging, *Hearing Loss, Hearing Aids, and the Elderly*, Hearings before Subcommittee, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, July 18–19, 1968 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 245–247.

[7] United States Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[8] Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, *Hearings Aids and the Hearing Aid Industry in Minnesota* (Minneapolis: November 13, 1972), p. 9.

[9] *Hearing Loss—Hope Through Research*, National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service Publication 207 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971), pp. 17–18.

[10] Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 49–50.

[13] "Hearing Aids—What the Buyer Should Know," *Consumer Reports* (May, 1971), p. 316.

[14] Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

[15] "Hearing Aids—What the Buyer Should Know," *op. cit.*, p. 314.

[16] United States Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

[17] Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[18] "Hearing Aids—What the Buyer Should Know," *op. cit.*, p. 315.

[19] Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

[20] United States Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, *Prices of Hearing Aids*, Hearings before Subcommittee, 87th Congress, 2nd Session, on S. 258, April 18, 19, 24, 25, and May 16, 1962 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 411.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 417.

[22] Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, *Hearing Alert*. Washington, D.C.

Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, *Statements on Deafness*. Washington, D.C.

Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf, *The Deaf Man and the Law*. Chicago: 1970.

Dodds, Elizabeth and Harford, Earl. *Helpful Hearing Aid Hints*. Washington: Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, 1970.

Federal Trade Commission, *Trade Practice Rules for the Hearing Aid Industry*. Washington: 1965.

Greenberg, Donna and Harris, Norma. "Services for the Hearing Impaired."

"Hearing Aids—What the Buyer Should Know." *Consumer Reports*, May, 1971, pp. 310–316.

Internal Revenue Service, *Deduction for Medical and Dental Expenses*. Department of the Treasury, Publication 502. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Mills, Wilbur D. Letter of June 26, 1973.

Moffat, Samuel. *Helping the Child Who Cannot Hear*. New York: Public Affairs Pamphlets, 1972.

Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, *Hearings Aids and the Hearing Aid Industry in Minnesota*. Minneapolis: November 13, 1972.

Public Health Service, *Hearing Loss—Hope Through Research*. National Institutes of Health, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Publication 207. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971.

Telex, *You Too Can Hear Again*.

United States Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary. *Prices of Hearing Aids*. Hearings before Subcommittee, 87th Congress, 2nd Session, on S. 258, April 18, 19, 24, 25, and May 16, 1972. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.

United States Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary. *Price of Hearing Aids*. Report of Subcommittee, 87th Congress, 2nd Session, on S. 258, October 1, 1962. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.

United States Congress, Senate, Special Committee on Aging. *Hearing Loss, Hearing Aids, and the Elderly*. Hearings before Subcommittee, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, July 18 and 19, 1968. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968.

United States Congress, Senate, Special Committee on Aging. *Developments in Aging*. Report, 91st Congress, 1st Session, on S. 223, March 15, 1968. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969.

Individuals to contact for further information:

Wendy Wilson, Retired Professionals Action Group, Suite 711, 200 P Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Phone 785–3266.

Sue Kline, Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, 2418 University Avenue, S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota. 55414.

American Speech and Hearing Association, Kenneth Johnson, Executive Secretary, Richard Dowling, Director of Governmental Affairs, Mr. McLaughlin, Associate Secretary for Audiology Affairs, 9030 Old Georgetown Road, Bethesda, Maryland. 530–3400.

Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, George Fellendorf, Director, Virgina Gilmer, 1537 35th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. Phone FE. 7–5220.

Gallaudet College, Dr. Edward C. Merrill, Jr., President. Phone 386–6532. Peter Ries, Demographic Studies. Phone 447–0301.

Elwood Bland, Media Services and Captioned Film, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (HEW). 962–8742.

John Pride, President, Montgomery County Association for Language Handicapped Children, Office phone, 963–6176.

National Association for the Deaf, Frederick Schreiber, Executive Secretary, 587–1788.

Dr. Edith Korlith
National Bureau of Standards
Hearing Aid Industry Conference
James Ince
1001 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C.
Phone 833–1414
Herbert Feibelman (lawyer)
3637 Longview Lane
Mobile, Alabama 36608
Council on Exceptional Children
Allan Abeson, Assistant Executive Director for Government Relations
1499 Jefferson Davis Hwy.
Arlington, Virginia 22202
Phone 521–8820
National Hearing Aid Society
24261 Grand River Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48219
National Census of the Deaf
Phone 588–8415
Federal Trade Commission
William D. Dixon, Assistant Director, Bureau of Consumer Protection
Phone 962–3638
Anne Fortney–Consumer Protection aspect
Phone 963–3165
Mr. Rosenberg
Phone 962–3448
Dr. Leo Connor
President, International Assn. of Instructors of the Deaf and Executive Director, Lexington School for the Deaf
Phone 212–8800

Legislative staff members

Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped: Mrs. Patria Forsythe, Professional Staff Member, Annex 101.
Special Committee on Aging: Mrs. Oriol, Room 4230.
Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly: Mr. Philip Shipman, Annex 203.
Senator Eagleton—Marcia McCord, Room 6235.
Senator Hughes—Mary Ellen Miller, Room 1327.
Senator Schweiker—John Hunnicutt, Room 6221.
Senator Stafford—Mike Francis, Room 5215.
Senator Cranston—Louis Ringwalt, Room 452.
Senator Kennedy—Jan Verrey, Room 431.
Senator Mondale—Ellen Hoffman, Room 443.
Senator Beall—Bernie Richey, Room 362.

The students who participated in my intern program were:

Joan Cumberland, Montgomery College
Penny Harms, Montgomery College
Stephen Adler, Albert Einstein High School
Douglas L. Beresford, Landon School
William M. Bucher, Jr., Winston Churchill High School
Jan P. Kurtz, Charles W. Woodward High School
Thomas P. O'Brien, Robert E. Peary High School
Calvin G. Carter, Rockville High School
Kathleen Cook, Wheaton High School
Carla D'arista, Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School
Mary Pat Fox, Winston Churchill High School
Beth Gelin, Richard Montgomery High School
Michael Hoff, Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School
Leslie D. Hyde, Madeira School
Ellen R. Litman, Colonel Zadok Magruder High School
Susan R. Mudd, Sidwell Friends School
Brian Ochs, Northwood High School
Judy Oroszlan, Academy of the Holy Cross
Peggy Pendergast, Academy of the Holy Cross
Richard Rybeck, Albert Einstein High School
Douglas Schmidt, Thomas S. Wootton High School
Denise Simms, Ursuline Academy
Susan Silverstein, Sidwell Friends School
Yvette Trujillo, Stone Ridge Country Day School
Mark Slobdnik, Walter Johnson High School
Shari Strobel, Colonel Zadok Magruder High School
Diane Tibbs, Paint Branch High School
Stephanie Tsacoumis, Robert E. Peary High School
Celeste Wiser, Holton-Arms School
Nadine E. Woodard, Springbrook High School
Marc Wortman, Walt Whitman High School
Catherine Vierbuchen, Walt Whitman High School

SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC CAMPAIGN FINANCING

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, in tonight's Washington Star-News, col-

umnist James J. Kilpatrick discusses the question of public financing of political campaigns, in a column, "A Way To Fund Campaign."

He endorses the view, that I share, that we must not stop work on campaign reform with the spending and contribution limits we passed last week in S. 372, but that we must also seriously explore the alternative of utilizing public funds for campaigns, an idea he said, "whose time has come."

Last week Senator MONDALE and I introduced S. 2238, the "Presidential Campaign Financing Act of 1973." Other public financing bills have been introduced, and hearings on public financing of campaigns have been scheduled for September.

I share Mr. Kilpatrick's feelings that in the wake of Watergate, we must "remove the curse of money that now corrupts our political process." I urge my colleagues to review his column, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks following these remarks.

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

[From the Washington Star-News, Aug. 3, 1973]

A WAY TO FUND CAMPAIGN

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

More than 65 years ago, President Theodore Roosevelt sent a message to the Congress. He was concerned about the high cost of the presidential campaign of 1904 and the bi-elections of 1906.

"The need for collecting large campaign funds would vanish," said the old Rough Rider, "if Congress provided an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties . . ."

Roosevelt's idea, in brief, was for the public financing of federal elections. It is an idea, I submit, whose time has just about come.

This represents a change of position on my part, and on the part of other conservatives who have objected to federal financing in the past. We have felt that any such program would be unwise in terms of fiscal policy, and we have argued that corollary regulations, limiting private contributions and otherwise regulating the conduct of political campaigns, would infringe upon First Amendment freedoms.

These are serious objections, and I reluctantly put them aside. What we are talking about is a complex system of appropriating public funds to be spent by private hands—by political parties and by individual candidates. Such a prospect requires, at a minimum, a network of tight controls, supervised by a massive bureaucracy. A workable plan would have to cover both primary and general elections; it would have to give account to third parties and to possibly frivolous candidates; and it might create new evils, by reviving bossism and entrenching office holders, as objectionable as the old evils it is intended to dispel.

Yet it seems to me, on balance, that drastic measures are needed if we are to remove the curse of money that now corrupts our political process. If we do not learn at least this lesson from Watergate, we are doomed to repeat that wretched course of instruction. By fixing tight limations on individual contributions, the Senate early this week moved in the right direction; yet a great deal remains to be done.

Political campaigns, of necessity, are expensive. They are especially costly, and especially difficult, for newcomers who challenge incumbents. Once we clip the wings of political angels, as the Senate proposes, some alternate plan of campaign financing will have to be provided. The present scheme of tax checkoffs and tax deductions is feeble and ineffective. Roosevelt's forthright proposal of 1907 could dispel the clouds that now shadow public confidence in public institutions.

This is the important thing. The walloping contribution from the milk producers to the Nixon campaign may have been utterly untainted by any thought of a bribe; but under the circumstances, it smacked of corruption. The $100 bills that came from Robert Vesco may have been prompted by motives of snow-white purity; but the charge is widely believed that the case bought access to high places. George Spater, chairman of the board of American Airlines, has explained why a large part of the political money given by the business community is given: "It is given in fear of what could happen if it were not given."

This pattern has to be broken. Granted, the drafting of a workable law on public financing will not be easy. This whole business of election reform, as last week's debate in the Senate made clear, is in part a choice of lesser evils as better than greater evils. The suspicious thought will not go away that some members, in the pious name of election reform, are in fact taking a leaf from the famous textbook in political science by John Wesley Dean, "Maximizing Our Incumbency, or, How to Screw Our Opponents."

Acknowledging all this, it still seems to me that a Rooseveltian experiment is worth trying. It might cost the taxpayers $100 million a year, but if the approach served to break the curse of implicit bribery, the plan would be cheap at twice that price.

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEYS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to share with my colleagues the response to my Ninth Annual Questionnaire Survey of the residents in my congressional district.

In March, I sent questionnaires to each of the more than 150,000 homes in my district, seeking their opinions on some of the issues facing our country. I have conducted such a survey each year since my election to Congress in 1964 and the results have been invaluable to me as a Representative in Congress.

The percentage results reported here represent tabulation of approximately the first 10,000 returns.

The questions as they appeared on the questionnaire, the percentage results, and my accompanying comments on each, are listed below:

1. The soaring cost of food has become one of the major problems of the day. Among the suggested answers are permanent price controls, elimination of farm subsidies and artificial price supports, or consumer boycotts to bring prices down. Which do you think is the answer?

[Percent]

	Yes	*No*
a. Permanent Price Controls	58	42
b. Elimination of Farm Subsidies	84	16
c. Consumer Boycotts	40	60

I was pleased to see that the overwhelming majority of my constituents agree with my votes to limit farm subsidies represent a way to attack the problem of rising food prices. It is absolutely unfair to the American public to use their tax dollars to subsidize farm profits, forcing them to pay higher prices for their groceries. Price controls and consumer boycotts can be only temporary and occasional measures in the war against inflation.

2. The cost of health care in America is increasing at an unprecedented rate. At the same time, that health standards are decreasing. I have cosponsored the Kennedy-Griffiths Health Security Bill, which would bring all Americans under a Federal health-insurance program to pay all medical and hospital bills. It would be financed in a manner similar to Social Security.

	Percent Yes	*Percent No*
a. Do You Favor Such a Federal Health Insurance Program?	65	35

As a cosponsor of the Kennedy-Griffiths health security bill, I am encouraged to see a growing number of Americans coming to recognize the need for this type of legislation. Most of the other industrialized nations of the world have long since adopted some form of national health insurance; it is a long-overdue step for the United States.

3. Two years ago, the Post Office Department was abolished and the Postal Service Corporation was created to administer the Nation's mail service. Critics contend that service has become worse and that the Postal Service Corporation is putting economy above service.

	Percent Yes	*Percent No*
a. Do You Think Mail Service Has Become Worse?	76	23
b. Do You Think Mail Service Is Better?	9	91
c. Would You Favor Abolishing the Postal Service Corporation and Returning to Our Former System?	62	38

As the response from my constituents shows, the general public is not happy with the service they are receiving from the Postal Service Corporation. Postal rates have already risen, and further increases are a certainty. Service in general has become worse and mail delivery takes longer and longer. Employee morale is at an all-time low. I believe that postal service is a logical function of government, and that the taxpayers are entitled to service. Like a majority of my constituents, I think that mail service is much worse under the Corporation plan, and that we should return to our former system.

4. The Administration has promised that the United States will take the lead in a massive program to help rebuild North Vietnam, once all our prisoners are returned, our missing are accounted for, and permanent peace is achieved. Critics contend the President had no right to make such a promise without first consulting Congress.

	Percent yes	*Percent no*
a. Do You Favor Substantial Economic Aid to North Vietnam?	8	92

b. Do You Favor Continued Economic Aid to South Vietnam?	34	66
c. Do You Favor Continued Military Aid to South Vietnam?	22	78

I think these answers indicate that, in my district at least, people are thoroughly frustrated with our long and costly intervention in the affairs of Southeast Asia, and want to bring it to a total end. I wholly agree that we should cut off all military aid to South Vietnam. So far as economic aid to either North or South Vietnam, I could not conscientiously support President Nixon's recommendation for such aid so long as he continues to veto money appropriated by Congress to solve the many pressing problems here in our own country.

5. American workers are covered by thousands of private and public pension plans, which are subject to little regulation. Each year, many workers lose their pension rights when they change jobs or when their employers go out of business. Even those who retire with pensions have a broad range of benefits, from very good to very poor.

	Percent yes	Percent no
a. Do you favor legislation providing Federal safeguards to insure that a working man or woman will receive the pension benefits which they have been led to believe will be theirs upon retirement?	96	4

This overwhelming response shows how deeply my constituents feel about this critical issue. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, and its General Labor Subcommittee, I have been active in the fight for pension-reform legislation, and served on a pension task force which conducted hearings throughout the Nation to obtain first-hand information. We are in the process of drafting legislation at this time, and hope to bring it to the floor for a vote before the end of the current session of Congress. It is one of our top priorities for the year.

6. Considerable concern has been expressed recently over basic press freedoms, in view of Administration harassment and intimidation of newsmen. Legislation has been proposed that would permit a reporter to refuse to reveal the source of a news story, even in court, unless it involved national security or libel

	Percent yes	Percent no
a. Do You Favor Such "Press-Shield" Legislation	66	34

I was pleased to see a sizable majority support the idea of protecting a newsman's source of information, and I was frankly surprised that the percentage was not even higher. The importance of a free and unhampered press was never more vividly demonstratd than in the Watergate scandal, which was brought into the open only through dogged investigative reporting by Washington newspapermen. I have cosponsored press-shield legislation, and will fight for its adoption.

7. Both the Congress and the Administration agree that Federal spending should be reduced, but there is broad disagreement on which programs should be cut, and which should be expanded. President Nixon, in fact, is refusing to spend money appropriated by Congress for programs with which he does not agree.

a. In which Three Areas Do You Think The Federal Budget Should Be Cut? (The following percentages represent the number of people who listed these issues among their three choices; only those with 10% or more are listed):

	Percent
1. Foreign Aid	45
2. Welfare	35
3. Defense	32
4. Cost of Government	42
5. Subsidies	17

b. In What Three Areas Do You Think The Federal Budget Should Be Increased?

	Percent
1. Education	27
2. Health Care	18
3. Senior Citizen Benefits	17
4. Environmental Protection	15
5. Crime and Drug Control	13
6. None	13

I think, Mr. Speaker, that these responses show how deeply the American people feel about the need to solve our domestic problems. Fully 77 percent of the respondents cited foreign aid and defense spending as the logical areas to reduce the Federal budget, and the need to reduce spiraling welfare costs is obvious to us all. I have consistently voted to reduce foreign aid and defense spending, and have long advocated welfare reform. Like my constituents, and in the same order, I feel that education, health care and aid for senior citizens should rank as our Nation's top priorities.

8. What are the three most important problems facing our Nation today? Give me your priorities.

	Percent
1. Crime and drugs	44
2. Inflation	40
3. Taxes	17
4. Government corruption	14
5. Pollution	14

It is obvious that my constituents see the drug menace and street crime as a joint problem, and a major problem—an analysis I agree with. Inflation is a close second, and has become even worse since my questionnaire was mailed. The Nixon "game plans" and his on-again, off-again control system have proved ineffective. Our economy has reached a point of chaos, and the lack of leadership in the White House is becoming painfully obvious. The entire Watergate mess is an undoubted factor, since so many of the President's top aides have been fired or forced to resign as a result of the continual revelations of high level corruption. It is no wonder that Government corruption was ranked fourth among the Nation's problems, and this percentage would probably be even higher if the survey were being made today. We can hardly expect to solve the crime problem with such a sordid example set at the highest levels of Government. When the investigation is concluded, and the guilty persons weeded out of their positions, we must work to restore the American people's badly shattered faith in the integrity of their leaders. I will support any reasonable legislation to prevent the recurrence of Watergate-type scandals in the future.

AUXILIARY POLICE UNIT PROTECTS LOCAL CITIZENS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to my colleague's attention an article printed in the August 1973 issue of Response magazine—a periodical prepared by the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency that is geared toward publicizing outstanding activities occurring throughout the Nation that protect local citizens.

The article pertains to the success of just one of many outstanding auxiliary police force units located throughout New York City. These groups of concerned volunteers have, through their contribution of time and effort, helped to make neighborhoods throughout New York a safer place to shop and live. I have spoken previously of the attributes of creating such voluntary forces throughout the Nation and the description below presents a convincing argument in support of such a program. I hope that my fellow colleagues agree that Federal backing of voluntary police forces would be an important step in our fight against crime in America.

The article follows:

NEIGHBORHOOD OFFICERS

NEW YORK, N.Y.—Just as in any community, the Nation's largest city is made up of many individual neighborhoods. And according to Carmin G. Novis, Director of New York City's Emergency Control Board-Civil Defense, that's where the city's 6,000 volunteer men and women Auxiliary Police are working to solve problems: in the neighborhoods where they live. Examples:

In an effort to reduce a growing number of false alarms, Auxiliary Police headquarters staff met with Fire Department officials and identified the locations of fire alarm boxes with a particularly high record of false alarms. Then at the precinct level, Auxiliary Police patrol routes were modified to enable the volunteer uniformed officers to maintain greater surveillance of the fire alarm boxes in question.

REDUCE FALSE ALARMS

In addition, members of the Auxiliary Police initiated and maintained a continuous dialogue with merchants, building custodians, and street leaders on the hazards to the community resulting from false alarms. The result was a 36 percent reduction in the number of false alarms.

"The response from the community was successful," Director Novis said, "primarily because of the fact that Auxiliary Police are assigned to patrols in those communities in which they live. This enables the Auxiliary Police to discuss matters with people in the community on a first-name basis."

Another example of neighborhood service by the Auxiliary Police was the experimental "Operation Open Blocks" program, aimed at the problem of people being unable to make evening purchases from pharmacies, grocery stores, and other businesses because owners were unwilling to keep their establishments open at night.

The plan was to select a small area in an under-privileged neighborhood, assign added Auxiliary Police members to night patrol in the area, reduce the risk of crime by increasing police surveillance, and encourage more store owners to stay open at night, at least between 8 p.m. and 11 p.m. during the week.

Of course there had to be enough police auxiliaries volunteer for night duty to provide the needed coverage.

STORE OWNERS COOPERATE

The 77th Precinct, where the Auxiliary Police unit had grown from 15 members to 112 in less than a year, was selected. Store owners on Kingston Avenue, between Atlantic Avenue and Bergen Street, were canvassed. "Most were pleased and agreed to cooperate," Mr. Novis said, "but others said they would wait and see what happened."

About a week before the added night patrols started, a public education program was carried out in the area with handout literature made available to each participating merchant so that he could pass it out to his customers.

"We consider the program a success," Mr. Novis said. "Doubtful owners are now convinced. Auxiliaries, with assistance of one patrolman from the regular police force, are fulfilling their pledge, and stores remain open. Residents are coming out to shop, and again the Auxiliary Police have demonstrated their ability to respond to community needs—right where they live."

LEGISLATIVE STATUS REPORT

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD a status report of the legislative measures which I have introduced and cosponsored during the 93d Congress. It is my belief that this legislative survey will inform my constituents in the 31st District of California of my position on major legislative issues before the Congress and of my concern with the various problems confronting our Nation today.

I would therefore want to place in the RECORD my first status report for the 93d Congress, January 3 to August 3, 1973:

AGRICULTURE

H.R. 4869 (Sisk): Prohibition of discriminatory state burdens upon interstate commerce in wine.

H.R. 7443 (Wilson): Repeal of the bread tax on 1973 wheat crop.

H.R. 9094 (O'Hara): To conform state inspection standards of marketing, labeling, packaging and ingredient requirements to those of the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

H.R. 9640 (Perkins): Establishment of an American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress.

CHILD WELFARE

H.R. 6819 (Schroeder): Establishment of a national center on child development and abuse prevention.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

H.R. 1279 (Wilson): Requirement that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by government agencies.

H.R. 1281 (Wilson): To protect the constitutional rights of civilian employees of the executive branch of the U. S. government. Employee Benefits Subcommittee hearings. Wilson testified.

H.R. 2200 (Wilson): Free Flow of Information Act. Similar to H.R. 5928 to be reported in lieu.

H.R. 6211 (Bell): Continued operation of the legal services program.

H.R. 4426 (Wilson): Confidentiality of information furnished in response to questionnaires, inquiries and other requests from the Bureau of the Census. Census and Statistics Subcommittee hearings. Wilson testified. Similar Bill H.R. 7762 reported in lieu.

H.R. 7762 (Wilson): Confidentiality of information furnished in response to questionnaires, inquiries and other requests from the Bureau of the Census. Reported to the House with amendments.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

H.R. 4 (Fascell): To open meetings of government agencies and of Congressional committees to the public.

H.R. 1283 (Wilson): To provide for no cost letter mail to Senators and Representatives.

H.R. 9004 (Grasso): To provide no cost letter mailing to the President, Vice President, Congressmen and Federal executive departments.

H. Res. 472 (Grasso): Toll-free telephone service for calls to the District offices of Congressmen.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

H.R. 2932 (Wilson): Definition of food supplements in the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

H.R. 3781 (Bingham): Licensing of food manufacturers and processors.

H.R. 8153 (Roy): Consumer Savings Disclosure Act on savings deposits.

H.R. 8570 (Moss): Definition for inclusive airline tour charters.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

H.R. 6317 (Danielson): Creation of a Federal Disaster Insurance Corporation.

H.R. 6904 (Flood): Establishment of a national program of Federal insurance against catastrophic disasters.

H.R. 7240 (Roush): Establishment of emergency communications facilities.

ECONOMY

H.R. 4820 (McFall): One year extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

H.R. 6161 (McFall): Establishment of a temporary price-wage board.

H.R. 8621 (Abzug): Equitable rents under the economic stabilization program.

H.R. 9382 (Harrington): Inclusion in the Budget of information showing the regional impact of proposals on state and Congressional Districts.

H. Con. Res. 194 (Wolff): Resolution to collect overdue debts.

EDUCATION

H.R. 1146, 2892, 4068 (Roybal): National Act for School Construction.

H.R. 3521 (Wilson): Income tax credit for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents.

H.R. 3885 (Wilson): Grants to states for vocational rehabilitation services to those with severe disabilities.

H.R. 4189 (Badillo): Tutorial and instructional services for homebound or handicapped children.

H.R. 6332 (Hastings): Extension of the Public Health Services Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act and Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act.

H.R. 7818 (Meeds): Improvement of the Adult Education Act.

H.R. (Peyser): Development and implementation of youth camp safety programs.

H.R. 9058 (Heinz): Equitable funding for state vocational rehabilitation services.

H.R. 9364 (Burke): Provision for autistic children in the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act.

ELECTION REFORM

H.R. 4427 (Wilson): Establishment of a program for canvassing of the election process through the Census Bureau.

H.R. 6031 (Fraser): Designation of payments to the Presidential election campaign fund on the front page of the income tax return.

H.R. 9642 (Rangel): Voter registration through the postal service.

H.J. Res. 412 (De Lugo): Participation of Guam and the Virgin Islands in Presidential elections.

EMPLOYMENT

H.R. 1418 (Reuss): Public service employment for unemployed persons.

H.R. 3942 (Conte): State technical services available to municipal governments.

H.R. 3987 (Hawkins): Public Service Employment Program.

H.R. 5401 (Corman): Extension of unemployment insurance coverage to employers of four or more agricultural workers.

H.R. 7964 (Mink): To prohibit discrimination against locally recruited personnel in overseas differentials and allowances.

H.R. 8058 (Burton): To require contractors of U.S. agencies producing motion picture films to pay prevailing wages.

H.R. 8792 (Roybal): To require contractors of U.S. agencies producing motion picture films to pay prevailing wages.

ENERGY CRISIS

H.R. 3615 (Denholm): Amendment of the Rural Electrification Act.

H.R. 4695 (Wilson): Termination of the oil import control program.

H.R. 7865 (Addabbo): Requirement that U.S. flag vessels carry a percentage of oil imports.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

H.R. 3795 (Dingell): Endangered Species Conservation Act.

H.R. 4420 (Veysey): California's right to enforce its more stringent motor vehicle emission standards.

H.R. 6451 (Mathias): Establishment of the California Desert National Conservation Area.

H.R. 6823 (Wilson): Enlargement of the Sequoia National Park.

H.R. 6824 (Wilson): More effective control of aircraft noise.

H.R. 7774 (Johnson): Salinity control program for the Colorado River.

H.R. 8659 (Anderson of Calif.): Federal income tax credit for motor vehicle emission controls.

H.R. 9709 (Fascell): Income tax deductions for automobile carpools.

FIRE PREVENTION

H.R. 4103 (Steele): Creation of the National Fire Academy. Subcommittee hearings.

H.R. 4104 (Steele): Grants to states, counties and local communities for training programs for firemen.

H.R. 4105 (Steele): Grants for educational fire science programs.

H.R. 4106 (Steele): Financial aid to local fire departments for the purchase of firefighting equipment.

H.R. 4107 (Steele): Financial aid for local fire departments for the purchase of firefighting suits and self-contained breathing apparatus.

H.R. 4108 (Steele): Three year extension of fire research and safety programs.

H.R. 4109 (Steele): National Fire Data and Information Clearinghouse Act.

H.R. 4110 (Steele): Extension of Flammable Fabrics Act to construction materials used in interior of homes and offices.

H.R. 4111 (Steele): Labeling of vehicles transporting hazardous materials.

H.R. 8098 (Symington): Improvement of local fire protection districts and departments.

H.R. 9281 (Brasco): Retirement of certain law enforcement and firefighter personnel. Ordered to be reported by POCS Committee.

H.R. 9374 (Patman): Establishment of a U.S. Fire Administration and National Fire Academy and coordination of fire prevention at all levels of government. Subcommittee hearings.

H.J. Res. 687 (Dupont): To proclaim January 17th as "National Volunteer Firemen Day."

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

H.R. 3333 (Wilson): Limitation of the use of armed forces without a declaration of war by the Congress. Committee hearings. Wilson testified. H.J. Res. 542 in lieu passed House.

H.R. 6424 (Bingham): War Power Act.

H.R. 4186 (Anderson of Cal.): Establishment of a cabinet committee for Asian American affairs.

H.R. 3919 (Mills): Prohibits most-favored nation treatment for denial of right to emigrate. Included in trade bill now pending in Ways and Means Committee.

H.R. 4369 (Esch): Japan-United States Friendship Act.

H. Res. 239 (Wilson): Panama Canal Zone sovereignty and jurisdiction.

H.J. Res. 587 (Derwinski): Commending the *N.Y. Times* for its defense against the People's Republic of China.

H. Con. Res. 267 (Lott): Continued close relations with the Republic of China.

H. Con. Res. 281 (Huber): The Missing in Action in Southeast Asia.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

H.R. 1284 (Wilson): Improvement of the Leave system for Federal employees. Ordered reported by POCS Committee with amendments.

H.R. 1870 (Rosenthal): Cost-of-living pay increase for Federal employees in heavily populated cities and metropolitan areas.

H.R. 4266 (Melcher): Senate appointment of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

H.R. 4928 (Dulski): Congressional control of certain Presidential pay increases.

H.R. 6567 (Hawkins): Congressional control of the Office of Economic Opportunity reorganization.

H.R. 8290 (Wylie): Senate confirmation of the Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Congress passed S. 518 in lieu. President vetoed; sustained.

H.R. 9003 (Grasso): Toll-free telephone numbers at regional offices and executive governmental agencies.

H.R. 9107 (Waldie): Increases in certain annuities of Chapter 83 of Title 5, USC, for Federal employees. Ordered to be reported by POCS Committee.

H.R. 9533 (Koch): Regulation of expenditures on private residential property guarded by the Secret Service.

H. Con. Res. 174 (Hawkins): Continuation of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

HEALTH

H.R. 2222 (Fulton): Voluntary health insurance for medical, hospital and dental care.

H.R. 7440 (Vander Jagt): Expansion of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases.

H.R. 7733 (Wilson): Authorization of health maintenance organizations to provide health care.

H.R. 8986 (Veysey): National registry of blood donors.

H.R. 7091 (Biaggi): Payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for optometrists' services and eyeglasses.

H.R. 9256 (Waldie): Increase of government contribution to the costs of health benefits for Federal employees. Ordered to be reported by POCS Committee.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

H.R. 5263 (Wilson): Seatbelts for all schoolbuses. Subcommittee hearings. Wilson testified.

H.R. 6094 (Aspin): Safety design standards for schoolbuses.

H.R. 7973 (Rooney): Improved enforcement of motor carrier safety regulations.

H.R. 9436 (Rooney): Extension of highway safety fund deadlines.

HOLIDAYS AND DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME

H.R. 5981 (Quillen): To restore the observance of Memorial Day and Veteran's Day to their historic dates.

H.R. 7858 (Wilson): Establishment of Daylight Saving Time on a year-round basis.

H.J. Res. 687 (Dupont): Designation of January 17th as "National Volunteer Firemen Day".

IMPOUNDMENT

H.R. 3943 (Conte): To prohibit the President from impounding any funds without the consent of the Congress. Similar to H.R. 8480. S. 373 passed the House in lieu.

H. Res. 242 (Brown): Authorization for Congressmen to sue on behalf of the House because of the President's illegal impoundment of funds.

LAW ENFORCEMENT/PENAL REFORM

H.R. 936 (Railsback): Establishment of an institute for continuing studies of juvenile justice.

H.R. 1285 (Wilson): To revise the pay structure of the police forces of the Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport.

H.R. 1286 (Wilson): Revision of the pay structure for non-supervisory positions of Deputy United States Marshals.

H.R. 4403 (Reid): Anti-hijacking Act.

H.R. 4600 (Biaggi): Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights.

H.R. 8402 (Wilson): Compensation to victims of crime.

H.R. 9238 (Ketchum): Additional immigration personnel to patrol the U.S. borders.

H.R. 9239 (Ketchum): Illegal aliens.

MILITARY AFFAIRS

H.R. 309 (Bennett): Additional pay for permanent professors at the U.S. service academies.

H.R. 3623 (Findley): Adjustment assistance to prisoners of war of the Vietnam era.

H.R. 7378 (Hosmer): Combination of the 11th and 12th Naval Districts.

H.R. 7857 (Whitehurst): Reemployment rights of members and former members of the U.S. armed forces.

H.R. 8687 (Leggett): To revise special pay structures for physicians, dentists, veterinarians and optometrists of the uniformed services.

H.R. 9528 (Biaggi): Appointment of students at state maritime academies and colleges as reserve midshipmen in the U.S. Navy.

H.R. 9530 (Biaggi): Increase of subsistence payments to students at state marine schools.

PENSION REFORM

H.R. 3883 (Wilson): Revision of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

H.R. 3884 (Wilson): Revision of the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act.

H.R. 5219 (Eilberg): Non-taxation of the pensions of policemen and firemen and their dependents.

H.R. 5558 (Waldie): Retirement of immigration, naturalization and customs bureau inspectors under hazardous occupations provisions.

H.R. 9257 (Waldie): Rates of employee deductions, agency contributions and deposits for civil service retirement. Ordered to be reported by POCS Committee.

POSTAL SERVICE

H.R. 528 (W. D. Ford): Financing of the cost of mailing certain matter free of postage or at reduced rates. Similar bill, H.R. 8929, reported in lieu by POCS Committee.

H.R. 1282 (Wilson): Elimination of certain restrictions on the rights of officers and postal service employees. Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Mail hearings. Chairman Wilson testified.

H.R. 4428 (Wilson): Financing of the cost of mailing certain matter free of postage or at reduced rates. Similar bill H.R. 8929 reported in lieu by POCS Committee.

H.R. 5184 (Wilson): Annual authorization of appropriations to the Postal Service. Similar bill with amendments, H.R. 2990, passed House.

H.R. 5312 (Wilson): Uniformity in Labor Relations of the U.S. Postal Service. Postal Facilities and Mail Subcommittee hearings. Chairman Wilson testified.

H.R. 5513 (Hillis): Improved nationwide standards of mail service.

H.R. 7202, 9167, 9168, 9169 (Wilson): Establishment of an arbitration board to settle disputes between supervisory organizations and the U.S. Postal Service. Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Mail hearings. Chairman Wilson testified.

H.R. 7554 (Hanley): Financing of the cost of mailing certain matter free of postage or at reduced rates. Similar bill, H.R. 8929, reported in lieu by POCS Committee.

H. Res. 261 (Dulski): Funds for the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 180. Passed house.

PUBLIC LAND

H.R. 2199 (Wilson): To permit suits to adjudicate disputed land titles.

H.R. 2218 (Wilson): Settlement of the title to certain property located in the vicinity of the Colorado River in Imperial County, California.

H. Res. 183 (Wilson): Settlement of the title to the Colorado River property in Imperial County by the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

H.R. 4855 (Rostenkowski): Establishment of an Urban Parkland Heritage Corporation.

H.R. 6602 (Matsunaga): National Park supervision and Naval construction of shoreside facilities at the U. S. ship "Arizona" memorial at Pearl Harbor.

H.R. 9115 (Bafalis): Deauthorization of the cross-Florida barge canal.

SCIENCE

H.R. 1287 (Wilson): Authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research and educational programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities.

H.R. 5204 (Bell): Establish a framework of national science policy and focus the nation's scientific talent on its priority problems.

SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 3886 (Wilson): Improvement of the Older American's Act of 1965. S. 50 passed in lieu. Public Law 93-43.

H.R. 4564 (Stokes): Reduced time qualifications for old age and disability insurance benefits.

H.R. 4887 (Wolff): Require states to not consider social security increases in determining eligibility for other assistance programs.

H.R. 5358 (Rooney): Revision of the system for Federal match funding to states for social services assistance.

H.R. 7092 (Biaggi): Remove limitation on the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security.

H.R. 7093 (Biaggi): Increase the lumpsum death payment to $750.

H.R. 7097 (Biaggi): Inclusion of qualified prescription drugs under the Hospital Insurance program.

H.R. 8019 (Heinz): Delete 10 percent limitation provision to states for social services payments to the aged, blind and disabled.

H.R. 9097 (Rosenthal): Free or reduced airline rates for handicapped persons and for individuals 65 years and older.

H.R. 9381 (Corman): Half-fare for elderly people on common carriers during non-peak travel periods.

H. Con. Res. 226 (Grasso): Opposition to the curtailment of Medicare and Medicaid program benefits.

TAX REFORM

H.R. 851 (Koch): Extension of full tax benefits of income splitting to unmarried persons.

H.R. 969 (Reuss): To raise additional revenues by tax reform.

H.R. 1040 (Corman): Broadening the in-

come tax base, equity among taxpayers, reform of the income and estate tax provisions.

H.R. 4727 (Wilson): Charitable contribution deduction for purposes of the estate tax.

H.R. 5218 (Eilberg): Tax exemptions for supporting a mentally retarded dependent.

H.R. 5992 (Sikes): Amend Section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

H.R. 6340 (Koch): Charitable tax deductions for blood donations.

H.R. 6353 (Pepper): Tax deductions for theft losses, on costs for theft protection and for the medical or funeral expenses of crime victims.

H.R. 6360 (Rinaldo): Licensing of persons in the business of preparing tax returns.

H.R. 7094 (Biaggi): Exemption of the first $5,000 of retirement income of taxpayers 65 or older.

H.R. 7095 (Biaggi): Full deduction of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 or older.

H.R. 7096 (Biaggi): Personal exemption for a dependent over 65 without regard to the dependent's income.

H.R. 9822 (Cohen): Tax incentives for the modification of architectural and transportational barriers to the handicapped or elderly.

VETERANS

H.R. 1493 (Fraser): Prevent reduction of veteran's pensions because of increased social security benefits.

H.R. 4751 (Danielson): Certain social security benefit increases be disregarded in determining pension. Subcommittee hearings. Wilson testified.

H.R. 5903 (Wilson): Establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County.

H.R. 6195 (Wilson): Veteran's disability rates and construction of veteran's hospitals.

H.R. 9147 (Breaux): No time limit on veteran's educational benefits.

H.R. 9148 (Breaux): Emergency treatment of veterans in private hospitals.

H.R. 9706 (Biaggi): Sixty day military privileges and health benefits to former military members.

EQUAL PAY AT GE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to report to my colleagues that as a result of a sex discrimination suit brought by the International Union, IUE Local 901, and 81 women, the Fort Wayne General Electric plant has instituted new, higher wage rates, job posting and upgrading procedures, and is providing $300,000 in backpay to some 350 female employees. The far-reaching changes mark the out-of-court settlement of the 1972 lawsuit, and according to the current IUE Journal, are "the forerunner of procedures to be negotiated locally throughout GE under the new national contract."

I am delighted to see that women are achieving substantial successes in their universal struggle to achieve equality with men. "Equal pay for equal work" is finally being realized after centuries of sexist oppression. For more information on this recent IUE victory, I commend the following article to my colleagues' attention.

The article follows:

PAY AND UPGRADINGS WON FOR FORT WAYNE WOMEN

FORT WAYNE, IND.—New, higher wage rates are in effect and backpay totaling an estimated $300,000 is being processed for some 350 women employees of General Electric, Fort Wayne, as a result of settlement of a sex discrimination lawsuit brought against GE by the International Union, IUE Local 901 and 81 of the women.

The dollar amount of the settlement is believed to be the largest ever in an Equal Pay Act case initiated by parties other than the Federal Government.

The suit alleged that GE had paid the female employees less than males doing comparable or nearly comparable work in 21 different job categories. IUE charged that GE maintained two separate classifications for each of these jobs, one of which was filled entirely or predominantly by males while the other was entirely or predominantly female. In each case, the male classification was higher paid, with hourly differentials up to 94.5¢

The settlement, worked out after months of union-management studies of the jobs, provides for retroactive upward rate adjustments for the female side of 19 of the 21 classifications, plus the institution of job posting and upgrading procedures throughout the Fort Wayne plant.

The case has a broad impact for all IUE–GE locals. Wherever discriminatory wage rates exist, they are being or will be challenged and the Fort Wayne victory will have a bearing on the outcome.

The job posting procedures established here are the forerunner of procedures to be negotiated locally throughout GE under the new national contract.

In addition to the backpay, the Fort Wayne rate adjustments will continue to bring an estimated $250,000 per year in higher wages for the women affected. Distribution of backpay checks is expected to begin July 25.

The job posting-upgrading procedures will provide new opportunities for upward mobility to all IUE-represented GE employees at Fort Wayne, including members of racial minorities and men as well as women.

The settlement provides for the posting of all primary vacancies, with the jobs to be awarded on the basis of seniority, subject to qualifications, to persons bidding for them. (A primary vacancy is one that does not result from filling another vacancy.) Other vacancies will be filled on the basis of seniority, subject to qualifications, from among employees who have stated a preference for the job involved. Employees may state such preference at any time for an unlimited number of jobs.

The rate adjustments, plus the job posting-upgrading provisions will eliminate the separation of male and female classifications.

Upward rate adjustments for certain jobs not covered by the settlements will be worked out between IUE and GE in order to establish and maintain a rational rate relationship among all jobs.

The suit, filed on Feb. 14, 1972, was dismissed recently, following approval of the settlement by a Federal Court.

JENNINGS-SHAMBO STATEMENT

In a joint statement, IUE President Paul Jennings and IUE–GE Conference Board Chairman John Shambo said, "The Fort Wayne settlement is a major step in eliminating persistent discrimination which is so costly to our members. The impact of this victory will be felt far beyond Fort Wayne and beyond IUE itself."

The complaint was initiated by Local President Tom Willhelm and former Business Agent Bob Wire. It was carried forward by Willhelm and Tom Rebman, who succeeded Wire as business agent.

The legal case was prepared and conducted by IUE attorneys Winn Newman, Ruth Weyand and Bob Friedman.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTER, PATERSON, N.J., COMMEMORATING 105 YEARS OF QUALITY HEALTH CARE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center, a true regional center of medical care, which is administered by the Sisters of Charity of Convent Station and located in Paterson in my congressional district, State of New Jersey, recently commemorated its century of progress and expanded health care facilities. Today, I am pleased and privileged to call their many hospital services to your attention and respectfully request that you join with me in commendation to the Honorable William F. Johnson, president, and Sister Jane Frances Brady, S.C., the administrator and treasurer, together with the other officers and trustees of this outstanding medical center, and hereby seek national recognition of all of their good works through our Nation's most historic journal of Congress.

The following excerpts of an article that appeared in the Paterson News, one of New Jersey's most prestigious newspapers, most eloquently depicts the vast expansion program that has been and is taking place at St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center to help meet the growing needs of our community, State, and Nation.

ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTER NAME CHANGE TELLS OF PROGRESS

PATERSON.—Not time alone, or size alone, or staff distinction alone, make a hospital more than a facility serving the immediate medical needs of its adjacent community.

"A hospital become a regional center of medical care," says William F. Johnson, president of St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center here, "When it has developed medical services, instituted educational programs so complex that smaller hospitals in the area rely on its excellence as a referral center for their patients."

Johnson was talking about the recent adoption of the hospital's new corporate title, "St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center".

"In a very real sense," he said, "the name change is a summary of the achievements and service which have brought us from 1867 through Dec. 31, 1972. The past year, our 105th, was truly a historic one for us and for the wide geographic community we serve."

Sister Jane Frances Brady, S.C., Administrator of St. Joseph's, since November last, recalled 1972 "as the last full year in which we at St. Joseph's enjoyed the dedicated service of our late beloved former Administrator, Sister Anne Jean Regan. "It was a year that brought us many advances, a year in which many of her plans for St. Joseph's came to fruition."

"St. Joseph's, through 1972, continued to expand and developed all of the services and facilities required to deliver excellent medical care to its immediate community, a community changing, with new demands, new expectations, new needs," Hospital President Johnson continued.

"At the same time," he said, "St. Joseph's was also reviewing its medical and educational responsibilities to the wider community of smaller suburban hospitals,

physicians practicing throughout our area, and the burgeoning general population which has developed outside of the city over the past 25 years."

"Our Board of Trustees, our administrative and medical staffs have developed a master plan to provide the kind of dual medical excellence our society requires in the '70's and will require to an even greater degree into the century ahead."

Johnson called the hospital's $9.5 million development program the latest phase of this master plan.

"We are taking this major step forward in full confidence that the entire community we serve will support us," he said.

Said Sister Jane Frances, "Sister Anne Jean has left us a trust to continue her work. Our new Development Program is but one of the more concrete and obvious plans she had for St. Joseph's. When it is completed, it will be a memorial to this great lady in bricks and mortar and vastly expanded community services."

Sister Jane calls the change in the hospital's name to include the term Medical Center, another part of the tribute to the memory of Sister Anne Jean.

"It was she who brought us to our present level of excellence, to our present diversity and comprehensiveness as a major regional medical center, serving Northern New Jersey."

SPECIAL SERVICES EXPANDED IN 1972

Quite independent of the major $9.5 million program of progress initiated in 1972 by St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center, the hospital planned expansion of two important special services. These were in Renology, directed by Dr. Mark Needle, and Cardiology directed by Dr. Russell Brancato. New construction is slated to expand the 27-machine Renal Dialysis Unit, Passaic County's only such facility. Near completion now is the new Cardiac Catheterization Laboratory, which will be the area's largest and most comprehensive facility for the diagnosis of coronary disease.

These two services, regional in scope and dimension, are among a growing list of highly complex facilities available to the scores of communities throughout Passaic County and on its perimeter in Bergen, Morris and Sussex Counties.

Others include: Rehabilitation medicine—St. Joseph's operates the largest Rehabilitation Medicine Unit in a general hospital in Northern New Jersey, with a full-time Director of Rehabilitation Medicine—Dr. Melvin Goldberg—and programs of speech and hearing therapy, physical therapy, occupational therapy, hydro-therapy.

Infertility clinic—The newest techniques and equipment are used to discover and treat the causes of infertility. St. Joseph's is the only Passaic County hospital using the cool-light laparascope for diagnosis of infertility and several other gynecological conditions.

Amniocentesis fetal blood gas testing, fetal monitoring—Newborn babies have a greater chance of survival because of the varied complex testing and diagnostic techniques used.

Computerized radiation dosage—St. Joseph's is the only hospital in Passaic County to have been designated a major cancer treatment center by the New Jersey Regional Medical Program's automated dosimetry project. St. Joseph's is now "on line" via computer with New York's Memorial Hospital for Cancer and Allied Diseases to prescribe radiation dosage more precisely. More than 500 patients are treated by St. Joseph's radiation therapy department each year.

Psychiatric Day Care Center—St. Joseph's was the first in the area to have a psychiatric day care center function as part of a general hospital. Most of the mental health services provided by St. Joseph's in past years are now a part of the program provided by the Community Health Center Inc. of Paterson. The hospital is one of a three-member consortium, making up the Center. St. Joseph's is the base for the Center's Mental Health Clinic and it is also a partner in the HELP LINE service, providing round-the-clock aid to people with emotional and mental problems.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

The education and training of physicians, medical students, technicians, and other para-professionals is expanding rapidly at St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center in Paterson, in cooperation with the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey and other institutions. There are three levels of Medical Education—the Undergraduate Externship Program, the Post-graduate Internship Program and Residency Programs.

Approved residencies are: Medicine, Surgery, Obstetrics-Gynecology, Orthopedics, Pathology, Anesthesiology.

Affiliations for nursing education are: William Paterson College, Felician College, Bergen Community College, Passaic County Community College, Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Other educational affiliations are: Medical Technology—Fairleigh Dickinson University, University of Scranton. Radiologic Technology—Passaic County Community College. Inhalation therapy—Bergen County Community College, Passaic County Community College. Speech pathology—Columbia University. Psychology—Fairleigh Dickinson University.

From its earliest days, St. Joseph's has been a leader in preparing its people to give excellent service to its own patients and provide other hospitals and community with a pool of skilled personnel.

Other educational programs at St. Joseph's include: Pharmacology Internships, Dietary Internships, Surgical Technician Program, Psychology Internships, Speech Pathology Training, LPN Training in affiliation with Passaic County Technical and Vocational School.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to present to you and our colleagues here in the Congress the story of St. Joseph's and our pride in the outstanding public service rendered by the officers, board of trustees, and 1,600 employees of St. Joseph's. I also respectfully request that you join with me in commendation to the current officers and members of the board of trustees of this distinguished lifesaving institution, comprised of highly reputable and outstanding religious and lay leaders of our community, as follows:

THE HONORABLE OFFICERS

William F. Johnson, President.
Frank J. Davies, Vice President.
Sister Jane Frances Brady, S.C., Treasurer/Administrator.

TRUSTEES

Sister Joseph Vincent Egan, Secretary.
Sister Hildegarde Marie Mahoney.
Sister M. Angelica Doris.
Frank M. Ash, M.C.
Maurice J. Brick.
Sister Claire Majella Scanlon.
Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph R. Brestel.
Francis B. Brogan, M.D.
Gerald B. Cramer.
Edwin Englehardt.
Eward B. Haines.
Charles T. Murphy.
Mrs. Thomas A. (Vivian) Sanfacon.
Mrs. A. J. (Felicita) Zimmerman.
Robert Dalzell.
Mrs. Raphael R. Goldenberg.
Robert Marcalus.
A. Gerard Peters, M.D.
Julius Treet, Jr.

HONORARY TRUSTEES

Most Reverend Lawrence B. Casey.
Thomas J. Brogan.
John Agnew.
Frank L. Bradley.
F. Raymond Peterson.

Mr. Speaker, we are indeed proud of St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center and the accomplishments of its administration, the staff, and the religious and lay leaders of our community who have contributed to this century of progress, and extend our deepest appreciation to them and the many other dedicated and devoted staff personnel at this hospital who throughout the years have contributed to the building, expansion, administration, and delivery of quality health care services to all of our people.

ON THE WATERGATE INVESTIGATION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the long-running special investigation by the Ervin committee in the Senate is beginning to take on aspects of partisan politics. I feel a sense of duty to speak out in this matter.

As president of the Grand Council of Columbia Association, representing over 80,000 Italo-Americans in civil service, I publically protested the Valachi hearings in 1963. By focusing only on one aspect of organized crime, these hearings implanted in the American mind the impression it was the only aspect. As a result, that effort had disastrous effects on the collective character of Americans of Italian ancestry. Today, primarily as a result of the Valachi hearings, and subsequent publicity, and amplified by "The Godfather" film, there is scarcely a single American who does not identify all organized crime as being Italian, specifically by referring to it as "Mafia" or "Cosa Nostra," And more disastrously, there is present in this land the suspicion that every Italian may somehow be involved in organized crime, just because he is Italian.

Today, with the Watergate, we see the the same thing happening. The President and many of his present and former aides are being tried, convicted and condemned in the press and on the television screens of the Nation. The result of these antics will be the impossibility of giving anyone involved in the matter a fair trial. They will not even be able to get a fair hearing.

Where are the rights of these individuals? I cannot agree with the argument that the right of the public to know and the press to inform is paramount. First and foremost must come the protection of the rights of the individual, particularly his right to a fair and impartial trial. Yet no editor of the leading liberal publications have sought to defend this right as it applies to the President and to the others allegedly involved in the Watergate incident.

Some say the President has set himself above the law. Yet by denying the President the protection of the law, has not the Ervin Committee and the press themselves set the President out beyond

the law? They have separated him from the law by claiming that the right of the American people to be fully informed on this issue is more important than the President's individual rights to a fair and impartial hearing before the courts. They have in fact denied him the equal protection of the law guaranteed by the Constitution.

This hearing has gone on too long already. It is doing damage to the basic institutions of this country, particularly to the Office of the President of the United States. Even though I personally have been a target of the dirty tricks of Ulascewitz, I still cannot condone the actions of the Ervin Committee, the news media and others to "get the President." This is partisan politics, pure and simple, and should be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, so that all my colleagues might have the benefit of a more eloquent and documented presentation of this argument, I would like to include in the RECORD a column by Patrick Buchanan which appeared in the New York Times today. There is a great deal of food for thought in these words. I hope my Democratic colleagues take notice.

The article follows:

MR. NIXON AS THE TARGET

(By Patrick J. Buchanan)

(". . . The reaction by journalists and politicians to the Watergate break-in has been morally even more corrupt than the Watergate activities themselves."—Chancellor W. Allen Wallis, University of Rochester, June 10, 1973.)

WASHINGTON.—Chancellor Wallis' indictment is understated. The Watergate crowd cannot hold a candle to its principal accusers in politics and the press.

Berated morning, noon and night with Watergate, the nation has seen its important business put off, its economic interests and currency suffer in foreign markets, its reputation in the world diminished. There now appears no damage to United States interests that is unacceptable—no political principle they will not rise readily above—to sink their teeth in the President of the United States.

Since the gavel rang down on Army-McCarthy, the nation's dominant media has warned, ad nauseam, against the inevitable injury to rights and reputations inherent in the Congressional Investigating committee, where no clear legislative purpose is being served. Eisenhower's refusal to allow his aides to testify before Senator McCarthy was received, therefore, as an act of statesmanship. Today, however, when the quarry is not domestic subversives or organized crime—but Richard Nixon and his men—the old caveats are forgotten in the frenzy of the case.

"Trial by headline," "guilt by association," and "Hearsay testimony," long the subject of scathing editorials, are now the source of daily headlines. In a questionable tribute to the power of the press, today, 36 percent of the American people have become convinced the President had prior knowledge of the Watergate break-in, though not a single witness has so testified.

Nor is one surprised to learn that the publications beating the drums for immediate public disclosure of the most sensitive papers and conversations of the President are one and the same with the publications in the vanguard demanding an absolute shield law to protect in perpetuity the confidentiality of their reporters' notes.

So much excellent scholarship has already been produced on the double standard of the liberal establishment, the exercise becomes as redundant as one more essay on Hamlet.

Let us suppose, nevertheless, that brothers Liddy & Hunt had done their breaking and entering on behalf of the antiwar movement. Had Judge "Maximum John" Sirica then handed down his draconian sentences—20 and 35 years respectively for first-offense burglary—to pressure the pair to betray confederates and superiors—would this trampling upon the spirit of the Eighth Amendment have been so loudly and universally applauded?

Poor Liddy & Hunt. If only, like Ellsberg, they had dropped their stolen papers off at the national desk of The New York Times, instead of the campaign desk of Jeb Magruder, they might be sharing the Pulitzer Prize.

In the catalogue of crimes against civil rights, how grievous is Watergate? We know of course that in the temple of American liberalism, off the main altar, there stand the marble likenesses of Franklin Roosevelt and Earl Warren. Yet, three decades ago, thanks to this pair, 110,000 Japanese-Americans were stripped of savings and property and hauled off to concentration camps. Alongside this atrocity against civil liberties, how really serious was Hunt's bag job on Ellsberg's analyst, or Liddy's rummaging through O'Brien's mail?

And, despite the cheers and applause of the yahoos assembled in the caucus room, how seriously can one take the "extremist humbug"—in a Richmond paper's phrase—of Senator Sam's teary-eyed declaration that Watergate is worse than the Civil War in which half a million Americans lost their lives?

Indeed, what is there in Watergate that is without precedent in the Democratic administrations and campaigns of the recent past? Wiretapping electronic surveillance?

But it was under Attorney General Robert Kennedy, not John Mitchell, that the F.B.I. taps went on the phones of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Democratic National Committee was not the first target of a political tap. Adlai Stevenson was bugged at the Democratic convention in 1960. Barry Goldwater was the subject of a full-court press in 1964. N.B.C. bugged the 1968 Democratic convention. And in the fall of that year, Mrs. Anna Chennault was the subject of a "national security" wiretap, the products of which were turned over to Democratic nominee Hubert Humphrey, for use at his discretion.

Dirty tricks?

When the Nixon and Goldwater campaigns of the early sixties were bedeviled with phony press releases, bollixed schedules and trains chugging out of the station before time, this was laughed off as the work of the "merry prankster, Dick Tuck." When, however, there arrived at a 1972 Muskie fundraiser 200 steaming pizzas, a giant floral wreath, two magicians all the way from Charlotte Amalie and a dozen Middle Eastern and African ambassadors in rented limousines, suddenly this becomes "political sabotage," meriting Congressional investigations and screaming headlines.

What of "political spies"? Are they a CREEP innovation? Hardly. When a newsman weasled his way into the confidence of the Nixon campaign, transcribing conversations, filching memoranda, the fruit of his deceptions, "The Selling of the President, was hailed as a centerpiece of the new journalism by publications that now affect horror at "political espionage" against Hubert Humphrey. The parties who lionized Joe McGinnis would terminate with extreme prejudice the Sedan Chair brothers.

Theodore H. White reminds us that, back in 1964, Mr. Ehrlichman's predecessor. White House counsel Myer Feldman, headed up a "five o'clock club," that had in hand Barry Goldwater's speeches well before their scheduled release. Whence came these documents? "Don't ask," White House aide John Roche was told on inquiry.

What of the charge with which Michigan Congressman Brown has been pilloried in testimony—the alleged Congressional coverup of a campaign scandal? What the Congressman did was vote against a partisan investigation of Watergate by the Patman Committee—following the established precedent of Senators Talmadge, Inouye, and Ervin, who voted, each of them, seven times in 1964 to restrict a Congressional investigation into the shenanigans of L. B. J. protege Bobby Baker.

The foregoing is not to excuse or condone or justify the misdeeds of Watergate but to place them in perspective. It is to suggest to the President's friends that the President's adversaries have not marshaled all these troops and all this artillery simply to "get at the truth about Watergate."

They are after larger game. What the left has in mind is not just running to ground their adversary of a quarter century but strangling in its infancy the President's new majority, rendering "inoperative" the political verdict of 1972, and reimposing upon the nation the politics, policies and programs repudiated in a million voting booths in November.

With all due respect to the senior Senator from Tennessee, the ultimate question of Watergate is not, "What did the President know and when did he first know it?" The ultimate question is not legal. It is not judicial. It is political: whether the democratic verdict of the American people in November of 1972 will be allowed to stand, or whether it will be overturned by a defeated minority—with Watergate as their weapon.

As Godfrey Sperling of The Christian Science Monitor perceived two months ago:

"Watergate has become the last best hope for liberals who are convinced that the President is leading a counter-revolution. Much of the zeal behind the Watergate probe is led by liberal critics who want to break the President in order to blunt Mr. Nixon's conservative thrust . . . the President's critics are really quite desperate. They are literally fighting for their political lives. . . ."

As has been argued by spokesmen of both the Republican party and the conservative movement, political and social, neither bear any culpability whatever for Watergate. Both, however, have a vital stake in the outcome.

One trusts that with the future of a sympathetic Administration, and the interests of the conservative movement in the balance, we will not see validated Whittaker Chambers' harsh verdict that the central shortcoming of conservatives is the failure to retrieve their wounded.

STATUS OF APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, 93D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, today the House adjourns for the August recess and I want to take this opportunity to place before the House an accounting of our progress in processing the appropriations bills of the session.

For the session, the House has considered 12 appropriations measures. The second and urgent supplemental bills dealt with fiscal year 1973. The 10 remaining general appropriations bills pertain to fiscal year 1974.

The Senate has approved seven of the

1974 appropriations bills and, as of close of business today, conference action will have been completed on four of those measures.

Three general appropriations bills for fiscal year 1974 remain to be considered by the House: defense, military construction, and foreign assistance. There have been authorization problems associated with the remaining three bills.

I include a summary table for the RECORD at this point:

ACTIONS ON BUDGET ESTIMATES OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY CONSIDERED IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, 93D CONG., 1ST SESS., REVISED TO AUG. 1, 1973

[Does not include any "back-door" type budget or spending authority in legislative bills; or any permanent (Federal or trust) authority, under earlier or "permanent" law,[1] without further or annual action by the Congress]

Bill and fiscal year	House actions				Senate actions			Final action	
	Budget requests considered	Reported by committee	Approved by House	Compared with budget requests	Budget requests considered	Approved by Senate	Compared with budget requests	Reported by conference	Compared with budget requests
A. Bills for fiscal 1974:									
1. Legislative (H.R. 6691)	$566,945,389	$550,044,940	$550,044,940	−$16,900,449	$677,150,959	$640,558,952	−$36,592,007		
2. Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection (H.R. 8619)	9,519,551,600	9,385,750,600	9,385,737,600	−133,814,000	9,519,551,600	10,176,926,500	+657,374,900		
3. District of Columbia (Federal funds) (H.R. 8658)	432,998,000	427,717,000	427,717,000	−5,281,000	432,998,000	417,717,000	−15,281,000	$417,717,000	−$15,281,000
4. Transportation (H.R. 8760)	[5] 2,892,732,006	[5] 2,752,631,006	[5] 2,753,231,006	−139,501,000	[5] 3,010,732,006	[5] 2,968,451,006	−42,281,000	2,898,446,006	−112,286,000
5. HUD-Space-Science-Veterans (H.R. 8825)	18,617,453,000	19,070,954,000	19,070,954,000	+453,501,000	18,617,453,000	19,118,373,063	+500,920,063	19,056,500,000	+439,047,000
6. Labor-HEW (H.R. 8877)	31,552,115,000	32,816,467,000	32,816,467,000	+1,264,352,000					
7. Interior (H.R. 8917)	2,274,431,300	2,269,554,200	2,269,554,200	−4,877,100	2,377,467,300	2,488,773,700	−111,306,400		
8. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary (H.R. 8916)	4,235,080,000	4,150,143,000	4,152,946,000	−82,134,000					
9. Public Works-AEC (H.R. 8947)	4,757,469,000	4,671,695,000	4,676,395,000	−81,074,000	4,757,469,000	4,772,982,000	+15,513,000	4,749,403,000	−8,006,000
10. Treasury-Postal Service-General Government	4,901,345,000	4,843,698,000	4,845,398,000	−55,947,000					
11. Defense	[3] (77,124,223,000)								
12. Foreign Assistance	[3] (4,316,567,000)								
13. Military Construction	[3] (2,937,900,000)								
14. Special Resolution, Gold Devaluation	[3 4] (2,250,000,000)								
Total, bills for fiscal 1974, to date	79,750,120,295	80,938,654,746	80,948,444,746	+1,198,324,451	39,392,821,865	40,583,782,221	+968,347,556	27,122,066,006	+303,474,000
B. Bills for fiscal 1973:									
1. Urgent Supplemental (H. J. Res. 496)	1,366,800,000	494,800,000	[2] 1,368,600,000	+1,800,000	1,366,800,000	1,368,600,000	+1,800,000	1,368,600,000	+1,800,000
2. 2d Supplemental (H. R. 7447, vetoed)	[3,162,880,434]	[2,855,542,209]	[2,855,542,209]	[−307,338,225]	[3,607,105,504]	[3,699,239,279]	[+92,133,775]	[3,362,845,279]	[−244,260,225]
3. 2d Supplemental (H.R. 9055)	3,607,105,504	3,362,845,279	3,362,845,279	−244,260,225	3,607,105,404	3,362,845,279	−244,260,225	3,362,845,279	−244,260,225
Total, bills for fiscal 1973	4,973,905,504	3,857,645,279	4,731,445,279	−242,460,225	4,973,905,504	4,731,445,279	−242,460,225	4,731,445,279	−242,460,225
C Cumulative totals for the session, to date:									
1. House	84,724,025,799	84,796,300,025	85,679,890,025	+955,864,226					
2. Senate					44,366,727,369	45,315,227,500	+725,887,331		
3. Enacted								31,853,511,285	+61,013,775

[1] The budget for 1974, as submitted Jan. 29, 1973, tentatively estimated total new budget authority for 1974 at $288,029,000,000 gross ($256,761,000,000 net of some $31,268,000,000 interfund and intragovernmental transactions and certain so-called proprietary receipts handled as offsets for budget summary purposes only). Of this total, an estimated $146,477,000,000 does not require current action by Congress; it involves so-called permanent appropriations such as interest, and various trust funds, already provided for in other basic laws. The remainder, $172,820,000,000 is for consideration at this session (mostly in the appropriation bills). About $8,600,000,000 of the $172,820,000,000 was shown in the January budget as being "for later transmittal" for supplemental requirements under present law, new legislation, and allowances for contingencies and civilian pay raises, and $49,534,408 of the remainder requires legislative reauthorization through various annual authorization bills or where the authorization expires periodically.

[2] $873,800,000 was added on the House floor as a committee amendment and was covered by a budget estimate.

[3] These estimates, totaling $91,539,454,000, were included in the President's budget but have not been finally acted on by the Appropriations Committee.

[4] "Not to exceed."

[5] Includes $90,360,000 in advance 1975 appropriations.

EUROPEAN TROOP REDUCTIONS: WHY THEY ARE NECESSARY

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, the American people have made great strides toward world peace in the opening years of the 1970's. The SALT agreement, the Paris accords, and the current negotiations on mutual balanced force reductions should contribute to a worldwide reduction in tensions and lead the United States to a reassessment of national priorities.

Given the gradual lessening of cold war tensions, it is my contention that we can now reevaluate our defense expenditures and make selective, carefully evaluated reductions in our defense posture.

The time has come for strenuous efforts to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit which, in the defense area alone, amounted to over $2 billion this year. In this regard current troop levels in Europe provide us with an excellent example of an area in which sound, justifiable reductions could be made without damaging our position in world affairs. Our European allies have made tremendous progress in postwar economic growth and they are now capable of contributing a greater share to their own defense.

I have found the following testimony by Edward L. King, given before the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee especially pertinent to this question of European troop reductions.

The testimony follows:

REDUCTION OF U.S. MILITARY FORCES STATIONED IN WESTERN EUROPE

(By Edward L. King)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I appreciate your invitation to appear before you and discuss reductions in the number of U.S. military forces stationed in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support an adequate program of national defense. And I believe we should honor Congressionally approved treaty articles that commit us to assist in the defense of the security of other nations whose security significantly impacts upon our own. However, I do not believe that we should continue to maintain costly overseas military personnel and bases that are excessive to our actual treaty "commitments" and to the scope of the military "threat" that exists in the area.

In my estimation that is exactly what we are doing today in Europe. According to the Department of Defense there are 319,000 military men and women (accompanied by around 225,000 dependents) stationed in Europe. This is more than the 311,600 military personnel we had stationed in Europe in June 1961 before the Berlin Crisis. Despite a Berlin Agreement, detente between East and West, a SALT agreement and growing trade across the Iron Curtain, the number of U.S. military personnel in Europe has in-

creased over the levels of the Cold War days.

The cost of maintaining U.S. forces in Europe and in the U.S. with NATO missions has steadily climbed from $12 billion in FY 1971 to an estimated $17 billion in FY 1973. Balance of payments deficits resulting from military accounts in Europe have been estimated at $1.8 billion in FY 1973.

The Department of Defense has justified these costly manpower levels on the basis of "U.S. commitments under primary applicable treaties" and the Soviet "threat" in Europe. The NATO treaty is cited as the "primary applicable treaty" requiring our current troop deployments in Europe.

Yet the NATO Treaty does not specify any level of U.S. military force to be stationed in Europe. Indeed it does not even require members to take military action to meet a common threat. The size and composition of U.S. military forces assigned to NATO has been determined by the Executive Branch of the U.S. Government—not by substantive "commitments" contained in treaty articles.

The most binding language in the NATO Treaty in regard to military commitments and forces is contained in Articles 3, 4, and 5, which read:

Article 3: "the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack."

(Under this article the U.S. has felt compelled to assume a costly 25-year obligation of massive military assistance to NATO countries.)

Article 4: "the members agree to consult whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the parties is threatened."

Article 5: "the members agree to consider an armed attack against one . . . an attack against them all." But each signer agrees only to "assist the party or parties so attacked by taking . . . such action as it deems necessary, *including* the use of armed force." (underlining added)

Article 11 states that the provisions of the NATO Treaty shall be carried out by the member states "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes." Neither the President nor the Congress is committed by an article in the NATO Treaty to any particular military course of action or level of military force in Europe. Thus I seriously question the legitimacy of using the "NATO Treaty" as the justification for the commitment of about 500,000 active military personnel to an "initial defense of NATO." On the basis of the "NATO Treaty" the Department of Defense in FY 1974 will allocate 8 active Army and Marine divisions, 6 aircraft carriers, over 80 surface warships and attack submarines, and 21 air squadrons to defend NATO.

These forces are allocated for "forward deployment" to NATO as a result of voluntary consultative agreements with our NATO allies entered into by the Executive Branch, and decisions made by the President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense and the Joints Chiefs of Staff. Congress has not always played a role. For example, Congress has not made a direct determination concerning U.S. troop levels in Europe since it approved sending 5 divisions to Europe in 1951.

What is the "Soviet threat" which is used as a basis for the deployment of 319,000 U.S. military personnel in Europe? The Department of Defense has stated the "threat" in almost these same words for the past four fiscal years.

"While we do not consider aggression by the USSR likely in the present political climate, the fact remains that the Soviets have a vital interest in preserving the status quo in Central Europe and in retaining their hold on Eastern Europe. A crisis that could lead to a conflict could arise if the political situation substantially changed in a way that threatened the USSR or its hegemony over Eastern Europe, or if a Soviet Government saw opportunities for other ways to apply ciritical pressures on the cohesion of the Alliance. Such a crisis could escalate to hostilities."

There is a great deal of vague supposition contained in this description of the extent of the Soviet threat to Europe. But the American people have kept over 300,000 of their sons and daughters in Europe, and paid ever-increasing billions each year to help defend our allies against this nebulous and increasingly unlikely "threat". It is difficult indeed to understand or justify the large number of U.S. military personnel deployed to Europe, and the resultant escalating costs that weaken the international value of the dollar, in view of the estimation of the "threat" and the high percentage of our European-based military personnel engaged in noncombatant duties.

How many U.S. military personnel stationed in Europe are assigned to fight in defense of our allies and U.S. national security? The main combat force is the 198,600 Army troops stationed in Central Europe. The Department of Defense has stated that in FY 1974 116,000 of these troops will be serving in "combat units". But are all personnel assigned in a "combat unit" actually involved in combat against an enemy? Using the Army's most favoraable divisional combat-to-support ratio of 42% combat and 58% support, the ratio of Army personnel stationed in Europe assigned to combat and support duties is as follows:

	Fiscal year 1974	Combat	Support
4⅓ divisions [1]	65,300	27,426	37,874
2 armored cavalry regiments	6,100	2,562	3,538
Berlin Brigade	3,900	1,638	2,262
Other combat units [2]	17,900	7,518	10,382
Missile forces [3]	22,900	9,618	13,282
Units supporting divisions	65,500	27,510	37,990
Strategic communications, intelligence, and security	10,900	----------	10,900
DOD/joint activities, free world and other services support and others	6,100	----------	6,100
Total	198,600	76,272	122,382

[1] 64,600 is the total authorized strength of the divisions.
[2] Artillery, combat aviation, combat engineers, and air defense.
[3] Includes 7,600 in direct support of missile forces.

The above table shows that using the Army's most favorable combat-to-support ratio there are 46,000 more support than combat troops stationed in Central Europe. If the less favorable percentage of the number of Army personnel assigned to combat skill jobs (i.e. individuals whose primary duty is to fire on the enemy) is used for computation then the figures change to the following:

	Fiscal year 1974	Combat	Support
4⅓ divisions	65,300	15,672	49,580
2 armored cavalry regiments	6,100	1,468	4,636
Berlin Brigade	3,900	936	2,964
Other combat units	17,900	4,296	13,604
Missile forces	22,900	5,496	17,404
Units supporting divisions	65,500	15,740	49,784
Strategic communications, intelligence and security	10,900	----------	10,900
DOD/joint activities, free world and other services support and others	6,100	----------	6,100
Total	198,600	43,608	154,992

Regardless of which ratio is used to measure the combat capability of our forces in Central Europe, it is apparent that a majority of them are serving in noncombatant headquarters and support roles. How do these military power deployments that we have maintained in Europe for over 20 years actually defend U.S. national security? The oft-stated purpose of our conventional general purpose manpower in Europe is to provide a means of phased "flexible response" to a Soviet ground attack. Any level of Soviet attack is highly unlikely. But if an attack were to occur it is doubtful that U.S. deployments in Central Europe would be able to respond successfully in a purely conventional manner. They are not positioned, trained, manned, or equipped to conduct an effective non-nuclear initial forward defense.

To provide a militarily credible ability to respond to a conventional Soviet attack, U.S. forces deployed in Central Europe plan on a warning and mobilization period of about 30 days. A caveat to this effect is written into all Department of Defense statements of U.S. land force missions in NATO.

With such an assumed 30-day warning and mobilization period prior to the commencement of hostilities, the U.S. divisions could be repositioned, reinforcements flown in from the U.S., some of the dependents evacuated and usable war-time lines of supply and communication (which are presently nonexistent) could be opened.*

Without such a period of preparation—in the event of a sudden attack—it would be impossible to accomplish any of these requirements, or to gain necessary air superiority to permit the landing of the rapidly airlifted U.S. reinforcements. Yet these airlifted reinforcements are essential to any hope of making a forward defense in Europe. For example, the Department of Defense has stated, "U.S. Army forces located in West Germany are spread thin. However, our plans for Europe include substantial augmentation. That part of the Reforger Division which is based in the continental U.S. is part of the Commander-in-Chief of Europe's M-Day force and therefore will be deployed during a period of increased tension. Also we plan to deploy an additional two divisions to Europe within 30-days. These two divisions are the *minimum essential* for the conduct of an initial conventional defense in the Central Region." (italics added.)

It is not possible for the U.S. Seventh Army to conduct an effective initial forward defense east of the Rhine River without these two divisions and their ten supporting elements. In the absence of these so-called "2+10" units U.S. forces deployed in West Germany would have no choice but quickly to resort to tactical nuclear weapons to save themselves from being pocketed and destroyed. Since the late 1950's they have planned on making first use of tactical nu-

*The ability of our forces to rapidly reinforce by air is questionable. For example, Exercise Reforger II conducted in the late summer of 1970 tested U.S. ability to rapidly airlift troops to Europe. This exercise required nearly 10 months of planning, cost around $10 million and took a week to move 11,400 soldiers to Europe. Only about 3,800 of those troops were actual combat personnel. The rest were command and support personnel. It then took those airlifted force another week to remove their pre-positioned heavy equipment from storage and put it in operational condition. A 1973 General Accounting Office report indicates that much of the pre-positioned equipment was either in the wrong place, or vulnerable to early capture by Soviet ground forces positioned only 180 miles away. There is the further problem that it is very likely that in any conventional ground attack, Soviet tactical air and armored units supported by conventional-armed rockets and long range artillery, could capture or put out of service most of the airfields that our airlifted reinforcements must use as forward landing sites. This would mean that it would not only be impossible to reinforce our presently "thinly spread" forward defense forces, but also make it impossible to evacuate the more than 60,000 dependent women and children living among those forward military units.

clear weapons from 2.5 to 20 kilotons, within the first 72 hours of commencing battle.

In 1970 General Lyman Lemnitzer, the U.S. Supreme Commander in Europe from 1962 until 1969, stated the scope of the problem our deployed conventional forces face in Central Europe. In testimony before this Committee he said, "One of the greatest problems that would confront NATO today would be a large conventional attack. Then we would be faced with a decision to use nuclear weapons or be defeated."

Rather than providing a "flexible" manner of response, U.S. conventional troop deployments in West Germany actually lock us into early first use of tactical nuclear weapons, which would initiate an escalation that could quickly lead to a massive nuclear exchange.

And would it be diplomatically feasible during any period of rising tension in Europe to commence rushing large numbers of U.S. military forces to Europe. Wouldn't such a military movement during moments of crisis accelerate and intensify the danger of war?

Also, doesn't the positioning of thousands of our tactical nuclear weapons within a few hours range of Soviet ground forces threaten a hurried use of nuclear weapons to prevent their early capture? And what of the U.S. Atomic Demolition Mines (ADM's) that are stored close to the West German frontier, wouldn't they have to be used in the first hour or so of any "conventional" battle to prevent capture?

As General George C. Marshall pointed out in 1950, there is nothing magical about the level of U.S. ground force deployments to NATO. The number of 5 divisions in Europe was picked by the Executive Branch and the Department of Defense in 1950, as a representative beginning contribution to NATO—until the NATO countries could raise the 80 odd divisions they had agreed to at the Lisbon Conference. But over the intervening 23 years the initial random selection of 5 U.S. divisions in Europe has somehow become a permanent fixture, which some say cannot be changed. Few see the U.S. force for what it is: not so much a viable military force for conventional defense, but a large hostage force manning a tactical nuclear tripwire that is heavily encased in noncombatant administrative and support personnel. The force guarantees that any American President must opt for immediate nuclear war in Europe. Not to do so would be to negate long-standing military contingency planning to use ADM's and tactical nuclear weapons of up to 20 kilotons, in the early hours of any sudden conventional attack. In the event of attack, Presidential denial of the early, first-use of these nuclear weapons would place nearly a half million U.S. servicemen and their dependents in grave danger of being killed or captured.

A smaller, better organized and positioned U.S. ground force could actually accomplish the same nuclear tripwire role as our present over-commanded and over-supported force. There would be two major differences; 1) it would cost less in direct costs and balance of payments loss, 2) it would provide the President with greater flexibility before having to resort to the use of tactical nuclear weapons.

But present troop deployments in Europe—and particularly in the Federal Republic of Germany—have become a sacred cow, politically sacrosanct. This has largely been the result of using military troop levels as the wrapping to cover the basically political nature of the real issue of U.S. primacy in European affairs. U.S. involvement and interest in Europe is probably more economic than military, but military troop levels have been used as a facade to divert attention and justify not publicly addressing more serious political problems. Over the years it has been far easier to defend and justify continued U.S. presence and influence in Europe on the basis of classified military requirements rather than on the basis of political expediency.

For over 10 years various military reasons have been advanced to delay consideration of reducing the U.S. military force levels in Europe. Yet during that time the British and Canadians have withdrawn forces. The French withdrew 10 divisions. The Portuguese withdrew forces. And during the Vietnam War the U.S. quietly withdrew over 100,000 men. But at home, American "Europeanists" continued to put forth arguments why there could be no reduction in the number of U.S. military personnel in Europe. Upon examination most of these arguments prove to be straw men.

The theory has been advanced that any reduction in the number of U.S. divisions in Europe would be interpreted by our European allies as a signal of a lessening of U.S. resolve to help defend them and mark the beginning of Soviet dominance. This theory has been advanced as much by our State and Defense Departments as by our allies. As we have seen, on close examination it has little validity. Thousands of troops have been removed from NATO and there has been no psychological collapse on the part of the Western European people. To give serious credence to such unreasoned behavior is to fail to understand the worldliness and maturity of the European people. There has been no rush to reach a hasty accommodation with the Soviets. What has happened has been an increased interest on the part of our European allies to strengthen the Alliance.

There are those who argue that there can be no reduction in the number of U.S. troops stationed in Europe—and particularly in West Germany—because any reduction might damage the *ostpolitik* of Mr. Brandt and weaken the internal political position of the West German Social Democratic Party. This is, of course, supposition based on confidences exchanged with these European political figures at NATO Council meetings. What is not supposition is that the Federal Republic of West Germany under the Social Democrats is able to devote a larger per capita share of its GNP to public health expenditures than the United States. At the same time the Federal Republic spends a smaller per capita share of its GNP on military expenditures than does the United States. West Germany has practically no unemployment compared to a chronic U.S. unemployment rate of around 5%. While we can find no government money available for child day care centers, the West German government has funded one of the most advanced day care programs.

It is my belief that the continued presence of excessively large numbers of costly U.S. military personnel in West Germany, which in effect releases West German manpower and money for domestic purposes, is to subsidize West German social development programs at the expense of fund-starved American domestic programs.

This is most difficult to justify under even the most dire defense circumstances. But such an expenditure of tax dollars is indefensible when one stops to consider that the majority of the U.S. troops that we are paying billions to maintain in Europe, are noncombat administrative and support personnel who would not fight to defend either the West Germans or the American taxpayer. And such a subsidization becomes even more indefensible when the vague, unlikely nature of the "threat" is considered along with the mission assigned to our costly conventional ground forces.

But the time is never ripe for reductions. Mutual Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR) is the latest in a long series of delaying tactics designed to keep U.S. forces indefinitely in Europe aiding allies that have for years failed to live up to their pledged commitments. As one delaying tactic after another has fallen away, MBFR has been increasingly used as the rationale why no reductions that would save American taxpayers money, could be made in U.S. troop levels. During the past three years the fact that East-West exchanges preparing the way for MBFR discussions were taking place has been used as a reason for postponing reductions. And during those three years American troop levels were increased by around 20,000 men. Now after five months of preliminary MBFR discussions, we are told that the conference may begin in September. The slowness of these preliminary discussions brings into serious question whether either the U.S. or the USSR is sincerely interested in mutual reductions. All indicators to date point to MBFR as yet another delaying tactic to avoid facing the military implications of a changing situation in Central Europe brought about by the Berlin accord and ongoing political and economic detente.

The true significance of MBFR has been succinctly expressed by Albert Willot, Counselor on the Belgian Permanent Delegation to the North Atlantic Council in a recent article appearing in the *NATO Review* (Vol. 21, No. 1). Mr. Willot points out:

"That Europeans should not labour under a misapprehension. Even in the absence of any agreement with the East on MBFR, the United States will sooner or later be compelled for well-known domestic political reasons, to reduce the level of their conventional presence in Europe. It must, too, be admitted that the Europeans are most unlikely to make up the difference. But it is here that MBFR comes in. By means of MBFR it may be possible to delay, and perhaps even for a long time limit this inevitable trend towards the reduction of American conventional forces in Europe.

"The mere attempt to enter negotiations on MBFR would have a delaying effect and this effect should normally last as long as the negotiations themselves. It should not be at all difficult to persuade the American public that the moment when negotiations are about to open, or when negotiations have just begun on force reductions with the East, is not the most appropriate time to carry out unilaterally—in other words without any quid pro quo—any early withdrawals of American forces from Europe. Lastly, there is reason to hope that MBFR would limit this American tendency simply because, following the reductions, force ceilings would be established. The psychological effects that may be expected to flow from the imposition of such a ceiling on force levels can easily be appreciated. Even the most staid motorist has a natural tendency to drive at the maximum legal speed limit."

To delay making needed reductions in the excessive and featherbedded U.S. conventional force deployments to NATO, and thereby help alleviate the international strain on the dollar is a costly mistake. And to make this mistake because of European reluctance to assume a more equitable portion of their own conventional defense, or to assist West German political figures, or from a naive hope for substantive results from the stalled MBFR talks, is to act contrary to what I feel are the best interests of the United States. If there is a sincere desire on the part of the superpowers to reduce military force levels in Central Europe, those reductions cannot realistically be on a man-for-man basis due to the difference in present strength and the disparity in distance that each side would withdraw its forces. It would seem feasible to assume that a ratio of exchange could be as easily worked out with a smaller number of U.S. troops as the present level. Past U.S. troop reductions in 1968 were characterized by former Secretary of State Rusk as being "tension lessening signals" to the Soviet Union. Further phased U.S. reductions—coordinated with our NATO allies—could again serve to stimulate Soviet initiatives to reduce their own European troop deployments.

In considering possible U.S. troop reductions in Europe it is helpful to examine the

deployment of our forces that are stationed there. The Department of Defense has indicated that as of December 31, 1972 U.S. military personnel were stationed in Western Europe and related areas as follows:

Belgium, 2,000.
Denmark MAAG, 7.
France MAAG, 7.
Germany, 221,000.
Greece, 3,000.
Iceland, 3,000.
Italy, 10,000.
Morocco, 1,000.
Netherlands, 2,000.
Norway MAAG, 6.
Portugal, 1,000.
Spain, 9,000.
Tunisia, 14.
Turkey, 7,000.
United Kingdom, 21,000.
Afloat in Mediterranean, 24,000.
Other, 3,000.

These deployments also raise some questions concerning the efficacy of the U.S. military role in helping defend Western Europe. For example, why is it necessary to continue to station 3,000 U.S. military personnel in Italy assigned to the Southern European Task Force (SETAF) for the purpose of providing nuclear missile fire support to the Italian armed forces? These missile forces consist of two battalions totalling less than 1,000 men manning obsolete Pershing missiles which could easily be replaced by more mobile air or sea missiles. And what treaty article requires that the U.S. station 1,000 military personnel in Morocco to help defend that country? There are two U.S. Air Force combat fighter squadrons (about 36 planes) and a Polaris submarine squadron (12 submarines) permanently stationed in non-NATO Spain, yet it requires 9,000 military personnel there to man and support this handful of combat power. There are no U.S. combat elements stationed in Portugal, and only an anti-submarine warfare squadron in the Azores, but there are 1,000 U.S. military personnel stationed there. There are no U.S. ground combat elements stationed in Belgium, but 2,000 personnel are stationed in the country. What treaty article or combat mission requires the presence of 21,000 U.S. military personnel in the United Kingdom?

It is such dribbling away of costly military manpower in questionable noncombat duties that keeps our military force levels unnecessarily high in Europe and throughout the world. It is imperative that such a wasteful structuring of our military forces be changed to streamline them into a more combat capable force requiring less administrative and support back-up.

But even more imperative is the necessity that the United States and our NATO allies face the hard choices that must be made at this juncture in the history of the NATO Alliance.

The United States can no longer financially afford to maintain its past level of conventional military force in Europe. If a concept of conventional defense is to continue, our European allies must either assume the major share of the costs of keeping U.S. conventional ground forces in Europe or provide substantially increased numbers of conventional forces themselves.

The U.S. ground force contribution to a NATO conventional defense structure does not need to be as large and support-heavy as it is today. I would recommend the retention of a corps-size force of two divisions (one armored, one mechanized) supported by an armored cavalry regiment and an anti-aircraft brigade. This force would be supported by the divisional initial support increments and one logistical command. Pre-positioned heavy equipment for one division should be placed in storage in the Benelux countries. Supply levels stocked in Europe should not exceed 45 days of combat supply. Tactical nuclear weapons should be reduced in number and moved to storage sites near the Channel ports. A "wartime" line of communications for NATO forces should be established across the Benelux countries to supply U.S. corps force repositioned along the line Hanover-Kassel in West Germany. Such a U.S. ground force would require less than 150,000 ground troops in Europe.

The American people should no longer be expected to pay more billions to provide forces to defend our NATO allies than those allies are willing to pay to defend themselves. Nor should the American people go on paying for a military force which provides a small margin of combat capability in comparison to the cost of its deployment. The issue of our NATO forces is critical. A decision must no longer be postponed. The future of our dollar and our domestic society wait upon decisions which provide for austerely meeting our legitimate treaty commitments, but at the same time ending the waste of our money on unnecessary troops and bases in Europe.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the Committee's time and consideration. I would be happy to respond to any questions you may have.

HARRY VOLKMAN, THE WEATHERMAN

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, Friday, August 3, 1973, is an excellent day to talk about the weather.

Here in Washington, it is cloudy and overcast, and we have had a few sprinkles of rain. Chicago, however, the weather is beautiful. The sun is shining, and the temperature is very moderate and comfortable in the 60-degree range. There is an old saying that—

Everyone talks about the weather and nobody does anything about it.

People around the United States rely more and more upon radio and television for their weather reports. The weatherman is a title that has taken on a new and added dimension. In particular, the television weatherman is a professional in every sense of the word.

Not so long ago, there was a group known as the "Weathermen," who received a good deal of adverse publicity in connection with their demonstrations and antiestablishment views. Their motto was:

You don't have to be a weatherman to tell which way the wind is blowing.

Fortunately, however, the term "weatherman" today is a term that is an appellation that is respected. The television weatherman, for example, must have a good knowledge of meteorology, the ability to interpret satellite pictures of the earth, the talent to understand high and low pressure areas, and the perspicacity to review weather data and apply it to a particular region. In addition to having the technical knowledge mentioned, the television weatherman must also have the ability to explain the weather so that the viewing public will understand the weather phenomena.

Harry Volkman of Glenview, Ill., is one of these new professionals who has been an extremely popular and able weather prognosticator to the Chicagoland area. On behalf of the people of the 10th District of Illinois, I am proud to recognize his exceptional talents and abilities.

A TRIBUTE TO CHESTER WIGGIN

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, Just a few days ago, a tragic accident occurred at Boston's Logan Airport. Eighty-eight people died in the crash of a Delta Airlines flight.

Among those whose lives were so tragically ended was a man who had faithfully served New Hampshire, New England, and the Nation for some 30 years.

While Chester Wiggin was a native of New Hampshire, we in Massachusetts liked to think of him as one of our own. For he always seemed to be working in our interest.

Chet graduated from Dartmouth College and Boston University Law School. He was a member of the Massachusetts, District of Columbia, and Supreme Court bars. During World War II, Chet served in the Marine Corps, rising to the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Thereafter, Chet embarked on a highly successful public service career. From 1953 to 1962, he served as administrative assistant to Senator Bridges. Upon Senator Bridge's death, Senator COTTON, rather than allow Chet to leave the Hill, offered Chet a position as his administrative assistant.

In 1970, as may well have been inevitable, and was certainly warranted, Chet's tremendous capabilities came to the President's attention. He was appointed Cochairman of the New England Regional Commission.

In October 1972 the President realized, as many others had earlier, that Chet's talents more than merited his appointment to a national post. So Chet spent the last months of his life as a Commissioner of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

His death terminates a career that included great contributions to many people's welfare and promised to contribute much more. It is a national tragedy.

My wife Mildred joins me in offering our deepest sympathy to Chet's wife, Joyce.

FULL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Watergate scandal has done a great disservice to American politics. It has given the public the impression that all elected officials must have some sort of contact with "dirty money" or questionable sources of income in order to survive. While we know this to be untrue for all but a very few public figures, just saying that this is the case will not allay a growing public suspicion.

Let us face it. The public has a perfectly good reason to wonder about the influences being brought to bear upon its elected representatives. We know that men near the President have made enormous compromises with the public interest in order to procure moneys for his election. We know that the campaign finances of the assured winner of the 1972 election were handled in an incredibly slipshod manner, and that much of the money was paid out for clearly illegal or unethical purposes. If this kind of malfeasance has come so close to the Presidency, why should not a citizen wonder about its having reached other levels of elected officials as well?

It is easy enough to set the record straight, and to begin to rebuild public confidence in politics. The Congress can act now to bind itself by law to the concept of full financial disclosure by enacting a simple measure to require that tax returns of all candidates for Federal office be made public. We have no choice but to lead in this area if we wish to recapture the full respect of our constituents for ourselves and the great institutions of which we are a part.

Mr. Speaker, I must add that enactment of my bill would be just a first step in the resolution of a nationwide problem. I hope that the several States will also enact similar legislation in an effort to rebuild the credibility of the political process at the most local levels.

I ask that the full text of my bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

H.R. 10026

A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress by providing for public disclosure of Federa' income tax returns by Members of Congress and candidates for that office

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 "Congressional Disclosure of Income Act".

SEC. 2. Each United States Senator and each Representative in (or Resident Commissioner to) the Congress of the United States who reports his income to the Federal Government for income tax purposes on a calendar year basis shall file with the Secretary of the Senate of the United States or the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, as the case may be, by the 30th day of April of each year, a certified copy of his Federal income tax return for the preceding calendar year. If he does not report his income to the Federal Government for income tax purposes on a calendar year basis, but rather on the basis of a different taxable year, he shall file said certified copy of his Federal income tax return with said official within fifteen days of the time he files said return with the Internal Revenue Service. Each candidate for Congress of the United States shall file his Federal Income Tax Return for the preceding year with the same official of the respective Houses within fifteen days of his qualifying as a candidate for such office.

SEC. 3. If said United States Senator or Representative in (or Resident Commissioner to) the Congress of the United States has received any additional income from any source during said calendar year or other taxable year which is not reported on said Federal income tax return, he shall file a separate sworn statement of such additional income at the same time and in the same manner as he files the certified copy of his income tax return provided for in section 2. Such separate sworn statement shall identify the source, nature, and amount of such additional income received, listing each source and the amount received from such source separately.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Senate of the United States or the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States shall—

(a) maintain all documents filed under section 2 in such manner that they shall be available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours; and

(b) preserve such documents for public inspection during the term or terms of office and during the period of his candidacy for such office, of the individual filing the same and for two years thereafter.

SEC. 5. Whoever knowingly and willfully violates any of the provisions of section 2 or 3 of this Act shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year or both.

CHAOS IN BEEF MARKETS

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial attempts to explain the catastrophic situation that exists throughout the country simply because the administration is too stubborn to admit they made a mistake.

CHAOS IN BEEF MARKETS

What is happening in the markets for cattle and beef was predictable (and was predicted) on July 19 when the Phase IV price control system was announced. Leaving beef price ceilings in place while removing other meats and poultry from control made beef shortages inevitable.

Farmers who could do so conveniently have held back fat cattle from market until the beef price ceilings are scheduled to come off Sept. 12. Consumers have rushed to the meat counters to buy beef while the ceilings stay on. Some people have been hoarding by stocking up freezers with beef.

Now there are signs of other distortions. A few black markets have been reported. Canadian meat packers have bought some cattle in U.S. markets and hauled them back to Canada for slaughter. The ceilings on retail meat prices tend to hold down the price of cattle, so that Canadian meat packers apparently can make a profit on buying live animals here.

There has been some talk that the meat might be brought back into the U.S. for sale at prices above the ceilings. The wholesale price of imported beef, like the price of cattle, is not under control. The higher cost of imported beef can be passed on to the retail level under the regulations.

However, the Cost of Living Council said Tuesday that this "pass through" provision does not apply to meat exported from the U.S. in any form (including the live animal) and brought back into the U.S. for sale. So, if a Canadian packer sold beef from U.S. cattle in the U.S., the beef could not be legally sold above the ceiling prices.

The retail ceilings on beef set last March are still in effect, therefore, for beef from U.S. cattle whether they were shipped to Canada for slaughter or not.

The traffic to and from Canada in cattle and beef, if it exists to any significant extent, will not last long.

But even in the six weeks remaining before the beef price ceilings come off, considerably more black marketing and other distortions in the beef market could occur.

The administration would save itself some headaches if it took off the beef ceilings right now.

SNOW'S ISLAND

HON. EDWARD YOUNG

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on a recent trip to observe a log-jam at the mouth of the Pee Dee and Lynches Rivers with the Corps of Engineers, we passed by Snow's Island in our small boat. One of the men in the boat pointed out that the island was used by Gen. Francis Marion as a campsite and place to hide his provisions from the British during the Revolutionary War.

One of my ancestors, Lemuel Benton, fought under the command of Francis Marion.

The sight of this beautiful island, some 5,000 acres, with its raw, natural beauty intrigued me. We obtained a copy of the book written by Dr. Bass entitled "The Swamp Fox," and read the story of how Francis Marion fought during the Revolutionary period of our country. Ofttimes with few men and nearly always under adverse circumstances. This man of small stature, originating from a Huguenot background, with a dedication to his faith, his Lord, and his country, kept the hope for independence alive. Many of his own men deserted the cause and returned to their farms; some of his fellow countrymen remained loyal to the Crown and were, therefore, enemies. But when he had the opportunity to choose between destroying these men or allowing them to live, he always acted with compassion.

In the South we seldom pay tribute to our heroes of times gone by.

We have introduced a bill that would make Snow's Island a national park. We realize full well that there are times when this island is flooded from the

waters of the Lynches and Pee Dee Rivers. Permanent facilities could be built on Dunham's Bluff with only restrooms on Snow's Island itself.

It would be desirable to leave Snow's Island in its natural, solitary state. Part of the area could be used for campsites and due to its intrinsic beauty, it would attract attention from all over the Nation.

We believe Snow's Island historic value should be preserved and brought to the attention of the American people who love our heritage, by making it a national park, thus preserving its significance for not only our generation, but for those to come.

THE TRIMBLE CENTENNIAL

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure as Congressman from Tennessee's Seventh Congressional District to announce the celebration of the Trimble, Tenn., centennial which will be held during the month of August. The good people of Trimble have worked long and hard in preparation for this event. It is their desire as well as my honor to invite everyone to Trimble to join in the centennial celebration of this proud and peaceful town.

In 1873, the railroad which was being constructed from Paducah, Ky., to Memphis, Tenn., experienced bankruptcy. Construction was halted in the virgin forest and rich soil of Dyer County, in west Tennessee. At this location, a settlement sprang up which eventually became a terminal of the railroad. Through the years, Trimble has developed and prospered, until today, it is one of the truly outstanding small towns of west Tennessee. Trimble is now a seat of cotton, corn, soybeans, and livestock production as well as grain shipping and industrial development. The Illinois Central Gulf Railroad serves the shipping needs of the Trimble area. The friendly folks of Trimble have reason to be proud of their community. Good schools, good churches, and good people highlight the outgrowth of this community pride.

For the centennial celebration, Trimble will return to its early days. Men wearing beards and women in long dresses and bonnets will be common sights. Activities will include old-fashioned ice cream suppers, united religious services, parades, contests, and antique displays.

The celebration is being held throughout the month of August. The door of the town is open, and my good friends in Trimble would be happy to be your host for the fun and festivities of the Trimble, Tenn., centennial celebration.

MORE FAME FOR COLTON YELLOW JACKETS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring your attention once again to the accomplishments of a fine group of high school students, the Colton High School Marching Band, and their director, Harold Warman. Due to their efforts and those of their families and friends, and because of the generosity of thousands of people from the Inland Empire and elsewhere, this band recently traveled to Geneva, Switzerland, as part of an 18-day European tour. In my opinion, the Colton group is one of the best high school bands in the country; all the praise they have recently received is well deserved.

I am entering in the RECORD an article by Henry Mendoza which appeared in the July 30 issue of the San Bernardino Sun which describes the band's experiences in Geneva. The article reads as follows:

COLTON BAND DID ITS STUFF AND GENEVA STOOD STILL

(By Henry Mendoza)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—Leave it to a bunch of high school kids to figure out a way to stop the wild drivers here.

Have a parade.

March six bands, about 800 musicians strong, down the busiest streets of Geneva on a lovely Saturday afternoon.

That's what it took July 21 to stop traffic and empty the sidewalk cafes here, and the Colton High School Marching Band was the center of attention.

Thousands lined the three-mile parade route, an unusual show of interest according to Geneva natives. And they enjoyed a fine band review, starting with the predominantly black Lincoln, Nev., Strutting Band and ending with Colton and its unique letter carrier identification unit that stole the show.

The Colton band played its competition parade march—"Rifle Regiment."—But it was the letter carrying unit that received the warmest applause. The letters, which are shields attached to the arms and look like Yellow Jacket wings, are used in a snappy routine that reveals the letters "C-O-L-T-O-N" and then "Yellow Jacket Marching Band," in precise sequence.

At the end of the parade, band director Harold Warman gave in to requests from the crowd and about 500 parade watchers gathered around the band in Parc Mon-Repos for a brief concert, which again spotlighted the lettercarriers in a pair of dance routines from the band's competition half-time shows.

Colton, 126 strong, had the largest band in the parade and was placed at the end because it was considered the best band there, said Gordon Norman, Glendora High Band Director and the parade official in charge of parade alignment. Norman has been working as the U.S. coordinator for the Geneva Youth Musicale, which is this first week's main activity and the principal reason for this European trip.

The parade along the lake-front here highlighted the Colton Band's first week of activity in Europe.

It climaxed a week's schedule that included a moving outdoor performance on the lawn of the United Nations complex, a small, informal, outdoor concert, an evening performance in this city's Ice Palace and the parade, aside from lectures and rehearsals spliced with some sight-seeing.

The Colton traveling troupe, which numbers 159, has found Geneva a beautiful start to the Band's 19-day European tour.

The city is at one end of Europe's largest lake, after which it is named. Although French is the predominant language, Geneva's international flavor has made the language barrier easier to handle. A number of the accompanying Mexican-American adults who speak Spanish have found that language useful in communicating with transplanted Spaniards.

The band is staying in the convention-center-like Palais de Expositions.

It was in a small park across from the Palais that the bands drew their first audiences Friday, July 20, in small, outdoor concerts. Sunday's formal concert was in the nearby Ice Palace, with an official reception following.

Just two blocks from the Palais is a small restaurant called "Wimpy's" which serves hamburgers and has already become the Colton Band's favorite stop.

The band flew out of Los Angeles July 16. After a minor plane maintenance problem converted farewells from a large group of well-wishers into a 2-hour affair, the takeoff was greeted with loud applause by the bandsmen.

When the plane rolled out toward the runway before takeoff, one member of the group commented, "These kids worked awfully hard to make this plane move." In retrospect, the enormous mechanical know-how that makes a huge jet fly seemed to have been matched by the efforts in battle drives, bake sales, candy peddling and car washes of the previous eight months.

For a majority of the band members it was their first lengthy jet flight. Each moment, at the beginning, was a memorable experience.

But as the band's time in the air approached ten hours and three flights, with a new day dawning in windows on the left side of the cabin, even "Lady Sings The Blues" on the plane's film screen could not hide the youth's weariness.

But the performances, first in the park then on the streets of Geneva, seemed to recoup that energy.

Mr. Speaker, I have been accused of being biased in my remarks about the band because Colton is my hometown. I invite any of our colleagues who may wish to hear for themselves just how good the Colton Marching Band is to contact me. I am confident that I can arrange for any Member of Congress to attend one of their performances in California to confirm their talents.

ATTORNEY WILSON'S REMARKS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I have been following the Watergate hearings quite closely, and, as you know, I consider the daily revelations of the Nixon administration's "dirty tricks" an affront

to the intelligence of the American people. I think the arrogant attitude of Mr. Nixon and his staff could not have been better articulated than by John J. Wilson, the attorney for H. R. Haldeman. Apparently, the memory of SPIRO AGNEW's reference to a reporter as a "fat Jap" lives on in Mr. Wilson's remark about Senator INOUYE's being a "little Jap."

I think the editorial on this incident in today's Washington Post in an appropriate expression of outrage, and I am inserting it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

The text of the editorial follows:

MR. WILSON'S SQUALID REMARK

"That's just the way I speak. I consider it a description of the man. I wouldn't mind being called a little American." Thus John J. Wilson, lawyer for H. R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman, explained (if that is the word we want) his disdainful allusion to Sen. Daniel Inouye (D-Hawaii) as "that little Jap." As is so often the case with people who perceive their fellow citizens in this way, Mr. Wilson's "explanation" was, if anything, more revealing than his original remark. That is, as distinct from Senator Inouye ("that little Jap"), Mr. Wilson thinks of himself as an American. What, then, does he think Senator Inouye is? A foreigner? A foreigner serving in the United States Senate? A foreigner who lost his right arm in World War II fighting in the American army in Europe? A native-born American who has won the Distinguished Service Cross for heroism in action and who has spent most of his adult life in public service and who is nonetheless . . . somehow . . . a *foreigner*?

Well, whatever else Mr. Wilson may assume about these matters, we think he's got one thing exactly right. "I wouldn't mind being called a little American," Mr. Wilson said. The small and squalid spirit of his remarks suggests to us that the description will do just fine.

IT IS NOW "U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE"

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith pertinent parts of a press release from the Department of the Treasury on the subject of instituting a new name for the U.S. Customs Service, one of the oldest, most important, and proudest agencies of the U.S. Government:

IT IS NOW "U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE"

The Treasury Department's Bureau of Customs will be renamed The U.S. Customs Service, effective August 1, 1973. The date marks the 184th anniversary of the agency, which was established by the First Congress in 1789.

The name change was signed by Secretary of the Treasury George P. Shultz on April 4, 1973, to become effective on August 1. The order was published in the Federal Register on May 30.

U.S. Commissioner of Customs Vernon D. Acree stated that the name change more properly portrays the wide range of Customs services to the public. Custom protects the Treasury against fraud, collects revenue on imported merchandise, combats smuggling of contraband, interdicts illicit narcotics and drugs, and enforces the Tariff Act and a host of other laws for the protection of the public.

"Service to the public has been the hallmark of U.S. Customs from its early beginnings down to the present," Commissioner Acree said. "Our posture at the borders in our relations with passengers arriving from abroad; our attitude in our dealings with the world trading community; our numerous contacts with other nations, all exemplify the concept of public service."

During fiscal 1973, the U.S. Customs Service collected more than $4 billion in revenue on $58 billion in imported merchandise. It processed more than 247 million persons who were cleared by Customs, and confiscated illicit drugs valued at over $432 million.

Although the primary responsibility of the U.S. Customs Service is to administer the Tariff Act, it enforces the laws of some 40 different federal agencies, offices and boards which prohibit or restrict certain imports such as hazardous substances, endangered species of animals, and medicinals and drugs.

CULTURAL LAUREATE PROPOSED AS CLIMAX FOR 1976 OBSERVANCE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Donald L. Miller, chairman of the Bicentennial Committee, Post 24 American Legion, Alexandria, Va., and editor of Spirit of '76, published by the Heritage Group for Citizenship Education, Inc., Washington, D.C., recently called my attention to an interesting plan for an event to climax the Bicentennial year in northern Virginia, a plan for a cultural laureate.

As I believe these plans would be of interest to all who are interested in Bicentennial plans, I request permission to insert a brief story by Mr. Miller about the cultural laureate at this point in the RECORD.

CULTURAL LAUREATE PROPOSED AS CLIMAX FOR 1976 OBSERVANCE

From the start of planning for the American Revolution Bicentennial observance it was apparent that the year 1976 would need a climactic event.

A world exposition that would draw participation from other nations, projected for Philadelphia, was swamped by difficulties and abandoned. High hopes for a $2 billion federally-funded Bicentennial Parks network were dashed when it became obvious that a tax-sore populace would not underwrite the cost. A new plan was needed.

As he assessed real property in Northern Virginia or flew one of his private planes crosscountry, Allen Turner pondered over the best way to project the real Spirit of '76. His thoughts began to formulate a continuing event less costly than the Bicentennial Parks and more far reaching than a world exposition.

His proposal was to establish the annual or biennial award of Cultural Laureates. The Laureates would recognize outstanding cultural contributions to mankind and encourage excellence in pure science, applied science, literature, the Arts, philosophy, religion, Social Sciences, Language, history general works, communications and statesmanship in every nation on earth.

The American Revolution grew out of thoughts and experiences of many nations. America was built by immigrants from all over the world. What more apt way to crystallize the Bicentennial than to launch a Cultural Laureate program, created and funded by the American people, to recognize and encourage progress all over the world?

In the minds of Allen Turner and those who gathered about him as Founders of the Cultural Laureate Foundation there grew a picture of an event in 1976. Before an audience made worldwide by satellite TV and dramatic by on-the-spot attendance of the highest cultural achievers of every nation on earth the President of the United States solemnly presents Cultural Laureates to men and women selected for the honors first by their peers in their own nation, and then by a cultural world assembly composed of cultural leaders of every nation.

To Mr. Turner and others who are proposing the Cultural Laureates, the American Revolution was an explosion of ideas, and the War of Independence was fought to remove obstacles to the continuous unfolding of that Revolution.

The explosion of ideas was articulated into a system which assured every one's freedom to have ideas, to discuss them, to test them, to put the good ones to work for one's fellow men and the freedom to benefit from what one did for others. The Laureate program embodies this concept.

As the project is now structured, the Cultural Laureate Foundation will function as a service group to state and national structures established to select state and national Laureates, and to a World Cultural Assembly, established to select the World Cultural Laureates from among those already selected by their peers as National Laureates from every country on earth.

It is contemplated that National Cultural Laureates will be awarded in 1975 and in each second year thereafter. The World Cultural Laureates are to be awarded in 1976 and in each alternate year following.

The Laureate awards will be accompanied by a money grant: one part for the Laureate recipient, one part to continue his work; and a third part to finance his or her visits to hold symposia and conferences with people in like fields in other nations.

The credit for the World Cultural Laureates would accrue to the American people but the benefits would be shared by every people on earth.

HELMS' TESTIMONY DIGNIFIED

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the U.S. Ambassador to Iran and former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Richard M. Helms testified before the Senate Watergate Committee.

Mr. Helms came before the committee to explain the relationships between the CIA and the Watergate break-in. He was apparently there because Howard Hunt, an ex-employee of the Agency was involved in the break-in—a situation which has given the press a great deal of glee, as it affords them the opportunity to fill their pages, and to take pot-shots at an agency involved in "intrigue."

Mr. Helms was not only a credit to himself but to his old agency. He proved himself knowledgeable, literate, composed, and a man with a great deal of respect for integrity.

One of Mr. Helms' responses is well

worth repeating, and remembering. He said:

It does not seem to get across very well but the Agency had nothing to do with Watergate break-in. I hope all the newsmen in the room hear me clearly now.

Enough said.

DIABETES RESEARCH FUNDS: MAIL RESPONSE AND SENSIBILITY

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, on July 16 I introduced H.R. 9304, to appropriate $20 million in Federal funds toward a cure for the dreaded disease, diabetes. Since that time, my office has received an enormous volume of mail in support of the appropriation. Today I would like to share and comment on some of that mail.

Many of the responses I have received have come from professional medical researchers, men and women whose daily task is the discovery of a cure for diabetes. These researchers are living on the edge of major breakthrough, but their hopes have been shaken severely by the million dollar cutback in Federal diabetes allocation for fiscal year 1974. For instance, one physician working in cell transplant research writes,

Thus far, our work is very encouraging indeed and continued funding is of utmost importance at the current time.

Without emergency moneys, this research might die on the eve of a monumental discovery.

Organizations devoted to the conquering of diabetes have responded with great enthusiasm. Through their communications with me, I have come to appreciate the phenomenal abilities of groups like the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, the American Diabetes Association, and the Research Action for Diabetes group to gain private and public support for diabetes research. The Diabetes Research and Education Hospital built in Birmingham with funds raised by the Diabetes Trust Fund is a magnificent achievement, and an important milestone in the search for a diabetes cure. But just as I have come to appreciate the successes of these and other groups, I have come to realize even more clearly how urgently necessary Federal monetary support of diabetes research is. A speedy cure will come only if the Federal Government strongly aids these independent organizations.

But easily the most touching—and to my mind the most persuasive—responses come from diabetics or parents of diabetics themselves. Some are quite simple, stating only their willingness to help in getting diabetes legislation through Congress and their determined hope that a cure will be forthcoming. One Connecticut parent writes, in words that echo in letters from across the country:

I have a 14 year old son who's been a diabetic for nine years. News of this nature is encouraging. Is there anything we can do to assist in this legislation?

Others describe the daily trauma of being diabetic:

I had thought that we were the people with the "forgotten illness." There are *no major fund drives* to help cure and eradicate diabetes. We faced a pretty dismal future. . . .

Some of us can hardly afford to pay our taxes, food, rent, and "general living." We must also spend approximately $15 to $20 per month for insulin, needles, doctors, etc. We faced a future of always feeling ill, restricted by what we eat, blindness, heart disease, and many other hazards.

Some express anguish at knowing that, since diabetes is a hereditary illness, they are passing on genes to their children genes with diabetic tendencies:

We have been waiting for a breakthrough for generations. My family has been suffering with this ailment, passing it on to succeeding offspring. If a cure is expected momentarily, it cannot come too soon.

The letters from diabetic children are among the most touching pieces of mail I have ever received. Quite often, these are children who know only two things: their own sufferings, and the hope that someday soon the cure will be found which will spare them a future of blindness, kidney malfunction, degeneration of the vascular system, amputation of gangrenous extremities, and early death. I include just one of these letters, this one from a 10-year-old girl in my Connecticut district:

I read Monday's paper, June 16. I was so happy to hear that because I am a diabetic. I have been one for five years today. The money has to go to a federal office before it can go on diabetes. Gee 20 million dollars is a lot of money, but I hope it goes through because I will be the first one to have the operation and I hope they find a cure. I am 10 years old going on 11 August 15. I was one at 6 years old when I became a diabetic. I was hurt but there was not a thing I could do, the doctors could not do a thing for any of us, but hope to find a cure but it takes money. I love all of you for doing this for me and all of them.

For half of her short life, this child has suffered from diabetes. She is only one of over 3 million young Americans who share her fate.

The life of the diabetic, as these and other letters indicate, is one of frustration, discomfort, and sometimes despair. But it can often be one of valiance. I have read a number of letters from diabetics who refused to live anything less than the fullest life possible. Not untypical of these is a Maryland woman who described herself, her sister, and her brother as juvenile diabetics, yet her brother holds a college degree, her sister holds a master's degree, and she herself is returning to college to begin pre-medical study in hopes of becoming a doctor—and she has two children.

And there is this letter from the mother of a courageous diabetic in Bridgeport, Conn.:

[Diabetes] is an affliction which hit home. My daughter was adjudged a juvenile diabetic in 1962 when she was 13. . . . Since that time she has lived every day of her life dependent on insulin dosage.

She has managed to complete four years of college (away from home and on her own) and is presently enrolled in a Doctorate program for a Ph. D. in molecular biology, which she tells me has to do with genetic structure. In the sense that diabetes is hereditary, there have been no known cases within the immediate family, and perhaps research will unveil this mystery.

Would it not be ironic that the very money you desire to be appropriated for this study might very well be used by my daughter in her research days in the future?

Mr. Speaker, not only would this be ironic; it would be the most compelling symbol imaginable of the potential rewards of the $20 million appropriation which I have proposed.

Let me reiterate one point from my introductory remarks to H.R. 9304. We are talking here about one $20 million increase in Federal money available to diabetes research. Using conservative estimates of the national diabetes population, that is only $4 per known diabetic. The average diabetic spends that much every week for medication and treatment. The Federal money we are talking about—money that could push us through to a cure, perhaps within the year—is a small percentage of what diabetes now costs Americans for 1 year of medical care. Plainly, this appropriation makes sound economic sense—without taking into account at all the physical and emotional suffering diabetes causes.

The message I relay from my mailbox to this House could not be clearer: We must commit ourselves, with immediate and realistic funding, to the earliest cure for diabetes that we can help produce.

STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA AND ENERGY CRISIS

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by reports of an attempt by the Standard Oil Co. of California to influence U.S. policy in the Middle East.

The chairman of Standard Oil has written to the company's 300,000 shareholders and employees asking them, as a result of the energy crisis, to support "the aspirations of the Arab people" and to urge the United States to "work more closely with Arab governments." This statement by an oil company with major financial interests in the Arab nations is a clear warning to those of us who feel that the United States must continue its strong support of Israel.

It is true that we are facing an energy crisis, a crisis which will require careful planning, the conservation of energy, and the development of new sources of power. We should not, however, let the oil in-

dustry use the energy crisis to panic the American people. Standard Oil's support for the Arabs comes from a desire to protect its billion dollar contracts with Arab countries, not from a concern about this Nation's energy needs.

American foreign policy should not be directed by corporations concerned only with profits. This has happened too often in the past, and done much damage to our position and interests in the world.

I believe that we have a moral duty to our valiant, democratic ally in the Middle East. America's policy toward Israel cannot be changed through the scare tactics of the self-seeking oil industry.

WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there follows the August issue of Washington News Notes which I circulate to various groups and individuals in the congressional district I am honored to represent:

CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER'S WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES, AUGUST 1973

HOSMER ON AID TO HANOI

Congressman Craig Hosmer has introduced a Resolution in the House to end all consideration of aid, trade, diplomatic recognition or any other communication, travel or accommodation with North Vietnam unless they live up to their agreements to facilitate the search for our MIA's. Hosmer said: "Our inspection teams have viewed graves near Hanoi, said by the North Vietnamese to be those of Americans, but they have not been permitted to examine or exhume one grave, nor allowed to visit a single crash site in enemy-held territory." More than 1,200 Americans are listed as MIA's or possible POW's.

SAFER AUTOS

The Department of Transportation has ruled that airbags—dashboard devices that inflate automatically to protect passengers—will be required on all new cars after 1975. Airbag tests involving more than 1,800 autos under actual driving conditions have been credited with saving several lives and preventing many injuries while recording only one malfunction.

SOCIAL SECURITY BOOST

President Nixon has signed into law a bill raising Social Security benefits to some 30 million Americans by 5.9 percent starting July 3, 1974. The new law also: raises maximum earnings permitted beneficiaries from $2,100 a year to $2,400 effective January 1, 1974; raises the Social Security taxable wage base to $12,600 in 1974 to help pay for the higher benefits; raises Federal welfare guarantees for the aged, blind and disabled from $130 to $140 per month for single persons and from $195 to $210 for couples, effective next July 1, and requires states with higher welfare payments than the Federal government guarantees, to make up the difference.

BENEFIT DEADLINE NEAR

New benefits for wives of military retirees, if their husbands die, are available under a law passed last year. Deadline to enroll in the new military Survivor Benefit Plan is just around the corner—September 20, 1973, but so far only about one-third of the eligible military retirees have signed up for their potential survivors. Applications (DD Form 1881) and full information about the plan can be obtained from any nearby military facility. Congressman Hosmer vigorously supported enactment of the new benefits.

MONUMENTAL TRIVIA

Washington area prices may be skyrocketing, but the Washington Monument is sinking—by .0047 feet a year! Only 555 feet tall, this marble obelisk has dropped nearly five inches over the past 89 years. At that rate, it will have disappeared below ground by the year 113,073. Don't put off that trip to Washington any longer!

RECIPE FOR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER'S FAMOUS ELEPHANT STEW

Ingredients

1 elephant (medium size)
2 rabbits (optional)
Salt and pepper to taste
Brown gravy, lots

To prepare

Cut elephant into small bite-size pieces. This will take about two months. Reserve the trunk, you will need something to store the pieces in. Add enough brown gravy to cover. Cook over kerosene fire about four weeks at 465°F.

This will serve 3,800 friends or 1,900 relatives. If more are expected, the two rabbits may be added. But do this only if necessary, as most people do not like to find hare in their stew . . .

VIETNAM VETS—THE "SECOND-CLASS" VETERANS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a young man who has something very important to say to each of us here in the Congress. Mr. James F. Lynch, Jr. enlisted in the Army in 1966, after receiving his draft notice, and went on to serve 4 years in the service, three of them as an officer. He earned a Bronze Star in Vietnam, and left the Army in 1970 with the rank of captain.

James Lynch describes himself as an "army brat"—in quotes. His father, a career NCO, served in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. The senior Mr. Lynch has been a member of the VFW for over 20 years, and himself used the GI bill. Both of the Lynches are quite familiar with the military and veterans' affairs in general.

He describes his experiences after leaving the Army; let me quote from his letter:

I immediately returned to college at Penn State University under the G.I. Bill. Since my return I have been active in veteran's affairs, including helping to establish an organization at the Commonwealth Campus which I first attended, and Chairman of the Legislative Affairs Committee and Vice President of the Penn State University Veteran's Organization. I am now President of that organization. I have also worked as a counsellor in the Veteran's Problem Center at Penn State.

At present, I am in the middle of a Masters Program in political science, and my G.I. Bill is about to run out. When I left this service we had $4,000.00 in the bank. Even though I have always held a part-time job, we have spent that and gone $5,000.00 in debt in order to barely support our family of four. The point of all of this is to let you know that I am directly familiar with almost all of the problems which face the Vietnam veteran, and I think that I can say something constructive about them.

It is my sincere hope that the attached statement will be of some use to you. With best regards,

Sincerely,

JAMES F. LYNCH, JR.

Having served for 8 years on the Veterans' Affairs Committee during my previous terms in this body—part of that time as chairman of the Education and Training Subcommittee—I am well aware of the problems faced by the returning veteran. I am proud of the legislation which I helped enact during those years to assist those who spent years in the service of their country. Even now, although my 2 years absence from this body caused me to lose the seniority which enabled me to hold the subcommittee chairmanship, I am cosponsoring more than a dozen pieces of legislation which would help our returned Vietnam veterans. But the fact that some of us have introduced bills to improve the situation does not help even one veteran; those bills must be enacted by the Congress and signed by the President before they can help anybody.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge every Member of this House—and of the Senate as well—to take just a few minutes and read the statement which James Lynch has sent me. I cannot believe that a majority of the Congress would not immediately support legislative action to improve the situation after reading just how badly this Nation is treating its veterans. I wish to insert the entire statement in the RECORD at this point, and then I would like to add just a few thoughts:

STATEMENT BY JAMES LYNCH

This nation has a proud tradition of caring for those who have fought her wars. The realization on the part of the government and people of the United States that those who have risked and sacrificed their lives and health should be repaid has indeed been laudable. Today, America is in danger of repudiating this principle.

We who have served in Vietnam know that we are at least as deserving of the nation's gratitude as the veterans of any other war. One need hardly be reminded that this war took the second largest toll of any in our history. Likewise, it is not necessary to emphasize that Vietnam's casualties are just as dead or disabled as those of any other conflict.

What does, perhaps, deserve emphasis are the facts that can be pointed out by veterans of previous wars, particularly those who have served in Vietnam as well. In no other war has the American soldier borne the brunt of disenchantment with government policy. In no other war has the American soldier been subject to such antipathy on the part of the people of countries which are our nation's "allies." In no other war has the individual G.I. been subject to such identification with minorities within his ranks whose

actions were beyond his control because of government policy, criminal acts, or social pressures.

The unique characteristics of the Vietnam War have had significant effects on the veteran. We have returned to a society in which our service is not recognized—indeed, when applying for jobs many veterans have found it better not to mention their service because of the risk of being identified as a junky, or worse.

Leaving aside the adequacy of veterans benefits for the moment, it should be mentioned that veterans are not even made adequately aware of what they can receive or who to go to for assistance. For instance, New York City has found it necessary to establish its own department of veterans affairs to help veterans find out who they can turn to. At Penn State University, my own Veteran's Organization found it imperative to work with the administration to establish a Veteran's Counselor's Office and an emergency loan fund, to make up for lapses in the administration of benefits.

It seems absurd that, in a country which claims to value the contributions of the veteran, Vietnam veterans should be unemployed at a rate higher than the rest of the population. Yet, despite television ads and statements of good will on the part of employers, this is the case. In January, 302,000 Vietnam veterans were unemployed, with those twenty to twenty-four years of age leading the way at 10.2%. In the face of all this, the administration moved to cut almost one billion dollars in the Public Employment Program of the Emergency Employment Act, knowing full well that thirty-eight percent of this program's employees are Vietnam Era veterans.

Medical and disability benefits have always been a program to which the Veteran's Administration could point with pride. At present, this pride is in danger of being misplaced. Eighty-one million dollars have been cut from V.A. hospital construction and there has been a 7.5 percent reduction in V.A. medical research funds. In addition there has been an arbitrary lowering of the daily patient census in V.A. hospitals, from 82,000 to 80,000. To top all of this off, the meat ax has chopped off 1.8% of the already inadequate V.A. hospital staffs. All of this is certainly significant enough, but when massive reductions in disability payments are added to it—cuts which affect Vietnam veterans almost exclusively—a curious pattern emerges. Of course, it is common knowledge that these cuts were not implemented on schedule by order of the President. What is not common knowledge is that the plans were not abandoned, but simply returned to the V.A. for further study.

If the effect of these moves is obvious, it becomes even more critical when applied to those veterans who are seeking help with a drug problem. How can these men be helped when there were almost unbearable waiting periods for treatment before the cuts? Another problem which relates primarily to drugs is that of the general discharge. There are thousands of Vietnam Era veterans whose lives are permanently marred by possession of these less-than-honorable discharges. A significant number of these men were guilty of nothing more than possession of marijuana, an offense which the military and society in general has belatedly put into perspective. At present, however, nothing is being done to alter the records of these veterans to reflect their careers more realistically.

Only 43.7% of today's veterans are using educational or training benefits of any type, while only 23.4% have entered colleges or junior colleges. There are, I believe three major reasons for this low percentage, which is ridiculously below that of World War II veterans and at a time when a college education is much more essential. The first of these is simply a lack of information about how, and encouragement, to use these benefits.

A second major factor arises out of the character of the draft. As is common knowledge, those who were drafted to serve in Vietnam (and a large portion of those who were enlisted) were men who could not qualify for, or afford to go to, college. The service did little to change the status of most of these men. Yet remedial programs which would qualify these veterans to use their educational benefits are painfully scarce.

The last reason for the low usage rate is the most important. It is that G.I. Bill Educational and Training benefits are simply inadequate—veterans cannot afford to go to college. This is amply illustrated by the fact that usage rates in the various states correlate with the availability of programs offered by the states which fill the void left by V.A. benefits. Of the largest states, usage rates range from 49.2% in California to 26.7% in Ohio and New Jersey. It must be remembered that Vietnam veterans have nowhere else to turn if the federal government is letting them down, since it seems unlikely and unfair that he go to his family for help. Besides, if a veteran's family could afford to send him to college, the chances are that they would have done so *before* he was drafted or forced to enlist to serve in Vietnam.

To put current G.I. benefits into perspective, look at the fact that a single veteran in my state of Pennsylvania can earn $144.00 a month more under unemployment than he can by going to college full time, *without* any tuition or books to pay for. Although students are not eligible for welfare, a comparison with qualification figures for public assistance is even more illustrative. Although my county in Pennsylvania has one of the lowest standards in the state, the figures clearly point out the plight of married vets. If a veteran has one child, he can spend $70.00 a month for school expenses before he reaches the level under which other people get public assistance. If he has two children he can afford $40.00, and with three children the figure is $17.00! When federal figures are used, the picture is even more bleak. Washington has set the "lower consumption" budget for a family of four at $351.00 per month. So, a veteran with a wife and two children can go to Penn State University, for instance, by simply applying for his G.I. benefits, and then coming up with an additional $35.00 a month to subsist, $351.00 for the month each year when he gets no benefits, $1,000.00 a year for tuition, $160.00 for books annually, another $50.00 or so for miscellaneous school expenses, and a prayer that no one gets sick. The Vietnam veteran is constantly reminded of the wonderful opportunity provided to him by a grateful government, and then is provided some $2,000.00 less a year than that government itself declares to be the minimum for anyone to keep body and soul together.

Of course, one might expect the vet to get a part time job to help himself through school. However, part time jobs tend to wreak havoc with an academic program, especially when one considers that today's veterans are likely not to have the best backgrounds for college. In addition, I challenge anyone to locate sufficient part time jobs in a college community—not to mention what they pay. Mention might also be made of the so-called abundance of federal scholarship and loan programs, until one considers the fact that veterans seldom qualify for them because the G.I. Bill is held against them as assistance already being received. The reasoning of this approach to the problem sems a bit flawed anyway. What sense does it make to cut short one federal program, only to ask its recipients to utilize another?

Although money is the most significant problem, there are certainly others. For example, the G.I. Bill provides for 36 months of education. This is exactly enough to complete work for the normal baccalaureate degree. However, if a veteran fails any courses, or is in a five-year program, or changes his major course of study, or qualifies for graduate school, he is out of luck. Admittedly, those who fall into these categories are a minority, but a significant one. There seems to be no reason why provisions should not be made for them.

What I've said so far paints a fairly rough picture for today's veteran. Most people would agree that the situation is not an enviable one, but we constantly hear that World War II and Korean War vets had it just as rough. The plain facts are that this contention is simply untrue. It is discouraging to see those who should know better insisting that today's G.I. Bill is equal to its predecessors. It becomes doubly frustrating when these people are in positions of public leadership, but refuse to answer the criticisms made of their argument and simply insist on maintaining an outdated and fallacious position.

To those who insist that today's G.I. Bill is equal to that of World War II, I offer a challenge to respond to *facts*. The costs of education have gone up 400% since World War II—how has the G.I. Bill compensated for this? Many colleges offered special help to veterans after World War II which today's vet does not receive. For example, after World War II, Penn State offered low cost housing and trailer courts to veterans. Today, the Vietnam veteran spends $160.00 a month for a one bedroom apartment. If there is equality between the two programs, why were 70% of the undergraduate students after World War II veterans, as compared to the fantastic fall-off in usage rates today? Why were half of the World War II veterans able to go to private institutions, while 80% of Vietnam veterans are compelled to go to public colleges?

There is one comparison which the opponents of a fairer G.I. Bill can ignore but cannot refute. The World War II veteran received $1,175.00 a year for subsistence and tuition. If this figure is adjusted to 1973 dollars, using the Department of Labor's Consumer Price Index, it becomes $2,250.00 per year (remember, this only reflects inflation of consumer prices, not the tighter part-time job market, the lack of low-cost housing, or the 400% rise in education costs). Since the student receives only eleven months benefits per year, he *should* get $250.00 a month to be on a par with the World War II vet. He *gets* $220.00 a month, and the discrepancies become worse as one adds additional dependents.

It is incomprehensible to me how anyone has the nerve to state that things are as good for the veteran as they ever were.

Why have the problems of veterans gotten so little attention in a nation which can justly be proud of its accomplishments in the past? There is no certain answer, but I think some constructive observations can be made.

Since the Vietnam War has been an unpopular conflict, the military services and the individual veteran have been looked upon as undeserving of any special considerations. Regardless of whether America's policies have been good or bad, it seems that those who

served in an unpopular war deserve, if anything, extra credit because our job was doubly difficult. It is blatantly unfair for the veteran to suffer the effects of misplaced blame.

Another reason we may not be getting the attention deserved is that Vietnam veterans have not joined the established super-organizations, the VFW and American Legion, in droves. We have, therefore, not received the full benefits of their political clout. The reasons for this development again go back to the nature of the war itself. Many Vietnam veterans either disagreed with government policy or were influenced by public attitudes. At any rate, many of us have no desire to be subjected to the type of behavior demanded by these organizations—behavior which requires the demonstration of a unique kind of patriotism consisting of draping oneself in the flag and refusing to disagree with any government policy. I do not mean to declare war on these groups, but I am saying that they have generally been too narrow, up until now, for today's veteran.

While other groups have agitated for what they felt was justly due to them, the Vietnam veteran has remained quiet, secure in his belief that America would pay her dues. This has, perhaps, been our mistake. Rightly or wrongly, other groups have made great progress while we still await our fair share.

Probably the biggest reason for our short-changing at the hands of the government has been the action of the politicians themselves. Those who supported the war constantly tried to play down its costs and effects. One way of doing this has been to minimize the problems of, and expenditures on, veterans. Those who opposed the war have, generally, found it awkward to identify too closely with our cause. The situation has become so absurd that the veterans group at one of our neighboring universities found it necessary to oppose the reelection of their Congressman because of his negative stand on veteran's benefits. This Congressman is a ranking member of the Veteran's Affairs Committee and a long-time supporter of the war.

The recent mood of the federal government—a mood which developed since the war ceased to be front-page news, I might add—can only be viewed by us as hostile. There have been the cutbacks in medical care which I mentioned earlier, the attempt to cut disability benefits, the destruction by compromise of the G.I. Bill raise which the Senate passed unanimously last year and which would have been very nearly equitable, and the impoundment of funds for much-needed programs. How else can we regard the government's attitude?

As I said before, the established veterans organizations have not as yet proven themselves to be adequate representatives of the Vietnam veteran. I would like to stress that I say this without animosity. However, it was the Vietnam veteran's own organization, the National Association of Concerned Veterans (NACVI), which filed suit against the Commissioner of Education for the release of $25 million in appropriated "Cranston Amendment" funds which had been impounded by the administration. We were successful in this effort. Again, the indication is that if we want help, we must help ourselves by taking decisive action on our own because we cannot count on our supposed friends.

Without wishing to appear trite, I feel compelled to state that recent events have "added insult to injury." I speak of the aggrandizement of the P.O.W.'s. Before continuing, however, I must stress that this is *not* an attack on the P.O.W.'s but on those whose admiration of them is shallow and short-sighted. We feel that the P.O.W.'s are Vietnam veterans like the rest of us, no better, no worse. They did what was asked of them, were unfortunate enough to be captured, and did their best to remain alive. We all respect that, and no one wishes to degrade it. However, we all took the same chance, and the returned P.O.W.'s are certainly better off than those who died, or are paralyzed, or blind, or will never walk again. I would venture to say that any prisoner of war would say the same.

What is particularly galling about the situation is that, while the average veteran is being ignored or having his benefits cut back, the P.O.W.'s, mostly career officers and N.C.O.'s, are being promised jobs if they are discharged, invited to the White House, and given national publicity for their every problem. At present, this session of Congress has had almost as many bills introduced to it to assist P.O.W.'s exclusively as there have been to assist *all* of the rest of us! Without considering why they were captured in the first place, they have been made the symbols of "peace with honor". I would like to suggest that the symbol of peace in Vietnam be men like Jim Mayer, the President of the National Association of Concerned Veterans, who is missing two limbs as a result of his service in Vietnam. The honor can be had by giving us all the considerations now reserved for prisoners of war.

What do we think should be done? The answers should be obvious by now, but I'll summarize. I won't drag it out by quoting numbers, but bills have been introduced, or soon will be, into Congress to take care of virtually every pressing need.

We need true veteran's preferences for employment, so that Vietnam vets can, at least, be employed at no higher a rate than the population in general. There must be a coherent program of remedial education to allow those who do not presently qualify for training or college to utilize their benefits. Medical facilities, particularly drug treatment programs, must *at least* be kept at their current levels. Those who hold general discharges for offenses which are no longer considered serious, should be sought out and their records should be changed.

There is a desperate need for an overhauling of benefits for training and education. As it did after World War II, the G.I. Bill should cover tuition and leave enough to live on. These figures could be based on the federal government's own "poverty level" and, considering today's economy, should have cost of living adjustments built in. There is also every reason to approve the comparatively inexpensive proposals to increase educational benefits to 48 months duration. None of these proposals are new, but all are overdue.

Now that the war in Vietnam is, hopefully, over, the American people want nothing more than to wipe it from their memories. Those of us who have served there want to forget, too. The way to put the experience behind us is not to ignore those who have borne the brunt of the sacrifice, however. If the Vietnam veteran is not given what's due to him, the memories of the war will be longer lasting and more unpleasant than anyone now foresees.

Mr. Speaker, I neglected to add that there is one additional person who should read that statement, and that is President Nixon. For he is one of those politicians who have been so generous with the cotton candy of glorious praise of our fellow citizens whom we sent to fight and die for us, while at the same time being stingy with the meat of substantive veterans' benefits. As Mr. Lynch points out, those most in favor of war have sometimes been those least willing to pay the costs of the war.

I intend to speak further of this situation in the future, Mr. Speaker. And I intend to continue speaking about it, until something is done about it. America cannot let this debt go unpaid.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD'S CREDIT CRUNCH CALLS FOR URGENT CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board's credit crunch relentlessly continues its devastating course and, as the evidence clearly shows, conditions will worsen unless the Congress initiates legislation to require the financial regulators to act in the public interest.

What brought on the credit crunch?

According to the evidence, which is coming in from the thousands of thrift institutions all over the country, we know that the Federal Reserve Board and its high-interest-rate policies are directly responsible for the crunch. When the Federal Reserve Board lifted the lid on interest rates on July 5, an immediate and irreversible movement of funds began from the thrift institutions into commercial banks. As a result, the savings and loan associations, who are the principal sources of financing for homebuyers, were forced to either turn away borrowers or to raise interest rates charged on home mortgages so that most people could not afford to purchase a home. Under such circumstances it is obvious that the savings and loan institutions will be harmed. Because of the present and potential dangers inherent in the rate war, many officers of these institutions have rightly petitioned the Congress to bring order into this regulatory chaos. The Congress should respond positively to the needs of this segment of the credit market because, in the final analysis, whether this country meets its housing needs ultimately depends on the strength and existence of these institutions.

WHO ULTIMATELY MUST SUFFER THE CONSEQUENCES OF HIGH INTEREST RATES?

While evidence shows that the financial regulatory system needs to be changed to protect our thrift institutions so that they can promote the public's interest in housing, the credit crunch brought on by unwise decisions in the Federal Reserve also shows that the entire system of regulation needs drastic reform to insure that all who need credit may obtain it when needed and at reasonable rates.

Under our economic system, credit is the life blood of the economic system. But the way the credit system is now being regulated, it is the small business-

man, the low- and moderate-income family, the laboring man, and the farmer who is denied access to credit markets at a time when they need it most. An economic system which only works for the rich and powerful is not the kind of system this country deserves.

As the present system falters, the harm is not so great to the rich and powerful—their position of power and wealth allows them to "ride out" hard times with relative ease—but the harm is acutely felt by those who are least able.

Clearly, individual members of the financial institutions bear some responsibility in assuring a reasonable flow of funds to the credit markets but I should point out that the present credit crunch was brought upon us by a Federal regulatory agency. This clearly gives the Congress primary responsibility in correcting this situation and I do not believe that the Congress would want to do anything other than take prompt and positive steps toward reform.

For this reason it is my intention to call a hearing immediately after the recess to consider all aspects of the credit crunch and the manner in which it is related to financial structure and regulation. I hope in the course of hearings we can hear from all segments and gain a sound understanding of what is wrong and what the Congress can do to correct those wrongs. In particular, I hope that the Congress will not only look into the specific needs of the financial institutions involved but, more importantly, that we can find and will receive strong support for meaningful reform which will assure long term protection to the public interest in this vital area.

In calling for these hearings, I am not unmindful of the great interest and concern that Members have expressed to me since the credit crunch has developed. Since that time I have received many inquiries from Members and so that all may know of their concern, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this time a representative sample of their correspondence:

PERPETUAL BUILDING ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1973.

Hon. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LARRY: I am sure you are aware of the recent authorization by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for increased interest rates which may be paid on various forms of savings by commercial banks and savings and loan associations, at which time the historical differential between banks and savings and loan associations was reduced from ½ of 1% to ¼ of 1%. This in itself has had no material effect upon savings flow, only increasing operating costs without any added benefit, as of the present time.

The really damaging regulation was the change in the rates on certificates of deposit, particularly the four-year certificates in minimum amounts of $1,000 or multiples thereof where the rates were allowed to vary consideraly, at the discretion of the institution. This was also true of the larger certificates of deposit in excess of $100,000 or more. As a result savings and loan asosciations have been losing funds to other market instruments such as Treasury Bills and/or Bonds, but the losses are the heaviest in those areas where unrestricted bank competition has appeared. This condition will undoubtedly worsen in the months ahead.

The effect on mortgage lending has been quite drastic as many institutions in the Washington area have completely withdrawn from the home mortgage market. Our Association which does not issue certificates of deposit while suffering disintermediation is continuing to make home loans on a limited basis to those individuals who are savings members of the Association, to home builders with whom we have maintained relations for a period of years, as well as real estate brokers on a restricted basis.

If the present trends continue we too will undoubtedly have to take another look at our mortgage lending activities which further aggravate the situation for home owners in Washington and its surrounding Metropolitan area. The Governmental agencies involved should immediately eliminate ceiling-free, four-year savings certificates which seem to be creating most of the havoc.

Sincerely yours,

THORNTON W. OWEN,
President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1973.

Mr. THORNTON W. OWEN,
President, Perpetual Building Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. OWEN: Many thanks for your recent letter expressing your concern over the recent savings rate increases authorized by the Federal Reserve Board.

I have forwarded a copy of your letter to the House Committee on Banking and Currency and to the Federal Reserve Board so that they too, will be aware of your sentiments.

Once again, thank you for taking the time to write and give me the benefit of your views.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,
Member of Congress.

RIDGEWOOD,
Brooklyn, N.Y., July 24, 1973.

Congressman JOSEPH P. ADDABBO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADDABBO: I am writing to you as my office is in your district. I am the attorney for Home Federal Savings and Loan Association, which has its office at 7001 Forest Avenue, Ridgewood, Queens County, New York, and would like to bring to your attention the recent action of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in removing any ceiling on interest on four year Certificates of Deposit issued either by Commercial Banks, Savings Banks, or Savings and Loan Associations.

The Association which I represent has first mortgage loans of over $256,000,000, all but a very few of which are mortgages on dwelling houses. Our savings accounts are slightly over $255,000,000, and it is evident that we are performing the principal function of Savings and Loan Associations by making money available for home construction and to potential home owners. The action of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in removing the ceiling on four year Certificates of Deposit encourages savers to deposit their money in Certificates of Deposit with Commercial Banks, whose main business is lending money to commercial organizations and large corporations. An automobile company, a large manufacturer or a public utility is in the position to pay 8, 9 and 10% interest, whereas the small home owner is not. Inasmuch as these are the organizations to which commercial banks cater, they will be in a position to pay a higher rate of interest on Certificates of Deposit than Savings and Loan Associations, and thus drain off the funds which are relied upon for home building and home ownership into other channels.

It should be obvious that unless something is done immediately to rectify the situation there will be no new financing of homes, which will result in the cessation of home building, and will make it very difficult to sell old houses because of lack of financing. Very little more than this would be needed to create a severe depression in this country.

Hopefully, Congress will see the danger before it is too late and act accordingly.

Very truly yours,

HUGO DREHER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1973.

Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN,
Banking and Currency Committee, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a letter I have received from Hugo P. Dreher, Esq., the attorney for the Home Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Mr. Dreher comments on the possible detrimental effects by the recent ruling of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

He makes the observation that the removal of the ceiling on interest on four year Certificate on Deposit, may deterimentally effect financing homes and possibly drain off the funds which are relied upon in this important section of our economy.

I would sincerely appreciate being advised if your Committee is considering this problem. I would also appreciate your comments and views on this subject.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH P. ADDABBO,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1973.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Committee on Banking and Currency, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have just received from the president of the Home Federal Savings and Loan Association of Shawnee, Okla., describing the adverse effects of the recently announced changes in savings rates. I would greatly appreciate any consideration and comment you may give his remarks.

Thanking you for this kindness, I am

Sincerely yours,

TOM STEED,
Member of Congress.

HOME FEDERAL SAVINGS AND
LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Shawnee, Okla., July 24, 1973.

Hon. TOM STEED,
U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I am sure that you are aware that on July 5, 1973, major changes in savings rates were anounced by various government agencies. The action was taken by most of these agencies because the movement to higher rates was precipitated by the Federal Reserve Board.

This Board responded to pressure from the big city banks and failed to grasp the adverse effects it would have on local housing markets, and difficulties faced by Savings

and Loan Associations as a result of the new savings rate schedules. The rates announced virtually eliminated additions to passbook accounts and opening of new certificates at other than the highest rate.

Since the announcement, we have only had one day of the eleven that we have been open when savings added to accounts exceeded those withdrawn. In addition, we have had a multitude of requests to up-grade certificate accounts to those paying higher rates. This increases our cost tremendously, and there is no way that we can have a corresponding increase in income.

Because of the nature of our business, it takes a substantial period of time to increase the overall loan rate. Even if we charge unconscionably high rates for loans, it will take 5 years for us to regain the position we were in before the July 5, 1973, announcement.

It seems as if these authorities in Washington are trying to eliminate the small, locally controlled financial situation. I hope that you will do all in your power to correct this chaotic situation.

Sincerely,

HOME FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION OF SHAWNEE,
HAYLOR H. FISHER, Jr., *President.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1973.

HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE STAFF
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am enclosing copies of two letters from constituents regarding the rerecent action by the Federal Reserve Board and its effect on savings and loan institutions.

I would appreciate receiving all the information you can give me in reference to the points raised in these letters.

Sincerely,

JOHN BREAUX.

JENNINGS FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Jennings, La., July 19, 1973.

Hon. JOHN B. BREAUX,
House of Representatives, Room 319, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The survival of the savings and loan business as a supplier of mortgage money for home owners is at stake.

Recent action by the Federal Reserve Board removing all controls on savings rates paid by banks (on 4-year deposits), forces savings and loans to drastically increase mortgage interest rates because of this increase in the cost of money.

Please, help us to continue our role in the housing market by supporting legislation that will help the savings and loans combat the unfair competitive conditions now existing in the commercial banks. We feel a halt in the new housing market will be a bad thing for us all.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES A. MACK, Jr.,
Manager.

O'ROURKE, GOSSEN AND ASSOCIATES,
ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS,
July 19, 1973.

Hon. Congressman JOHN BREAUX,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: You, no doubt, have been contacted by others concerning the latest developments concerning the change in interest rates. All this business is doing is creating chaos in the financial business and jeopardizing the stability of some of the newer and smaller savings and loans. There is no doubt that ultimately these increases are passed on to the consumer.

I am enclosing herewith a bulletin from the U.S. Savings & Loan League which explains it far better than I could. We ask your help and also solicit the help of your colleagues.

Sincerely,

DON J. O'ROURKE, AIA.

UNITED STATES SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE,
Chicago, Ill., July 17, 1973.

TO SAVINGS ASSOCIATES EXECUTIVES.

LETTERS TO CONGRESS NEEDED ON SAVINGS RATE WAR

The officers of the U. S. League met in Washington today to review developments in the savings market since the major changes in savings rates were announced by various government agencies on July 5. The widespread concern and dissatisfaction within the savings and loan business over these developments is clearly justified.

In the view of the League officers, the movement to higher rates was precipitated by the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board had to respond and authorize higher rates to savings and loan associations. The Federal Reserve failed to grasp the adverse effect which will be felt on local housing markets and the difficulties faced by savings and loan associations as a result of the new savings rate schedules.

The chief problem posed by the movement upward in savings rates was the creation of a "wild card" savings category with no rate ceilings on funds deposited for four years or longer. From reports received from around the country, there is ample evidence that this action in effect meant the removal of ceilings on savings certificates or roughly half the funds held by savings and loan associations. The result of a free rate category has been that shorter term certificates are, in fact, not salable. Commercial banks are promoting this category heavily with no restrictions on the total amount of these funds they can accept, paying 7½%, 8% and more, on four-year certificates.

The result has been the start of a dangerous savings rate war. It is impossible, of course, for savings and loan associations to match the rates paid by commercial banks without charging unconscionably high rates for mortgages—which will most certainly bring most mortgage markets to a halt.

It is also clear that there is a great deal of concern and distress in the business over the practice on the part of many commercial banks of increasing automatically the rates on outstanding savings certificates.

Every effort must be made to assure that banks are not permitted to automatically increase rates on outstanding certificates without requiring an extension in the maturity of such certificates (commensurate with the rate to be paid) and including the newly required penalty clause.

While it would be possible for the Federal Reserve Board to resolve these major concerns on the part of the savings and loan business, we have little hope that the Federal Reserve will, in fact, take appropriate action to check the savings rate war now underway.

In the judgment of the League officers, therefore, it is essential that the Congress begin to focus attention on the major emergency problems that now confront the savings and loan business and the housing industry as a result of the July 5 action.

An effective vehicle for congressional intervention is provided by the law governing interest rate controls on savings accounts which has been extended until August 1 and will be considered later this month by a House-Senate Conference Committee.

We urge you, therefore, to communicate immediately with your Representative and your two United States Senators expressing your personal views on the confusion, chaos, and unfair competitive conditions which have developed in your savings market since July 5. You should urge congressional review of actions precipitated by the Federal Reserve reimposition of ceilings on long-term savings and the elimination of the four-year certificate on which there is no rate ceiling.

Of course, in writing to your Congressmen, you will want to do so in your own words and in terms of the actual situation in your own city. In many cases, copies of ads from local newspapers will be helpful along with specific descriptions of the tightness of the mortgage market. You should stress the grave danger of removing savings rate ceilings at a time of inflation and rising interest rates.

It would be appropriate for you to give copies of your letters to the builders and Realtors you finance so that they recognize their welfare is linked to the decisions Congress makes to restore order to the present chaotic state of the savings markets. It would also be appropriate for you to urge your builder and Realtor friends to write their Congressmen.

Your officers are also shifting into high gear with plans for other essential legislation. This would include improved powers and authorities for associations that would permit changes on both the assets and liabilities side of our business. It would also include 100% insurance of public funds, tax-exempt interest on savings accounts, improvements in the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and tax deferred retirement accounts, etc. We will report further on this in the near future.

The officers regard the present emergency as the most serious threat to the savings and loan business since 1966. We hope this sense of urgency will be conveyed in your communications to members of your congressional delegations and that you will transmit these sentiments immediately.

Please send the U.S. League copies of your correspondence.

Sincerely,

RICHARD G. GILBERT,
President.
GEORGE B. PRESTON,
Vice President.
TOM B. SCOTT, Jr.,
Legislative Chairman.
NORMAN STRUNK,
Executive Vice President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1973.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Please read the attached letter or ask an appropriate staff member to do so and give me the benefit of the thinking of your Committee and staff on the recommendations which are made. It will be appreciated if this can be done within the next few days.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

BOB SIKES.

FIRST FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION OF PANAMA CITY,
Panama City, Fla., July 9, 1973.

Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I am a concerned citizen of the savings and loan business. I am very

disturbed about the future of the savings and loan association. As you well know, this has been the backbone of the homeowners for a very long time.

I was very much disturbed when I read that Mr. Arthur Burns, the Federal Reserve Board Chairman, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation had increased rates that commercial banks could pay on savings, and even more disturbed when I found that the Federal Home Loan Bank had followed suit for the nation's savings and loans.

The Federal Reserve Board Chairman knows that the savings and loans are locked in on long term mortgages for a long time, when the commercial banks make mostly short term loans and can turn their loans over very rapidly to increase their rates and, therefore, pay a higher dividend rate. This action can only serve to increase home loan interest rates, as well as interest on all products, (also make Government borrowing more expensive).

Our biggest mistake has been trying to hold down long term mortgage rates to the very lowest rates possible and still make a profit. However, by doing this we are now in a position where home loan demand is up and we cannot market (sell) our loans due to the low interest yield. We are forced to borrow short and lend long to meet current demand.

The higher dividend rate will only force most of us out of the mortgage business, and we can only borrow from our Federal Home Loan Bank for only a short time, in order to hold the mortgages that we now have (and cannot sell) due to the low interest rate which, as you know, do not prepay before maturity.

As you know, any rate increase on savings affect all savings, but an increase in mortgage rates only applies to loans made after the effective increase date.

The average cost of our savings was 5.54% before the current rate increase, and the average rate of return on all of our mortgages is 7.3%, as shown on the attached schedule. However, this does not tell the whole story, because of the high cost of operations (overhead) must be taken into account, which is almost 2% of mortgage loans.

It would not be necessary for us to charge the 8½% interest, which we are currently charging, if we could increase most of the low interest loans up to 7.5%. We would only be charging current borrowers 7.5%.

My proposal would be that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board be instructed by Congress to require some type of variable interest rate mortgage. A mortgage such as outlined below maybe would save the savings and loan industry from a catastrophe caused by increased dividend rates and increased operating costs.

1. Require the use of a mortgage form with an interest adjustment period every three years from date of mortgage.

2. The mortgage form must require the lender to give the borrower at least 90 days' notice if any change is to be made in the interest rate. (This would give the borrower 90 days in which to try to secure cheaper financing, if rates were increased or not decreased to the borrower's satisfaction. Also, no prepayment penalty could be charged on this loan if refinanced with another lender at a lower rate than offered.)

3. Require the lender to publish in the local newspaper on the last day of each month the current interest rates being charged on each type of loan. (Require by regulation that supervisory authorities of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board examine the published rates, and the rates of mortgages closed during each month. This would keep any mortgagor from being exploited. The lender, in giving the 90 day notice could not charge an amount greater than the published rate 90 days before the new increase or decrease was to go into effect.) (This to be reviewed and controlled by Federal Examiners.)

4. Monthly payments to remain the same throughout the life of the loan. This would result in lengthening or shortening mortgage maturities.

Under this plan, competition would control the increase or decrease in the mortgage interest adjustment the same as it now does on any new conventional loan made each day. Variable rate mortgages cannot be tied to any national average or price index, due to the difference in operating costs of each association, and operating costs in different parts of the country. We should not be required to charge a lower or higher rate than another association in our town or across the nation, if we are able to hold operating costs down (or if our costs were higher).

This type of loan must be undertaken on a nation-wide basis. One association in a community could not adopt this type of program and expect to make loans unless it was common among all savings and loans. I am sure that a loan of this type would be accepted by the consumer on a national basis without hesitation.

A mortgage program of this type started today would take about twelve years to feel any real relief. However, I am sure that it would gradually decrease mortgage interest rates.

This is the only survival for the savings and loan industry. I know of no industry, business, or labor that will agree to sell you a product or work for you at today's prices for the next five, ten, twenty, or twenty-five years, which is what we agree to when we make a long term loan.

Congress could even go further by requiring that any undue profits above a certain per cent of average assets (that any association tried to make or made) be paid directly to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation after taxes.

Congress should be drawing more distinct dividing lines between Savings and Loans and Commercial Banks instead of trying to make them more competitive with one another. "We do not want to be a bank, we want to be a savings and loan."

Also, congressional action is needed to control merging, which is forcing the small savings and loan out of business. If merging is continued, I can foresee in the near future only two or three ultra large savings and loans in Florida. This country was built on the small competitive business.

Getting a charger approved for a new savings and loan is like getting a liquor license in Florida. The organizing directors have something they can sell (merge) to the larger institutions at a very large profit.

Your help is needed now!

Very truly yours,

PAUL H. EUBANKS,
President.

CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1973.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: For the consideration of your committee, I am enclosing copies of letters from Mr. R. C. Winstead and Mr. John A. Williams, concerning the Federal Reserve Board's decision granting commercial banks authority to increase the limits banks can pay on savings accounts.

With kindest regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

L. H. FOUNTAIN.

UNITED FEDERAL
SAVINGS AND LOAN,
July 25, 1973.

Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOUNTAIN: As a result of the recent changes in the savings, on July 5, 1973, the Savings and Loan industry has been jeopardized by the close competition of the commercial banks.

No doubt, the number of new housing starts will begin to recede as the new interest rates take effect, with no rate ceilings on savings funds which are deposited for more than four (4) years.

There is no way for the Savings and Loan Associations to compete with the rates paid by commercial banks unless we charge exceptionally high rates for home mortgage loans. This leaves room for only one solution—a halt to conventional home building.

May you also note that many commercial banks are entertaining the idea of automatically increasing the rates on certificate funds acquired previous to the new rate hikes. Effort must be made to assure the Savings and Loan Associations that commercial banks are not permitted to increase existing rates on savings without two (2) requirements.

1. Add the newly required penalty clause to the existing certificate.

2. Extend the maturity date of the certificate.

These changes in savings rates at a time of rising interest rates on home mortgages leads only to increasing inflation.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. WILLIAMS,
Mortgage Loan Department.

UNITED FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN,
July 25, 1973.

Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOUNTAIN: Recent actions of the Federal Reserve have created problems in the savings and loan industry. We have been forced to raise our own rates just to retain those funds that we now hold in savings. By raising savings account rates it will force mortgage interest rates up, thereby slowing down the number of housing starts.

By having to increase savings rates will cut the margin of profit to a bare minimum until the higher mortgage rates can offset the loss being experienced on all of the low percentage loans now outstanding.

Many associations throughout this country, and I would venture to say almost 100% have mortgage loans with rates as low as 4% which is a real drag on our industry. Back when these loans were made, rates were not changing as fast as they are today. One could make a low percentage loan and not worry about an economic loss. However, this is not the case today because even the 6% loans made a few years ago are experiencing losses. Unlike our friends in the commercial banking business, their loans are paid off in a much shorter period of time and at a much higher rate of interest which gives them more flexibility and the ability to pay higher rates.

Under the new rules, they have been given an advantage of automatically increasing interest rates on outstanding certificates and we have not. This has been brought to our attention on several different occasions.

In my opinion, congressmen should study our market conditions and determine why such action has been taken to cause confusion and continued inflation.

Thank you for your time and concern in this matter.

Sincerely,

R. C. WINSTEAD,
Vice-President and Loan Officer.

JACKSONVILLE FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Jacksonville, Fla., July 24, 1973.

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Re bank-savings and loan rate war.

DEAR CHARLIE: You are certainly lucky that you are not in Jacksonville today, trying to buy a home. For about the last three or four months, as you know, the financial picture has been getting gradually tighter, but mortgage money was still fairly plentifully available around Florida. The price had edged up a little, but not more than ¼ or ½ point.

But that situation has now changed drastically. When the Federal Reserve turned the commercial banks loose with a—wild card—no limit-type of CD, the weekend of July 5th; it has created a situation which could well result in drying up the mortgage market completely.

In our particular case, a commercial bank across the street from us, immediately started offering 7¾% (effective yield—8.06), four year certificates. This was drained off a large number of our accounts.

In general, the commercial banks are able to pay a higher rate on these certificates, because they charge so much more on a big category of their loans, types that we cannot even make at all. On their automobile financing, credit card, consumer loans, etc., they charge an add-on interest rate, which results in a yield to them of between 15 and 20%. There is just no way that a Federal can lend on single-family housing, or any housing for that matter, and produce this kind of return.

With the gradually tightening money situation of the last three or four months, and then the cataclysmic chaos, and rate war of the last two weeks; it has already forced some of the lenders out of the market altogether. They have stopped taking applications on many types of loans, until the situation clarifies to some extent.

If the savings and loan business is going to be able to continue to finance two thirds of the homes in America, some protection must be given our savers, so that their money will not be drained off into the commercial banks, high rate—short term-business oriented—lending.

There are several bills before the Congress now which could reinstate long standing rate differentials, which have made it possible for our business to finance the majority of American homeowners.

The whole housing industry would appreciate anything that you can do—and the sooner, the better—to restore some order to the savings picture.

Very truly yours,

JACKSONVILLE FEDERAL.
W. M. MASON, Jr.,
President.

JULY 31, 1973.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing for your consideration an extract from correspondence from one of my constituents.

As you will observe he is pointing to recent actions taken by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Reserve's Board of Governors in their regulation of savings and loan companies, which seem to result in a discrimination against savings and loan associations. I imagine you are receiving similar reports from others, but thought you might wish to have this in considering what, if any, legislative action may be appropriate.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. SEIBERLING,
Member of Congress.

(Attachment.)

I feel, that a month ago, there were hundreds of thousands of satisfied savings customers in the United States. Today, there are hundreds of thousands of dissatisfied and confused customers, even though higher rates are being offered. In early July, The Federal Reserve Board announced the change in rates which allowed banks to offer new rates on their savings accounts and savings certificates. The Federal Home Loan Bank also announced changes for the Savings and Loan industry.

First, it seems to me that one change which the Fed allowed has been somewhat defiant of Congressional action. Congress had approved the rate control extension bill dated 6/29. It controlled rates to be paid savers by both banks as well as savings and loans. On July 5, when the Fed announced a new schedule of savings rates, it included a wild card category whereby there was no interest rate ceiling on CD's of four years or longer, with a minimum denomination of $1,000. What good is rate control with this kind of loophole permitted by the Fed?

Finally, the increased savings rates and resulting increased costs can be paid for only by the home buyers and home builders. Rates of 8–8½% are now standard for real estate mortgages. At a time when many people still need to be housed, it does not seem wise to be driving up mortgage interest rates. It appears to me that the precipitous action taken by the Fed, followed by our Federal Home Loan Banks, has not helped the financial industry to attract funds or, for that matter, hold funds that might seek much higher interest rate yields.

FRANK MANCINI RETIRES

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform you that on June 30, 1973, an outstanding man, a credit to his community and to Federal service, retired after 31 years of service with General Services Administration. The man to whom I refer is Frank W. Mancini.

Mr. Mancini began his Government career in 1942 as an operating engineer at the Navy Finance Center, then located in the old Higbee Co. building in Cleveland. Soon after, he was promoted to building manager in charge of maintenance of all Government owned and leased buildings in the city of Cleveland.

Because of his impeccable record, experience and ambition, Mr. Mancini was shortly thereafter promoted to area manager, supervising maintenance and improvements in all Government buildings located in a 44-county northern Ohio area.

Always affable and understanding, Frank has the reputation of "getting along" with the hundreds of maintenance employees in the area, and of dealing sternly, yet fairly, with contractors and suppliers. A dedicated and capable Government employee, Frank Mancini, who numbers U.S. Senators, Congressmen, judges, and agency heads among his many friends, will be missed around Ohio's Federal establishments.

Along with his many other friends and associates, I would like to extend to Frank W. Mancini a hope for happiness and good health in his retirement.

AN OUTSTANDING NEWSPAPER CAREER

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the month of August an event of significant importance in the newspaper profession in the State of California will take place. This is the retirement of Mr. Carl Greenberg, longtime political writer for newspapers of Los Angeles.

At the present time Mr. Greenberg is serving as a staff member of the Los Angeles Times. It does not seem possible that the time has come for Carl to retire and those days when we served together in Sacramento are so far in the past.

I knew Carl when I was a member of the California State Legislature and he was covering the legislature so ably for the LA press. During that period, I was tremendously impressed with the dedicated, thorough reporting. He always dug deep and came up with the facts. The resulting presentation to the newspaper readers of the LA area and all of southern California of the activities in the State capitol conveyed to these readers the true comprehensive picture of what was happening in the State government.

In this manner, Carl contributed tremendously to good government at the State level. There are few in his profession that have contributed more.

During the years that I have served in the House of Representatives, I have continued to follow, through the press, his fine reporting. My respect for the outstanding job continues to be great.

As Carl leaves the Los Angeles Times, he can do so with the knowledge that our State and its people have benefited greatly from his knowledgeable reporting of public affairs over the years. May I take this opportunity to extend to Carl my heartiest congratulations on an outstanding career and say that I hope that his retirement will be all that he wishes and certainly deserves.

AMERICAN AUTO INDUSTRY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, America's automobile industry is enjoying one of the best years in its history. American automakers sold more cars in the first half of 1973 than in any other previous 6-month period since the auto was invented. Domestic sales from January 1, 1973 through June 30 totaled 5,214,623, almost 600,000 units more than the previous 6-month high. The profit figures of the Big Four reflect this trend. Ford Motor Co., for example, experienced second quarter profits 39 percent above the same period a year ago. First half profits increased 41 percent over 1972.

Behind the figures, however, I am concerned that the American automobile industry is seriously misjudging the shifting character of consumer demand for automobiles. Evidence to bolster my apprehensions is appearing in the statistics of the market demand already compiled for 1973. In short, I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the automobile industry is not reacting quickly enough to rapidly changing consumer tastes. The result could be a serious decline in automotive sales in 1974, placing millions of workers in jeopardy.

APATHY IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY

Manufacturing automobiles has become a central institution in our economy. The Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association proudly proclaims that 1 out of every 6 employed persons in the United States works in the manufacture, distribution, maintenance, and commercial use of motor vehicles; 1 out of every 5 of the nation's 311,464 wholesale establishments sell automotive products; and 1 out of every 4 retail dollars is spent for automotive related purchases.

The impact of the Big Four is so pervasive that one analyst of the industry has quipped, "When Detroit sneezes, the Nation catches a cold."

In view of the vast importance of the auto industry to the health of our economy, it is absolutely essential that the management in Detroit be innovative and responsive. Unfortunately, past events in the industry do not allow much room for optimism.

The threat of foreign competition has been continually hanging over domestic producers. There have been no periods of serious market penetration by foreign manufacturers. The procrastination of Detroit in meeting these challenges provides a clear example of the lack of astute judgment by management in Detroit.

The first period of increased foreign imports occurred in the late 1950s. By 1959 import penetration had reached 10 percent of the domestic market. To counter this trend, the manufacturers finally introduced the compact. The compact was tremendously successful because it met the demands of the American consumer for an economical, dependable automobile. By 1962 compacts soaked up 31 percent of domestic demand and the share of imports was reduced to 3 percent.

But the industry was not content with the small car market—it tried to goad the consumer to larger, more expensive models. For this reason, the advantage the automakers gained with the introduction of the compact was gradually eroded through the sixties. The automakers' reluctance to meet the desires of the consumer precipitated the second import crisis, which reached significant proportions by 1968.

Import sales reached 1 million units in that year. By 1969, 1.1 million units were sold; by 1970, the total reached 1.3 million units. Their share of the market has expanded from 7.3 percent in 1966, to 11 percent in 1969, and 13 percent in 1970. Against this background the manufacturers began—slowly—to readjust their marketing strategies; 1970 saw the introduction of the subcompact.

The response occurred only after a good deal of hesitation, confusion, and procrastination by management in Detroit. In May of 1968, GM's President Edward N. Cole commented on the flood of imports:

> We don't know why it is happening, but there has got to be some kind of solution.

Even with the introduction of Detroit's new line of subcompacts, it is clear that the dedication of the automakers to provide Americans with a low cost, efficient automobile is shallow.

Detroit's efforts have not been impressive. The American subcompact has had surprisingly little impact on the foreign car boom. The total foreign car import for the first quarter on this year was 15.7 percent of the domestic market—up 7 percent from the first quarter of 1972.

The simple fact behind all these maneuvers by the managers of Detroit is that the American consumer wants a low cost, efficient automobile which gets lots of miles to the gallon. But the automakers do not want to admit this fundamental fact. Instead, they are more concerned with creating a demand for their more luxurious—and more profitable large, overpowered cars—demand encouraged by limiting the appeal of their smaller cars.

They are fearful of "locking in" these customers into the subcompact class: "Make the product too appealing," they appear to be saying, "and you might find they would not want anything else." The failure of Detroit to respond adequately to consumer demand has cost the jobs of American workers. For every car imported, Detroit loses the opportunity to make and sell one more car.

The second area in which the automakers of Detroit have displayed less than astute business sense is in the area of pollution control. It should not have been difficult to see during the decade of the sixties that air pollution—particularly from automobiles—was reaching crisis proportions. Something was going to be done. Unfortunately, the automakers were not the ones to do it. It was not until the Congress took positive and forceful action with the passage of the Clean Air Act that the problem of automobile air pollution was thoroughly addressed. The National Academy of Sciences offers this revealing criticism of the management in Detroit.

> It is unfortunate that the automobile industry did not seriously undertake such a program on its own volition until it was subjected to governmental pressure. A relatively modest investment over the past decade, in developmental programs related to emissions control could have precluded this crisis that now prevails in the industry and the nation.

Undoubtedly, many of the problems the Big Four presently find with the Clean Air Act standards could have been avoided, if they had been willing to cooperate more actively in their formulation.

The failings I have outlined do not arise from extraordinary challenges. Every businessman—from the corner baker to the biggest industrials—must learn to forecast changes in the market in order to maintain his competitive advantage. If he does not learn to "roll with the punches" he will soon fail. It is the job of management to anticipate these challenges, assess their importance, and formulate adequate responses. It is in this central responsibility that the managers of Detroit have not been impressive.

Mr. Speaker, if one fact is clear from all the exposure the "energy crisis" has received, it is that the era of cheap energy is over. The American consumer will no longer be able to cruise along the Nation's highways confident of inexpensive and plentiful supplies of gasoline. In fact, until the problems of our intermediate supply are solved, gasoline shortages will be a fact of life for the near future. At the same time, it is not inconceivable that gasoline prices will climb to 50 and 60 cents a gallon in the next decade.

To get an indication of the adequacy of Detroit's response to our growing gasoline shortages, my staff and I conducted a market survey of autodealers in the Cleveland, Ohio, area.

During the last 2 weeks of July my office contacted 46 Cleveland area automobile dealers. Acting as individuals interested in purchasing a car, my staff requested of each dealer information on the availability of various automobile lines from subcompact to intermediate. The results, I think, are significant. The data reveals that the autodealers are particularly unequipped in meeting the public's demand for smaller, more efficient, and economical automobiles.

Generally speaking, compacts and subcompacts were immediately available only in seriously limited numbers, or not at all. An individual wanting a small car would be forced to wait anywhere from 1½ to 4 months for delivery. On the other hand, larger, medium, and intermediate size automobiles were in greater supply at the dealerships, although the waiting period for these models were comparable.

[Available for immediate delivery]

Dealer and model	Number	Waiting period [1]
Ford Motor Co.:		
A:		
Pinto	1	4–6 weeks.
Maverick	2	
LTD	20	
B:		
Pinto	0	Unsure.
Maverick	0	
LTD	4	
C:		
Pinto	0	Mid-September.
Maverick	0	
LTD	7	
D:		
Pinto	10	Unsure.
Maverick	10	
LTD	20	
E:		
Pinto	0	End of September.
Maverick	0	
LTD	8	
F:		
Pinto	2	4–6 weeks.
Maverick	0	
LTD	4	
G:		
Pinto	3	Sept. 20.
Maverick	4	
LTD	0	
H:		
Pinto	0	Mid-September.
Maverick	2	
LTD	3	
I:		
Pinto	3	September.
Maverick	5–10	
LTD	[3]	
J:		
Pinto	0	Do.
Maverick	3	
LTD	20	
General Motors:		
Chevrolet Division:		
A:		
Vega	0	End of September.
Nova	2	
Impala	150	
B:		
Vega	4	Unsure.
Nova	5	
Impala	100	
C:		
Vega	1	Early October.
Nova	3	
Impala	50	
D:		
Vega	1	Mid-September.
Nova	2	
Impala	50	
E:		
Vega	2	September–October.
Nova	2	
Impala	20	
F:		
Vega	1	Early September.
Nova	0	
Impala	15	
G:		
Vega	4	October–November.
Nova	0	
Impala	[3]	
H:		
Vega	1	September–October.
Nova	0	
Impala	[3]	
I:		
Vega	2	Early September.
Nova	4	
Impala	[3]	
J:		
Vega	1	October.
Nova	4	
Impala	[3]	
K:		
Vega	20	Do.
Nova	20	
Impala	[3]	
Pontiac Division:		
A:		
Ventura	0	
Catalina	0	
B:		
Ventura	3	Late September.
Catalina	100	
C:		
Ventura	5	October.
Catalina	60	
D:		
Ventura	3	Do.
Catalina	50	
E:		
Ventura	5	End September.
Catalina	20	
Oldsmobile Division:		
A:		
Omega	1	Late September.
88 Series	36	
B:		
Omega	4	Do.
88 Series	25	
C:		
Omega	3	Late September/
88 Series	13	October.
D:		
Omega	1	October.
88 Series	8	
E:		
Omega	0	September.
88 Series	4	
American Motors:		
A:		
Gremlin	2	August.
Hornet	0	
B:		
Gremlin	0	September.
Hornet	0	
C:		
Gremlin	1	August.
Hornet	1	
D:		
Gremlin	2	September.
Hornet	0	
E:		
Gremlin	3	Early Sept.
Hornet	0	
F:		
Gremlin	8	6–7 weeks.
Hornet	0	
G:		
Gremlin	2	4–6 weeks.
Hornet	2	
H:		
Gremlin	2	September.
Hornet	1	
Chrysler-Plymouth:		
A:		
Dart	7	Late September.
Valiant	0	
Fury	50	
B:		
Dart	0	Mid-August to mid-October.
Valiant	24	
Fury	5–6	
C:		
Dart	[3]	October.
Valiant	12	
Fury	20	
D:		
Dart	[3]	Do.
Valiant	1	
Fury	11	
E:		
Dart	[3]	September-October.
Valiant	2	
Fury	5	
F:		
Dart	30–50	Unsure.
Valiant	5	
Fury	20	
G:		
Dart	[3]	Do.
Valiant	5	
Fury	5	

[1] For cars on order from the manufacturer.
[3] Many.
[4] Dealership does not carry this model.

From the 45 dealerships sampled, it is clear that subcompacts and compacts are simply not available in significant numbers in the Cleveland area. Of the Ford dealerships, only 19 Pintos were on hand. With the Chevrolet Vega, a similar picture emerges with the exception of one dealership which had 20 on the lot. Of the five Oldsmobile dealerships only nine Omegas—the new compact—were available. American Motors dealers had the most depleted inventories. Our sample of eight dealerships turned up only 20 Gremlins and 4 Hornets.

The blame for depleted inventories does not lie with the individual dealers. Repeatedly, during the survey, my staff was confronted with such dealer comments as, "I could sell a Pinto a day, if I had them," or "You just cannot find small cars." The root cause of the scarcity rests with the manufacturers in Detroit. Their inadequate assessment of market growth has led to the perilously low inventory levels which I have uncovered in this survey.

From the standpoint of the consumer, the results are significant. An individual rarely goes into a dealership with a set idea of the type of car he wants. He must balance a number of factors including optional equipment, trade-in value, any special dealer packages, and, of course, new car availability. With waiting periods of the length evidenced in my study, the consumer interested in an economical automobile is left stranded. He must either buy what is available, wait the several months to get what he wants, or turn to foreign alternatives.

The Automotive News has detailed the changing nature of the automotive market.

SHIFTS IN MARKET SHARES

Percent change in penetration June 1973 v. 1972

Subcompact	+24.8
Compact	+17.7
Import	+12.4
Luxury	−5.4
Intermediate	−6.7
Standard	−17.9
Medium	−19.8

(Based on retail sales reported by makers.)

With economy-sized small cars unavailable for immediate delivery, increasing numbers of American consumers are turning to foreign cars. In June, while the domestic market expanded to record proportions, foreign sales totaled 175,400 or 16.2 percent of the total market—a record high. It is clear that foreign sales are strong and growing stronger. If Detroit does not take positive steps in meeting consumer demand our balance of payments and ultimately the jobs of millions of Americans will be jeopardized.

It is clear to me the automakers understand that the American automobile is undergoing fundamental change. Henry Ford recently stated that subcompacts, compacts and foreign cars will absorb a greater proportion of the market, "probably as high as 50 percent by 1977." In order to take advantage of this expanding opportunity, the industry will have to abandon some of its time-honored marketing and promotional practices.

For the automaker the margin of profit on a larger, heavier car is considerably greater than the profit which can be made on a smaller car. As a result, Detroit is constantly pressuring its customers to "trade up." They accomplish this task in essentially two ways. First, they limit the appeal of their smaller cars chiefly by limiting the options available on them. Second, they increase the size of their existing lines.

These practices must be abandoned. Innovative strategies of marketing and promotion must be developed to satisfy the real needs of the American consumer. To encourage and promote changes that must be made, I have introduced the Fuel Economy Act of 1973. By establishing a graduated excise tax based on fuel economy on each new car, this proposal would force automakers to incorporate fuel economy as part of their business strategy. This is not an effort to hammerlock the industry; the tax is imposed in model year 1977. I want industry to have

enough time to assess the impact of the tax and act accordingly.

The data I am releasing today indicates that the automakers in Detroit have not been active in meeting the demands of the burgeoning small car market. The management of the Big Four must take immediate, affirmative action to adjust their production schedules and promotional practices to meet the rapidly changing character of today's market. No less than the prosperity of the industry and the health of the economy is at stake.

RESULTS OF PUBLIC OPINION POLL

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the results of my 17th annual public opinion poll indicate an increasing awareness and concern for national issues on the part of the residents of the Sixth District of Illinois.

Nearly 27,000 persons took time to record their thoughts on 13 questions, and when you consider that this response is many times the size of the average sampling used by professional pollsters, I believe the results will be of interest to my colleagues.

The complete results follow:

Are you in favor of granting unconditional amnesty to draft dodgers and deserters? Yes: 12.87%; No: 86.29%; No Response: 0.84%.

Do you favor U.S. aid for post-war reconstruction of South Vietnam? Yes: 42.19%; No: 55.37%; No Response: 2.45%.

Do you favor U.S. aid for post-war reconstruction of North Vietnam? Yes: 11.25%; No: 86.48%; No Response: 2.28%.

Would you favor diverting 1c per gallon of the Federal Gasoline Tax (Highway Trust Fund) to aid mass transit? Yes: 74.40%; No: 24.45%; No Response: 1.14%.

Would you favor legislation providing for no-fault automobile insurance on a national basis? Yes: 76.46%; No: 18.14%; No Response: 5.40%.

Do you approve of the President withholding certain funds authorized by Congress in order to keep Federal spending under control? Yes: 69.16% No: 28.70%; No Response: 2.15%.

Do you favor extending deadline dates for meeting environmental standards where necessary to cope with the energy crisis? Yes: 66.42%; No: 30.71%; No Response: 2.86%.

Do you favor re-imposing nonflexible wage and price controls for a period not to exceed one year? Yes: 66.26%; No: 30.20%; No Response: 3.54%

Would you support an amendment to the Education Appropriation Bill banning use of Federal funds for school busing programs established to achieve racial balance? Yes: 68.93%; No: 29.51%; No Response: 1.57%.

Do you believe reporters should be given complete immunity from revealing their news sources? Yes: 49.99%; No: 47.39%; No Response: 2.62%.

Do you believe capital gains should be treated as regular income for tax purposes? Yes: 52.76%; No: 42.88%; No Response: 4.36%.

Do you think the emergency powers of the government should be expanded to deal with strikes seriously affecting health, safety and welfare on a regional basis, as well as on a national basis? Yes: 80.94%; No: 17.49%; No Response: 1.57%.

Do you approve of the Supreme Court ruling that abortions are permissible under certain circumstances? Yes: 72.21%; No: 25.58%; No Response: 2.21%.

(NOTE.—All percentages were calculated to four decimal places, then rounded off, so totals do not always equal 100%.)

ON LOVING MY COUNTRY

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, recently brought to my attention was a powerful and eloquent sermon delivered on July 1 by Minister W. Frank Harrington, pastor of Peachtree Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Harrington entitled his address, "On Loving My Country," and I found it an inspiring testimonial on both the greatnesses and weaknesses of America.

I commend this very fine address to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed as an extension of my remarks.

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

ON LOVING MY COUNTRY

(Text: Amos 7:10–17)

I like the coming of the 4th of July each year because it is a time to remember our heritage as a nation. All over our nation in the days that lie just immediately before us there will be colorful parades and bands will be playing . . . and patriotic banners will be waving, and little children will be standing on street corners with flags of our country in their little hands.

I have noticed in recent months an increasing number of bumper stickers carrying the message, "America: Love It Or Leave It!" Now, this admonition is not easily dismissed. It confronts one with a distinct challenge! I would like to ask a psychiatrist sometime what it is that causes something in our psychic to desire to express something on a bumper sticker—or on our license plates.

I was driving toward the center of town one day this week and I saw a license plate that said, "GRR." That intrigued me! And so I weaved through the traffic to find out who would be driving such an antagonistic kind of car, and it was a little lady about seventy-five sitting there driving it! I wonder what it was that welled up out of her psychic to put "GRR" on her license plate!

But I've noticed this bumper sticker, "America: Love It or Leave It", and it confronts us with a challenge. Is it really asking us too much to say that we should love our country? If we do not love it, and cannot love it, is it really too much to suggest that we leave it and find a country that we can love? It's not an easy statement to read and dismiss for it poses other questions. How does a Christian love his country? How do we get our churchmanship and our citizenship together?

"America: Love it or leave it!" . . . To be very candid, now, I find it easy to be sympathetic with that statement. I speak to you today as one who unapologetically and unhesitating says he is patriotic! I still like to hear the "Star Spangled Banner", and sing the songs of patriotism . . . and make no apology about it! And so it is easy for me to be sympathetic because there is so much about our country that one can love.

I have little patience with those who want to destroy it. My forefathers, as did yours, came to this land, many as indentured servants, seeking freedom and they won it with blood, toil, and sacrifice. And having won it they did not hoard it as a selfish possession to be enjoyed by their generation but they passed something on to us—the torches to be tended by us—and passed on to succeeding generations to our children and to our children's children if possible!

I can remember as a lad hearing the stories from my grandfather, who told of saddling the horse for his father, who rode up one side of Black River and burned the bridges so that Sherman's army couldn't cross and destroy our section of South Carolina. A part of my upbringing has been to have a respect for and a love for one's country and its heritage. I find it easy to be sympathetic with the statement. . . . Who, for example, can read the Declaration of Independence and not respond with a strong affirmation of love for his country? Who can read the Bill of Rights and not stand more erect? Who can read the Constitution of this republic and not be grateful for the authors and appreciative of the protection that it offers for the least and the lowest citizen of this land? I find no embarrassment in unashamed patriotism and love for my country! I rather like the stanza of that hymn that goes . . .

"My native country, thee, Land of the Noble Free, Thy name I love. . . ."

This land of ours has great beauty . . . It has a rich variety of people . . . Its record of achievements is breathtaking. . . . And all around the world today, while we are criticized, we are still looked up to as a symbol of hope and freedom!

Again, I repeat, because I love this country, because I love all that it professes to be and aspires to be, I am inclined to be sympathetic with the slogan . . . "Love it or leave it!"

If man has no love for his country, can find nothing in it worthy of his devotion, and is not in sympathy with its professed ideals, he had best go where he can invest his life with joy and fulfillment! Such a man should not leave in disgrace, but should be permitted to go with dignity and freedom, but he should go!

Walter Scott put it this way:

"Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land,
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burned
As home his footsteps he hath turned,
From wandering to a foreign strand."

"Love it or leave it!"

But the deeper questions come back when we ask, What does it mean to love our country? To whom are these bumper slogans addressed? "Love it or leave it." What motivates their widespread distribution? Love, we are told in an old adage, "is blind." We know from experience this is true because our love for our children and our families is often blind, but we know that this kind of blind love is not in the best interest of those we love. In the long-run it is a very weak kind of love that does not and cannot face the realities involved. A mother, for example, who insists on the perfection of her son despite the obvious faults in his life is frightened. A mature love would say . . .

"I know that my son is not perfect, but, nevertheless, I love him and I'm trying to correct his faults."

Likewise, the person who says, "My country, right or wrong," is, in my judgment, going too far! If it is suggested that we should leave America rather than challenge the ills of this nation, then we are being called upon to give an infantile love, and being chal-

lenged to live by illusions and to ignore the seeds of destruction already growing in our native soil!

Again, the question that this sermon poses comes with a haunting persistence . . . "What does it mean to love our country?"

(1) *In the first place, it surely does not mean a refusal to confront its problems!*

The blemishes that disfigure the face of our nation, the malpractices that in the past have distorted justice must be dealt with and confronted! I have, thank God, been privileged to visit some of the great cities of the world. In Paris and in London, in the late afternoon and early evening, Sara and I walked through the parks and thoroughly enjoyed ourselves. We felt safe and secure.

Billy Graham, in an interview this week with the Atlanta Magazine, expressed a similar feeling when he said he could walk through the parks, I believe, in Singapore and feel secure. "But in the great cities of our own country I would not walk through the parks at night. I would be afraid to do so!"

It is sad, but true, that we lead the world in crimes of rape, robbery, and assault! Our homicide rate is more than twice that of Finland, and from four to twelve times higher than the rates in a dozen other countries of advanced civilization. The past decade has seen a 200 percent increase in arrest rates on charges of robbery involving boys from 10–14 years of age.

Last night's paper said there has been a 12% increase in crime in Atlanta. . . . And one who lives in this city must come to realize that we have a crime and homicide problem of immense proportions! Just this past week a high police official was quoted as saying that the high instances of breaking and entering homes and robbing innocent people was just a part of an increase in crime trend in our day!

An article in Fortune magazine recently pointed out that 75 percent of all crimes remain unsolved!

My friends, we can no longer dismiss the decadence of our day as a mere mundane statistic or just an indication of a developing trend because we have more people! Surely, to love my country does not mean that I have to accept the evils that exist and the pestilence of vice that stalks our land without calling upon us as Christian men and women as citizens to wake up and face the situation that we confront!

This leads me to observe . . .

(2) Secondly, that surely loving my country does not mean that I should leave it rather than speak out!

The fact is that many people who say, "America: Love it or leave it" are not thinking of the well-being of the country at all. They are thinking of themselves, their own pleasures, and their own comfort. They feel that they have it made, and they do not want anything or anyone to upset their plans for the future. They would like to put everything disagreeable out of sight. Just as we want our criminals in jail, our mentally disturbed in hospitals, the sick under sedation, the aged in places far from our homes, the poor in the ghettos, the war over there and not here . . . so they would like to push the crying needs of our nation out of sight! It can't be done!

So, if anyone begins to press for action . . . the whole prospect of dragging the evils in the open is so upsetting that they would rather the critics leave than say anything!

Loving our country demands that we say something about the evils that will destroy us! Let's not forget that many of the men and women who are great in our eyes today, as great patriots, were not so thoroughly loved and respected by their contemporaries.

Last night I took off at the National Airport in Washington, and the great plane, as it soared up into the heavens, circled over the city and there dotting the ground below was the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument, the Jefferson Memorial, the White House and the Capitol, and one could not help but remember and appreciate our heritage as a nation.

As I looked down at the Jefferson Memorial I remembered that Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, was accused by his fellow countrymen of leading the country into rack and ruin because he was critical of some of the problems that existed.

John Adams was roundly criticized for championing an unpopular cause. You see, any tampering with the "status quo,", which may be soundly evil, always brings the cries of protest.

Now the prophets of the Old Testament really loved their country, and they were almost without exception cruelly treated and maligned because they brought a message from God which spoke with telling clarity to the evils of their day. I read in your hearing today an eloquent passage from the Book of Amos. Amos, in his day, was regarded as an outside agitator. He came from the country down South and he went up North to speak to the cities there. He had been a tender of sycamore trees, and came to the big city where he observed the oppression of the poor by the wealthy and the well-to-do. Amos, by the way, was not a clergyman—he was not ordained—he was a concerned layman.

And, so it was that under the compelling power of the Spirit of God Amos spoke out, and if you will read the book that bears his name you will read some of the most striking, terse, direct, and passionately poetic lines to be found in the Bible! In a time of substantial security for his nation he lifted his voice in the name of God to protest what he saw because he loved his country. What he said to his nation because he loved it is what I want to say to you today as citizens of this community and of this land. He said:

"God rules over and judges all men and all nations. There will come a time of accounting when all men will sit at a table of consequences!"

And I tell you the situation that is revealed on our television sets every day in these Watergate hearings just sickens a person! To realize that in the highest echelons of our nation's government men have perjured themselves.

I am reminded of what Hambone wrote. Do you know who Hambone was? He was a cartoon character on the front page of the News & Courier when I grew up. And one day Hambone said, "The truth stands by itself—but a lie, you have to keep propping it up!"

And that's what is happening! Amos said:

"God demands righteousness of His people; by their fruits you shall know them!

"God condemns social as well as personal sins. He believes that we are our brother's keeper!"

And as Amos looked about him he saw a wayward and complacent nation, and in his own words he said,

"God desires that justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an everlasting stream!"

I love my country, but my love for it is more than sentiment. My love for it must find expression in the establishment of justice, and the ordering of society for the welfare of all citizens. Love of God and love of nation need not be in conflict! Love for God will be manifested in our attempt to realize the ideals of a nation reflecting the righteousness of God! To love my country, therefore, requires that I seek to make known to all men the nature of God as He is revealed in Christ!

So, we come back to where we began . . . "America: Love it or Leave It!"

As for me, having viewed it in some perspective from across the sea. I have no intention of leaving but I do, as a Christian minister, intend to speak out concerning the sins of this nation! It would be a betrayal of our faith ever to dilute our moral influence for the sake of expediency. We abhor moral mediocrity! Christian ministers who must in some measure maintain constant scrutiny over the political life of the nation should always be brave enough, whatever the embarassment in terms of political pressure, to speak boldly where moral issues are involved!

I would rather my church be wrong than to say it has no message at all for a world that needs every urge to righteousness. And this, I believe—the major weakness of our time has been a departure from the fundamentals! Our age has been full of techniques without principles . . . material possessions without spiritual power, tactics without strategy, skill without character, a demanding of rights without an acceptance of responsibility! Our time knows how, but it has not sufficiently known what and why!

We have not learned that the training of a man's mind, without the education of his heart and the feeding of his soul, is filled with peril, for what we have done, if we leave out the spiritual nurture, is to create a clever devil! The entire decade through which we have just passed has been marked by an increasing toleration of wrong! It is, therefore, high time for us to return to the fundamentals—the knowledge and the love of God, loyalty to His truth, obedience to His will, eagnerness to live in the Spirit of Christ and make brotherhood a reality on earth!

Let me close with two statements. The first was written on June 12, 1775 and it's called, as it was issued by the Continental Congress meeting then—and they knew that war was imminent with a mother country, since that day, a "Declaration of Dependence Upon God." In a most specific way it reflects the religious outlook that prevailed in colonial America. It reads:

"This Congress do earnestly recommend that Thursday, the twentieth day of July next, be observed by the inhabitants of all English colonies on this continent as a day of public humiliation, fasting, and prayer; that we may, with united hearts and voices, unfeignedly confess and deplore our many sins, and offer up our joint supplications to the all-wise, omnipotent, and merciful disposer of all events; humbly beseeching Him to forgive our iniquities, and to remove our present calamities!"

Each of us can do his part to bring this spirit of dependence upon God increasingly into our government, especially in these critical times when so much misery has come about because men have abandoned or defied Him!

Then Jonathan Wainwright, one of the captured generals during World War II, immediately following the victory of the free world, was flown back to the United States. He had been starved, mistreated, and whipped while an enemy prisoner. On Thanksgiving Day 1945, he prayed this prayer:

"Oh, God our Father, today we give thee thanks for the things we take for granted, for freedom, for security of life for loved ones. We thank thee that once again men may have hope, the opportunity to work and plan for a better future, a chance to secure peace and an ampler life for themselves and their children. Keep us humble in the day of victory; make us wise in the presence of great problems, strong and brave in the face of danger, and sympathetic and generous as we face the appalling need of a war-torn world. In gratitude for all who paid the price of victory, we now ask thy guidance as we dedicate ourselves to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion. . . . Lord of hosts, be with us yet . . . lest we forget . . ."

"God bless our native land!
Firm may she ever stand,
Through storm and night,
When the wild tempests rave,
Ruler of wind and wave,
Do thou our country save
By thy great might!"

HOW OIL COMPANIES CONTROL COAL

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, with all the talk of an energy crisis, one tends to forget that we own at least three to four centuries' reserves of coal. Why are we then experiencing shortages? Why are we underutilizing our most plentiful energy resource? First, the technology of coal production poses several problems: underground mining endangers human lives and strip mining threatens the environment. Second, the burning of coal yields unsafe pollutants. Yet scientists have been saying for years that all of these obstacles can be overcome. According to their predictions, we should now be benefitting from perfected methods of producing and employing coal. Why are we still unable to employ our vast reserves?

That question cannot be directly answered at present. But our search for the answer indicates why we find no answer—our search takes us to the several other major industries which own and control much of the coal industry. According to the current United Mine Workers Journal, 11 of the 15 largest coal companies are controlled by outside concerns, by America's largest corporations representing businesses with a less-than-impartial interest in the future of coal.

At a time when an oil shortage threatens our Nation's health and welfare, as we learn of fuel shortages expected to affect our homes, schools, hospitals, and offices this winter, the status of the potentially-booming coal industry becomes most relevant, I do not subscribe to the argument of big business that relaxation of environmental standards is necessary to realize the potential of our coal supplies. First, we should take a good look at the complex interrelationships among the giants in the industry and examine their profit-motivated practices which result in higher prices for the consumer. In this regard, I commend the following UMW Journal article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE NEW ENERGY BARONS: HOW BIG OIL CONTROLS THE COAL INDUSTRY

(By MATT WITT)

UMWA coal miners have been fighting coal operator control over their lives ever since the union was formed in 1890: company stores, company doctors, company houses, company wage cuts in hard times, company discrimination against immigrant or black miners, company firing of safe workers—in short, domination over those who risk death or injury or dust-filled lungs to bring the black wealth out of the ground by those who take the profits home.

In 1973, the battle continues. Throughout the coalfields, miners are already talking about the 1974 contract struggle, and many of the goals you hear discussed are the unachieved goals of the past—pay for the sick worker and care for the widows and disabled, a decent living through automatic raises during inflation, the right to enjoy some sunlight through decent vacations and pensions, the right to fearlessly demand safety and to bid on jobs without discrimination, protected by a clear and readable grievance procedure.

There's a lot of talk, too, about the fight between energy companies and the public, known as the "energy crisis." We hear about how coal miners' jobs are being threatened by the failure to develop sulfur pollution controls—and how coal miners' paychecks are being gutted further by 40 cents-a-gallon prices for gas. And large coal companies now are talking about the high profits of western mining at the expense of existing jobs in the East or Midwest.

In 1973, the battle continues, but there is an important change that makes the contract and energy fights that much tougher. The coal barons have changed.

Today's big coal companies aren't just selling groceries to a few captive communities or deciding the future of jobs for a few hundred miners. In fact, today's big coal producers are in most cases not really coal companies at all. Instead, they are divisions of some of the largest and most powerful oil and metal corporations in the world, corporations which are selling an "energy crisis" to an entire captive nation for a high economic and environmental price, and which are attempting to decide from an oilman's point-of-view the future of jobs for the entire coal industry.

The invasion of these high-powered energy corporations began in the 1960's. Gulf Oil acquired Pittsburg and Midway Coal, the thirteenth largest producer, in 1963. In 1966, Continental Oil bought out the giant of the eastern coal industry, Consolidation Coal. In 1968, Occidental Petroleum took over Island Creek Coal, the third largest coal producer, while Standard Oil of Ohio took over Old Ben Coal, now the tenth largest producer.

In these same years, Kennecott Copper acquired Peabody Coal, now number one in production, while General Dynamics became the eleventh largest producer by buying Freeman Coal and United Electric Coal, and American Metal Climax climbed to sixth place after buying Ayrshire Collieries.

When the dust cleared 11 of the 15 largest coal companies were controlled by outside interests. Through their own production and acting as brokers for smaller companies' coal, 13 of these 15 companies controlled more than 60 per cent of annual U.S. coal sales.

Other oil companies which did not move into coal production in a big way did move into control of coal reserves. Standard Oil of New Jersey, now called Exxon, suddenly bought at least 7 billion tons of reserves. Atlantic Richfield became the second largest holder of federal coal land leases, with 43,500 coal acres.

The new coal industry run by oil means one change right off the bat: the UMWA is no longer bargaining with single-product coal companies, but with huge enterprises who make their money on a variety of businesses. Shutting down the coal production of Consolidation Coal or Island Creek during a contract strike was bound to have more effect when Consol and Island Creek were independent than it will now when each only contributes about 10 per cent of its parent company's total revenues.

This change has led to suggestions of joining with other energy unions like the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers (OCAW) or of boycotting Conoco and Gulf and Sohio gasoline during the next contract strike if that is legal. But UMWA officials seem to think that rather than mimicking the concentration of the companies it would be better to pressure Congress, the Federal Trade Commission and the Justice Department into reversing that concentration. President Miller called for an investigation along those lines in his June 6 energy statement to the Senate Interior Committee.

The contract is one way oil control of coal affects the coal miner. Energy policy is another major way.

From a business point of view, oil's investment in coal made a great deal of sense. Coal was an unusually profitable industry, as it continues to be. But more importantly, by controlling coal the oil companies moved into position to stall industry and government research into technology necessary to fully develop coal as oil's competitor, such as low-sulfur burning techniques and gasification and liquefaction.

Moreover, the reserves of oil were clearly limited. A shift into control of other energy production would allow the oil companies to play off one resource against another to obtain the highest prices, the least "labor trouble," and the most advantageous treatment from government.

GAME PLAN WORKED

It was a good game-plan, and it worked—for the oil companies and against the coal miner. While Island Creek Coal's production per month fell in 1972, compared to the non-strike months of 1971 and while the nation screamed for energy, the chairman of the board of Occidental Petroleum, Island Creek's parent, was off to the Soviet Union to arrange for $8 billion worth of natural gas and to Saudi Arabia to arrange more oil imports.

While the coal industry failed to press development and use of sulfur pollution control devices, new coal giants Continental Oil and Gulf Oil and others were instead investing their money in uranium reserves and nuclear power processing, just in case.

And whether by conspiracy or just by common actions toward a common goal, the push an independent coal industry would naturally make for coal gasification and liquefaction has not taken place under oil leadership.

Actually, oil opposition to the processes of changing coal into substitutes for natural gas or gasoline has a surprisingly long history. Gasoline made from coal was used during World War II to power Hitler's war effort. By a written business agreement between I. G. Farben, a German chemical firm which developed the technique, and Standard Oil of New Jersey, Jersey Standard was given sole right to the process outside Germany. They proceeded to sit on it to keep anyone from using it in competition with Standard's oil and gas.

Consolidation Coal, when still independent announced in 1961 that plans first developed in 1947 for gasification would be successful within ten years.

A contract was signed with Consol in 1963, before it was bought by Continental, calling for $9.9 million in federal money for development of gasoline from coal.

According to James Ridgeway in his excellent book on the energy crisis, *The Last Play*, "by 1971 the government had paid Continental $20 million and the plant still did not work. Indeed, the Interior Department had renegotiated the contract, letting Continental off the hook entirely, continuing to provide them more funds so that the plant could be used for desulphurization of oil."

A Bureau of Mines official estimates that private industry spends $500 million a year on oil and gas research, but only $25 million on coal research.

WHO CONTROLS PRODUCTION NOW?

15 largest coal producers and major interest	1972 in tons
Kennecott Copper (Peabody Coal Co.): Metal	71, 595, 310
Continental Oil (Consolidation Coal Co.): Oil	64, 942, 000
Occidental Petroleum (Island Creek Coal Co.): Oil	22, 605, 114
Pittston Co.: Coal	20, 639, 020
United States Steel Corp.: Steel	16, 254, 400
American Metal Climax, Inc.: Metal, oil	15, 718, 787
Bethlehem Mines Corp.: Steel	13, 335, 245
Eastern Gas and Fuel (Eastern Associated Coal Corp.): Gas	12, 528, 429

15 largest coal producers and major interest	1972 in tons
North American Coal Corp.: Coal	11,991,004
Standard Oil of Ohio (Old Ben Coal Corp.): Oil	11,235,910
General Dynamics: Aircraft weapons	9,951,263
Westmoreland Coal Co.: Coal	9,063,919
Gulf Oil (Pittsburg & Midway Coal Mining Co.): Oil	7,458,791
American Electric Power (Central Ohio, Central Appalachian Windsor Power Coal): Electric utilities	7,437,000
Utah International: Coal, metal	6,898,262

WHO OWNS COAL FOR THE FUTURE

Company	Estimated reserves: Total (billion tons)	Estimated reserves: Low sulphur (percent)
Burlington Northern RR	11.0	100
Union Pacific RR	10.0	50
Kennecott Copper (Peabody Coal)	8.7	27
Continental Oil (Consolidation Coal)	8.1	35
Exxon (Monterey Coal)	7.0	NA
American Metal Climax (Amax Coal)	4.0	50
Occidental Petroleum (Island Creek Coal)	3.3	28
United States Steel	3.0	NA
Gulf Oil (Pitts. & Midway Coal)	2.6	8
North American Coal	2.5	80
Reynolds Metals	2.1	95
Bethlehem Steel	1.8	NA
Pacific Power & Light	1.6	100
American Electric Power	1.5	Minimal
Eastern Gas & Fuel Association (Eastern Assoc. Coal)	1.5	33
Kerr-McGee	1.5	60
Norfolk & Western RR	1.4	99
Utah International	1.3	94
Westmoreland Coal	1.2	88
Pittston Co	1+	100
Montana Power (Western Energy)	1	100
Standard Oil of Ohio (Old Ben Coal)	.8	Minimal
Ziegler Coal	.8	0
General Dynamics (Freeman/United Elec.)	.6	0
Rochester & Pitts Coal	.3	0
Carbon Fuel	.1	97
Amer. Smelting & Refin. (Midland Coal)	.1	0

Note: As coal loomed larger as a key energy resource, oil companies and other outside corporations rushed during the 1960's to buy 11 of the top 15 coal producers. Outside control is even tighter on coal's future, as 16 of the top 17 holders of coal reserves are oil companies, railroads, steel and metal interests.
NA—Not available.

While the oil-dominated coal industry was going slow on gasification and liquefaction, the lack of an independent voice for coal interests left coal very low on the federal government's list for public research subsidies to private industries. The current federal budget calls for only $62 million for coal research, less than 10 per cent of the total federal energy research budget.

But while Big Oil lobbyists dampened the government's enthusiasm for research subsidies to promote coal as a competitor to oil, they successfully encouraged other substantial kinds of government welfare to help oil achieve and maintain its grip on coal.

IRS GAVE TAX BREAK

Not only did the Justice Department fail to take anti-trust action against any of the oil-coal purchases, but the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) made a special ruling which allowed Continental Oil to avoid paying taxes on the income it used to buy Consolidation Coal. In effect the coal miner—as a taxpayer—helped Continental to buy Consol through a complicated tax subsidy. Two years later, Kennecott Copper took advantage of the same public tax subsidy in buying Peabody Coal.

By another IRS ruling, coal operators can avoid paying taxes on up to half their income through a special depletion allowance. This is particularly attractive to steel companies and others like General Dynamics, which are the main users of their own coal since they can often sell coal to themselves at an inflated price and show the profits in the coal division where the taxes are lower. The depletion allowance and other special tax breaks generally have the effect of attracting investment by corporate giants with large amounts of money, like oil companies.

OTHER KINDS OF WELFARE

The same government generosity to coal producers is reflected by the failure to enforce mine safety laws and collect fine assessments and the failure to make coal operators pay from the beginning for black lung disease caused by high dust levels in their mines. Again, the government has been happy to provide every kind of financial break for the coal industry except research, apparently because every break except research helps oil and other interests who have moved into coal.

A bald example of government assistance in the oil takeover of coal is the leasing of federal coal lands to large interests like Atlantic Richfield and Continental Oil for an average $1 per year rental on each acre leased. These companies have been successfully pounding on the Interior Department's door, especially in the last ten years, in order to tie up valuable low-sulfur coal by keeping it out of production until they are ready to exploit it with gasification and liquefaction when the oil business runs into trouble from political problems in the Middle East and emptying of U.S. reserves.

Thus, the amount of federal coal acreage leased soared from about 200,000 acres in 1960 to more than 775,000 in 1970. Yet, less than 2.4 per cent of the land leased in that decade is under production.

Despite the clear statement in Section 187 of the Mineral Lands and Mining Act that the Secretary of the Interior shall "insure . . . the prevention of monopoly" in leasing public lands, the top 15 lessors control over 60 per cent of the leased lands, and someday, when the energy conglomerates are ready to use the land they've leased, they may still be paying the ridiculously low rates for which they originally signed.

With federal coal lands held out of production and government and industry research into sulfur control and conversion techniques held to a minimum, the oil industry is nearly in a position to get whatever it wants because coal is not ready to take over its rightful share of the energy market. Big Oil would have a much more difficult time asking the public to ignore the environmental risks of offshore drilling or supertankers or the Alaska pipeline if an independent coal industry had developed coal as a ready alternative.

In the same way, oil and other large outside interests can use the lag in sulfur control development they seem to have caused to force acceptance of their plan for western strip mining. Such mining is more profitable for the operator because it employs fewer men, often not under UMWA contract, but could threaten tens of thousands of coal miners' jobs and carry tremendous costs to the eastern and midwestern electric power consumer and to the environment.

Proper development of washing and blending of midwestern medium- and high-sulfur coal and expansion of eastern low-sulfur mining would have hurt the ability of the oil-coal barons to sell their western plan to the public.

ORGANIZE TO FIGHT BACK

The fight against oil domination of coal is not one the UMWA can wage alone. This is particularly true with the coal industry completely robbed of its voice box. For example, National Coal Association President Carl Bagge, who should speak for coal's interest but who speaks for his oil bosses, called on June 18 for loosening anti-trust laws to allow greater concentration by energy companies—just the opposite of what is needed.

A coalition with other unions, environmental organizations, and consumer groups would be necessary to lobby for abolition of tax incentives for concentration and for the government investigations and anti-trust actions which President Miller has demanded.

The coal barons have changed, but the need to organize against their power remains much the same. The profits and the control of lives are still in their hands. Only now the entire country is a company town.

THE COMPANIES THAT CONTROL YOUR FUTURE

Since the early 1960's, some of America's largest corporations have been rushing to buy up the coal industry, with oil giants, like Occidental Petroleum, Gulf Oil, and Continental Oil leading the way.

Private and government money for research that would make coal a competitor to oil, like gasification, liquefaction, and sulfur control, slowed to a trickle.

Other kinds of companies, especially steel interests, were attracted by possible tax advantages, and everyone was interested in the coal industry's high profits and bright future.

Whether UMWA miners now work for oil giant Standard Oil of Ohio or for weapons builder General Dynamics or for house builder Jim Walters, the effect is to leave coal policy in the hands of Big Oil and to pit the UMWA against the nation's richest corporations in the next contract struggle.

Listed below are some of the largest coal companies controlled by outside interests.

CONTROLLED BY THE OIL INDUSTRY

Coal producer and controlling company

Consolidation Coal, Continental Oil.
Island Creek Coal, Occidental Petroleum.
Old Ben Coal, Standard Oil of Ohio.
Pittsburg & Midway Coal, Gulf Oil.
Arch Coal, Ashland Oil.
Monterey Coal, Humble Oil.
Hawley Fuel, Belco Petroleum.
Canterbury Coal, Western Industries.

CONTROLLED BY THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Coal producer and controlling company

U.S. Steel, U.S. Steel.
Bethlehem Steel, Bethlehem Steel.
Republic Steel, Republic Steel.
Gateway Coal, Jones & Laughlin.
Buckeye, Olga & Youngstown Coal Mines, Youngstown Sheet & Tube.
Kaiser Steel, Kaiser Steel.
Cannelton Coal, Cannelton Industries.
Inland Steel, Inland Steel.
Armco, Armco.
National Mines & Beaver Creek Coal, National Steel.
Pikeville Coal, Steel Company of Canada.
Woodward Company, Woodward Company.
C. F. & I: Steel, C. F. & I. Steel.
Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel, Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel.

CONTROLLED BY UTILITIES

Coal producer and controlling company

Central Ohio Coal, Central Appalachian & Windsor Power Coal, American Electric Power.
Western Energy Company, Montana Power.
Pacific P & L, Pacific Power & Light.
Duquesne Light Company, Duquesne Light Company.
Washington Irrigation & Development, Washington Irrigation & Development.
Southern Electric Company, Southern Electric Company.
Greenwich Collieries & Tunnelton Mining, Pennsylvania Power & Light.
Alabama Power Company, Alabama Power Company.
Eastover Coal, Duke Power Company.

CONTROLLED BY METAL COMPANIES

Coal producer and controlling company

Peabody Coal, Kennecott Copper.
Amax Coal, American Metal Climax.
U.S. Fuel Company, U.S. Smelting & Refining.

CONTROLLED BY CHEMICAL COMPANIES

Coal producer and controlling company

Semet Solvay, Allied Chemical.
Barnes & Tucker, Alco.
Union Carbide, Union Carbide.
C & K Coal, Gulf Resources.

CONTROLLED BY OTHER INTERESTS

Coal producer and controlling company

Freeman Coal & United Electric, General Dynamics.
Utah International, Utah International.
Alabama By-Products, Alabama By-Products.
MAPCO, MAPCO.
Ogleday Norton, Ogleday Norton.
International Harvester, International Harvester.
Boone County Coal, Zapata Noress.
Twilight Industries, U.S. Natural Resources.
Simpson Coal, Galloway Land Company.
Allison Engineering, Allison Engineering.
Aloe Coal, Pullman, Inc.
Gilbert Imported Hardwoods, Gilbert Imported Hardwoods.
U.S. Pipe and Foundry, Jim Walters Corp.

NEED FOR EXPANDED EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most perceptive article, on the education of handicapped children, which was written by Mr. Henry Gottlieb and published in the June 10 edition of the Miami Herald.

Says Mr. Gottlieb:

In a nation that strives to offer free education to everyone, 4.2 million mentally and physically handicapped youngsters are being deprived of learning because their schools are short of cash.

The article, Mr. Speaker, goes on to document some of the appalling human tragedies to which special education is addressed, and notes that fully to provide special services for our Nation's handicapped children would mean a staggering total cost of more than $3 billion above what is now being spent on education.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to tell my colleagues that the present financial crunch our schools are experiencing mitigates against their being able to provide the additional funds needed for handicapped children.

Indeed, the States, as well as the District of Columbia, have argued in court that they should not be required to provide special educational services for the handicapped because of the high costs of providing such services.

The courts, however, Mr. Speaker, have ruled that such arguments are not acceptable, and in several important cases have ruled that States must provide special educational programs appropriate to the handicapped child's needs.

But quite apart from these legal decisions, which mandate that States spend more on handicapped children, there is, I believe, a compelling moral argument in favor of educating handicapped children.

Perhaps the distinguished chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey, best expresses this view:

Said Senator WILLIAMS:

It is time to change our attitudes, to rid ourselves of the old myths and to begin dealing with realities. Handicapped children are children. They have the same rights as any other child to hope, to learn, and to be free.

Mr. Speaker, along with 13 members of the Education and Labor Committee, I have introduced the Education of the Handicapped Children Act, which would authorize the Federal Government to pay for 75 percent of the extra costs involved in educating handicapped children.

Senator WILLIAMS is cosponsor of a companion bill in the Senate.

The Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, hopes to begin hearings on this bill before the end of the year.

So that my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, can understand the urgency of our acting speedily on this measure, I insert Mr. Gottlieb's article at this point in the RECORD:

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN DENIED FULL EDUCATION

(By Henry Gottlieb)

In a nation that strives to offer free education to everyone, 4.2 million mentally and physically handicapped youngsters are being deprived of learning because their schools are short of cash.

Angela Coleman, a 9-year-old partially blind girl from Augusta, Ga., is grades behind in reading because her school can't afford special books with large type.

Twenty-two educable but autistic children in the Tidewater area of Virginia were turned away from schools because the added costs of teaching them were too much for their community to bear. The parents are currently trying to get the federal courts to get their children back into classes.

According to the Senate committee on Labor and Public Welfare, only 17 states are serving more than half their physically and mentally disabled children. One million disabled children aren't in schools of any kind.

STATES OFFER LITTLE HELP

In 1971, seven states provided less than 20 per cent of their handicapped children with a suitable education and, according to the committee, one state, Arkansas, offered an equal education to only 10 per cent of its disabled children.

How well children are taught depends in part on the severity of their problems, the committee said. The hardest to control in classrooms are the emotionally disturbed, and of these, only 13 percent were getting an education, the committee contended.

But of the nation's crippled or orthopedically handicapped children, whose minds are as sound as those of their peers, only 35 per cent were getting adequate training. Of the trainably mentally retarded, 57 per cent were being taught, the committee said.

"There are seven million handicapped children in the United States," said Sen. Harrison A. Williams (D., N.J.) in a speech to the Senate.

"Close to 60 per cent of these children are denied the educational programs they need to have full equality of opportunity."

"The education that they are likely to receive will in no way prepare them for a life of independence and in most cases their exposure to learning opportunities will be so irregular that it may have been better not to have made the effort at all," Williams said.

The chief problem, he said, is a lack of money.

"It's not always that the schools don't care. The problem is they have money problems and it costs a lot to give a disabled child the education he needs."

According to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, it costs approximately 80 per cent more to educate a handicapped child than it does to teach a normal child.

Thus it would cost between $400 and $800 per pupil to give the nation's handicapped children a decent education—a staggering total cost of more than $3 billion above what is now being spent on education, the committee projects.

What disturbs Williams is that recent federal court decisions are making the school districts' pleas of "sorry, no funds," illegal excuses.

On Aug. 1, 1972, District Court Judge Joseph Waddy, sitting in the District of Columbia, handed down what is now viewed as a landmark decision outlining the rights of handicapped children.

The ruling stemmed from a complaint brought on behalf of seven Washington, D.C., children age 7 to 16, suffering from such problems as brain damage, epilepsy, mental retardation and orthopedic disabilities. None of the children was allowed to attend public schools and none was given public grants to seek a private education.

THE COST RUNS HIGH

The District of Columbia Board of Education argued in response that these and other disabled children could not be handled because of the high costs of educating them. Statistics indicated it costs about $900 per pupil more to educate a disabled child in Washington than a normal child. Giving a full education to a disabled child would cost the school board about $8.7 million more each year.

But Waddy ruled that pleas of poverty were unacceptable.

"Their failure to fulfill this clear duty to include and retain these children in the public school system, or otherwise provide them with publicly supported education, and their failure to afford them due process hearing and periodical review, cannot be excused by the claim that there are insufficient funds," Waddy said.

And he ordered the children accepted in public schools or given tuition grants to attend institutions that could deal with their problems.

In addition to the Waddy decision, federal courts in Pennsylvania, Virginia, Connecticut and Michigan also have been asked to deal with the question of education for handicapped children and, according to the Council of Exceptional Children, the right of handicapped children to get a complete education is being upheld.

"The decisions have substantiated the right of handicapped children to equal protection under the law—including being provided with an education," said the council, which supports legislation aiding disabled children.

If the courts are mandating these expensive services to disabled children, who is going to pay for them?

The federal government, says Williams.

"It is hard to argue to the state that the federal government is serious about full educational opportunity when we are not willing to invest funds to make this goal a reality," Williams says.

For this purpose, Williams and 23 Senate cosponsors have introduced a bill that would underwrite 75 per cent of the excess costs it takes to educate a handicapped child.

Thus, if a state is currently paying $1,800 for educating a handicapped child—$1,000

more than it pays for other children—the Williams bill would pay the state $750.

DETAILED PLANS

In addition, the states would be required to submit detailed plans to the U.S. Commissioner of Education outlining plans to implement special education programs in its state. Included in the plans would be timetables showing when facilities will be built, when personnel will be hired and how funds will be raised. And the plans would have to be in operation by Jan. 1, 1977.

The bill also includes as children those between 3 and 21 years old. Most states, for example New Jersey, do not provide free public education for handicapped children until they are 5 years old.

Thus the bill would provide the same services for 3-year-olds in need of educating that it would for school-age children.

For example, this would pay for nursery school education for retarded or physically disabled tots who currently must wait until they are 5 before getting free professional teaching.

"It's important to give children with disabilities a head start, because by the time they reach age 5 they often already have a sense of failure," says Zelda Pollack, administrator of a private nursery school run by the New Jersey Association for Children with Learning Disabilities.

Passage of legislation like the Williams bill would make a real change in the lives of six children who currently are on a waiting list to enter the NJACLD's nursery school Mrs. Pollack heads on the campus of the College of St. Elizabeth in Convent Station, N.J.

EXPAND SERVICES

"If school boards are getting 75 per cent of their excess costs repaid, they can afford to extend services to preschool children," Mrs. Pollack says. "We would like to expand our services here, but there's no money.

"And because there hasn't been enough money for preschool age children, it's costing the school boards more money in the long run, because when problems go uncared for, they're more expensive to deal with at a later date."

Williams agrees that spending money when problems are small is the way to save money in the long run, and this is his argument to potential critics who gasp at his proposal's $1.7 billion price tag.

"The expense is minimal compared to what it has cost this society to deny appropriate services and maintain handicapped children at a level which is far less than their potential," Williams says.

He says if disabled children are not educated, they become a drain on society's resources. It is cheaper in the long run to educate disabled children than to be tight with money when they are children and face the burden of having a large segment of the population unproductive as adults, he states.

"It is time to change our attitudes to rid ourselves of the old myths and to begin dealing with realities," Williams says. "Handicapped children are children. They have the same rights as any other child to hope, to learn and to be free."

BILL INTRODUCED FOR EISENHOWER COLLEGE AND RAYBURN LIBRARY

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, as we are all aware the vote to grant a rule to debate S. 1264, the Eisenhower College and Rayburn Library failed.

Because I realize the importance of maintaining a living tribute to President Eisenhower, and Speaker Rayburn, in accordance with the wishes of the late President and his family, I have joined with Congressman WYLIE today in introducing a bill which would enable this national monument to become a reality.

This bill would provide $4½ million for the Eisenhower College and $500,000 for the Rayburn Library, in Bonham, Tex. This outright grant I feel is a much more equitable means of providing funds for the support of these two fine institutions. It would put a limit on the amount of money provided whereas S. 1264 stated no limitation on the amount, the only determinant being the $1 multiplied by the total number of proof coins which had been and thereafter minted.

I believe that the image of President Eisenhower and Speaker Rayburn grows throughout this country and the world with the passage of time. It seems most fitting that the Eisenhower College and Samuel Rayburn Library should be supported by the entire Congress as a living memorial to these two great Americans.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST?

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that one of our colleagues, who holds two elected positions, first as chairman of the House Administration Committee and second as chairman of the Democrat congressional committee, has been accused of a conflict of interest between the two positions. The allegation, as I understand it, is that the Democrat congressional committee chairmanship carries with it the obligation to help elect Democrat Members of Congress, including a horde of incumbents, and that the job of chairman of the House Administration Committee carries with it the capability of influencing legislation which might help to elect a lot of Democrats.

The chairman of the House Administration Committee was elected to that job by his peers in the Democrat caucus after being elected to the Congress by the people of his district. He was also elected chairman of the Democrat congressional committee.

I did not elect him, and I am one who often takes positions contrary to those of the chairman, particularly on election campaign laws, but I do not support the conflict allegation. I think it is terribly important that Congressmen not be foreclosed from serving in positions of party leadership. Our system is best served by healthy and capably led parties. I do not believe the chairman of the House Administration Committee, or any other Congressman, should be denied one political party position simply because of his congressional assignment. I hope none will be afraid to serve in such positions.

A MISSION FOR THE BAR ASSOCIATION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Rauh, Jr., one of America's most distinguished lawyers, has written a thoughtful analysis of one of the side issues of the Watergate affairs. His article in the August 1 issue of the Washington Post discusses "the present crisis of confidence in the legal profession," and the opportunity that lawyers have to restore confidence in their profession at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association.

I commend this excellent article to the attention of my colleagues:

A MISSION FOR THE BAR ASSOCIATION

(By Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.)

In the light of Watergate it may be considered no more than a common cliche to point out that the legal profession has failed in its sworn duty to uphold the law.

Certainly it will be considered incredibly naive to suggest that the American Bar Association do something about it. Nevertheless, an ashamed lawyer at least ought to be allowed to wonder out loud whether the legal profession has not acted so badly and has not dropped so far in public esteem as to warrant some dramatic and drastic action by the American Bar Association—such as scrapping its entire 100-page business-as-usual agenda at its meeting here and devoting the entire proceedings to considering remedies for the present crisis in the profession.

Most lawyers, I believe, are ashamed of what they have seen on television and in the press these past weeks: a lawyer President suppressing facts needed to enforce the laws he is sworn to uphold; a former Attorney General describing discussions of illegal conduct in his office at the Department of Justice; the President's own personal lawyer flitting around the country arranging secret payments to known criminals; an ex-counsel to the President detailing his role in obstructing justice; a lawyer top assistant to the President defending the legality of burglary; a lawyer acting FBI Director destroying material evidence. And this, sadly, is only the tip of the iceberg. What of the lawyers who developed, implemented and defended the administration's program of selective law and order, a program attacking street crime while endorsing the wholesale violation of other laws. What of the administration lawyers engaged in already-adjudicated illegality in refusing to enforce civil rights laws, in impounding funds for social programs, in dismantling OEO; what of the plan to "screw" political opponents with IRS investigations, and heaven knows what else; what of the legally-groundless bombing of Cambodia going on at this very moment.

The able president of the American Bar Association, hard put for an explanation of all this, raised the question "whether lawyers who participate in government, at policy and administrative levels, have not lost that professional detachment from their clients' affairs that makes it possible for them to be objective—whether they are not, as it were, too easy victims of the philosophy that winning an election is all-important." But one can properly question Mr. Robert Meserve's assumption that government lawyers are really so very different from those in the private sector, there is no evidence whatever that the latter have more "professional de-

tachment from the client's affairs" or are less imbued with the philosophy that winning is "all-important." Indeed most lawyers carry their principles and habits from private practice into the government and not the other way around.

The problem is far more basic. Somewhere along the line, from law school to admission to the bar and on through the practice of law, something has gone wrong. Somewhere considerations of the public interest and support for the rule of law dropped out of the vision of too many lawyers. Somewhere the clients' interest became identical with right even to the extent that the end justified any means. Just look at the current scene: corporate lawyers attacking every governmental regulation that is in the interest of the consumer, condoning and defending if not participating in price fixing, representing the management of companies rather than their stockholders; "superlawyers" lobbying to defend and aggravate tax loopholes while obstructing every social program for want of funds; lawyers for unions in obvious conflict of interest, furthering the regimes of corrupt incumbent officers who continue to oppress the members whose dues pay the lawyers. And all this and more is ratified by legal disciplinary committees, staffed from the very firms that engage in these practices who look the other way and spend their time investigating overzealous representation by lawyers defending individual rights and minor infractions by impoverished members of the bar.

The American Bar Association has not been the defender of the public interest over the years. For example, in the old McCarthy days, it yielded to the temper of the times and even supported the excesses of the House Un-American Activities Committee before the Supreme Court and urged the overriding of President Truman's courageous veto of the now practically-defunct Internal Security Act of 1950. Its record in civil rights was no less ignominious; while purporting to speak for all lawyers, it continued its color bar long after segregation had been outlawed by the courts in other areas of public participation. Its support of the confirmation of Clement Haynsworth and Harrold Carswell is equally well known. But, despite this past record, there are many who feel the situation is changing rapidly and that the American Bar Association is dedicating far more of its energies to the public interest today than ever before. This 1973 convention is a rare opportunity for the association to prove that dedication.

The present crisis of confidence in the legal profession presents the American Bar Association with the opportunity and the obligation to demonstrate its new vitality. The simple act of canceling the agenda and focusing every session of every committee or section of the association on the present crisis would evidence to the public that legal business-as-usual is over and that lawyers are determined to clean their own house. Beyond this, there are many subjects to be discussed far into the night at a time when so many lawyers come together: Have the law schools adequately taught the public interest role of the lawyer in society and his unique responsibility for the rule of law in our country? Has there been adequate discussion of this role in legal writings beyond law school? Is there not some way to spell out standards of proper legal conduct in simple terms and to hold the profession to such standards? Have legal disciplinary bodies sought to implement the spirit of the public interest and the rule of law or have they too often exhibited a contrary view? Have the thousands of young lawyers who want to make a career of public interest law been given the support they deserve and is there any way they can be propelled into the leadership of our profession? A public airing of these and other matters would at least evidence the bar's realization of the crisis it faces and its determination to start on the road back.

On Law Day each year lawyers applaud John Adams for his defense of British soldiers, Clarence Darrow for his support of an unknown Tennessee teacher and Charles Evans Hughes for his struggle on behalf of Socialist legislators. The task ahead is to make this image of the public-spirited few a practical reality for the many. The American Bar Association has a historic opportunity to begin the movement in that direction.

THE NATIONAL BLOOD BANK ACT

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, a hospital is not the most likely place where one would expect to contract a fatal disease. Yet at least 10,000 Americans die and 500,000 become seriously ill each year as a result of one of the most simple and routine medical procedures performed in hospitals today—the blood transfusion. These people the the victims of serum hepatitis, an infection of the liver causing nausea, itching, fever, diarrhea, yellowing of the skin, extreme pain, and all too frequently, death.

Serum hepatitis comes primarily from contaminated blood resulting from infectious donors and inadequately sterilized syringes and needles. The most common sources of contaminated blood are the numerous commercial blood banks which buy blood from donors for up to $5 per pint and sell it to hospitals for as much as $40 a pint.

Too often, commercial blood banks are more concerned with profitmaking than with providing safe blood. They are apt to be less careful about the cleanliness of their equipment and less selective of their donors, many of whom are transients and addicts who need money to buy drugs or alcohol.

Paid donors are more likely to carry hepatitis and lie about past illnesses in order to gain a few fast dollars than voluntary donors. Statistics show that blood from paid donors is 70 times as likely to be infected with hepatitis than voluntarily donated blood. Unfortunately, hospitals are forced to use commercial blood, which accounts for over one-third of the U.S. blood supply, or else curtail transfusions.

Commercial blood banks, unless properly regulated, are a danger not only to patients receiving blood transfusions in hospitals, but to blood donors themselves. Serum hepatitis could be spread from donor to donor if equipment used on one person who was a carrier of the disease was not properly sterilized.

Blood banks gained recent attention as health hazards in the 14th District of Ohio when 12 cases of serum hepatitis developed in the past 2 months, raising fears of a hepatitis epidemic. These cases were traced to a commercial blood center in Akron which had no State, Federal, or local regulation. Akron city health officials have had a difficult time tracking down donors who have given blood in the past several months, even with the blood center's help.

Akron Councilwoman Elsie Reaven has introduced legislation in the Akron City Council to place strict restrictions on blood donations as a result of the recent outbreak of serum hepatitis. I think Akron is fortunate to have someone taking this initiative, and I commend Councilwoman Reaven for her effort.

Unfortunately, people do not usually have a choice as to where they are going to have an accident or fall ill and need a blood transfusion, and chances are it will not be in Akron. Safe blood is needed in hospitals throughout the country, and I do not think we can afford to wait until an outbreak of sedum hepatitis moves every local government into taking action to regulate blood banks. We must have nationwide blood safety standards immediately.

One hundred and fifteen Members of the House and myself have cosponsored a bill introduced by Congressman VICTOR VEYSEY which would establish a national program of blood safety. The National Blood Bank Act would establish a national blood bank program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and require the inspection, licensing, and regulation of all blood banks. The program's director would set standards for donor selection, management of inventories, and limitation of paid donors. The bill also authorizes a $9 million national program to recruit voluntary donors.

Mr. Speaker, people are going to stop giving their much-needed blood if steps are not taken to insure greater safety in blood banks. If the supply of safe, voluntarily donated blood dries up, the ability of our hospitals to deal with the medical needs of the American people will be seriously impaired. At this point I insert the text of the National Blood Bank Act in the RECORD:

H.R. 8986

A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, and to establish a national registry of blood donors

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that human blood is necessary for medical treatment and that an adequate supply of pure and safe blood throughout the United States is essential to the welfare of the Nation. Congress further finds that interstate shipment of pure and safe blood and blood components is necessary for the welfare of the United States; that since human blood is a living tissue which cannot be manufactured, an adequate interstate supply of blood depends upon the willingness of individuals to donate their blood; that since the virus hepatitis, malaria, and other diseases are transmitted in human blood and are found significantly more often in the blood of persons who donate for monetary compensation than in the blood of voluntary donors, the purity and safety of the national blood supply is seriously threatened by the inadequate level of voluntary donation and by monetary compensation of blood donors. The Congress therefore finds that the welfare of the United States will be promoted by development of a 100 per centum voluntary blood supply as soon as feasible, that voluntary donation should therefore be encouraged and promoted, and that certain procedures and

standards should be established with respect to the operation of all blood banks in the United States.

SEC. 2. There is established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Blood Bank program.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to assure an adequate supply of pure and safe blood throughout the Nation, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall—

(1) promulgate regulations for licensing and inspection of blood banks;

(2) develop, by grant or contract, new procedures, materials, and techniques to inform the public of the need to donate blood voluntarily;

(3) provide direct assistance to establish an adequate supply of voluntary blood in those parts of the country where it is presently unavailable;

(4) develop a national program to honor and recognize voluntary donors;

(5) establish yearly goals of voluntary donors for each blood bank;

(6) conduct evaluations of the effectiveness of various recruitment techniques and inform the licensed blood banks of the most effective techniques;

(7) classify blood banks as either "class A blood banks" or "class B blood banks";

(A) a class A blood bank is one which collects no more than a specified percentage of its blood from paid donors. The Secretary is authorizd to qualify a blood bank which does not meet this percentage as a class A blood bank if, in his opinion, its previous record of performance qualifies it to be so classified;

(B) a class B blood bank is any blood bank not classified as a class A blood bank";

(8) annually increase the percentage of voluntary donors to qualify as a class A blood bank to the highest level consistent with an adequate national blood supply; and

(9) require that each unit of blood collected by a blood bank be clearly labeled as obtained either from a class A blood bank or a class B blood bank.

(b) The Secretary shall maintain a registry of all persons who give blood after July 1, 1973, to a licensed blood bank and shall identify donors on such registry who may have been implicated in the transmission of hepatitis or who should otherwise be disqualified as blood donors. The Secretary shall notify all blood banks of such disqualifying information.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 4. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Advisory Council to be composed of the following nine members appointed by the President:

(1) two representatives from each national blood bank system, one of whom shall be a person with not less than five years' recent experience in blood bank administration;

(2) three representatives of blood consumer groups including:

(A) one hospital administrator;

(B) one representative of organized labor;

(C) one representative of business management; and

(3) two persons experienced in advertising and public relations neither of whom may be employed or retained during their service on the Council by any firm or other organization which is engaged in operating a blood bank.

(b) DUTIES OF COUNCIL.—The Advisory Council shall—

(1) make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to long-term policy goals to be pursued by the Secretary in carrying out his functions under section 3 of this Act;

(2) make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to the encouragement of blood donation and the motivation, recruitment, and recognition of blood donors;

(3) make recommendations to the Secretary relating to reciprocal transactions between national blood bank systems to the extent that no agreement relating to such transactions exists between such systems; and

(4) make recommendations to the Secretary relating to the removal of the cost for purchasing blood, as distinguished from the combined cost of the blood and its processing, from coverage under health insurance plans.

(c) TRAVEL EXPENSES: PER DIEM.—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Council, members of the Council shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

BLOOD ASSURANCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 5. No person other than a blood bank which is classified as a "class A blood bank" may maintain any program in which individuals deposit blood in advance of their need for blood or pledge to give blood upon request.

PURCHASE OF BLOOD BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 6. No agency, department, or other instrumentality of the Government of the United States shall contract for or pay for the provision of blood from any person other than a class A blood bank and such agency, department, or other instrumentality shall take such measures as may be necessary to insure that such blood has been tested according to the best available test for hepatitis.

PENALTIES

SEC. 7. Any person who willfully violates any provision of this Act or any rule or regulation promulgated thereunder shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, on conviction thereof, be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year, or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this Act, the term—

(a) "Blood" means human whole blood, or any component thereof.

(b) "Blood bank" means any person or other entity engaged in the bleeding of individuals and performing any of the following functions—

(1) recruitment of blood donors;

(2) processing of blood for transfusions;

(3) storage of blood;

(4) crossmatching of blood;

(5) administration of blood to individuals; or

(6) preparation of blood components for transfusion.

(c) "Blood donor" means a paid blood donor or a voluntary blood donor.

(d) "Paid blood donor" means an individual who receives monetary compensation or an adjustment in his scheduled period of prison confinement for his donation of blood or any component thereof.

(e) "Voluntary blood donor" means any individual donating his blood other than a paid donor.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

GILMAN SUPPORTS PRESERVATION OF THE DELAWARE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today pleased to join several of my colleagues in introducing legislation bringing part of the Delaware River into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

That portion of the Delaware which runs through my district will, as a result of this bill, come under the provisions of the Scenic Rivers Act, preserving the natural free-flowing condition of the river by protecting the environment surrounding its banks.

Historically, the Delaware came into being over 300 million years ago, when the Appalachian Mountain range rose, creating the necessary gap for the Delaware's fetal existence.

Anyone aware of its history and who has seen the beautiful Delaware freely flowing with its clean waters and abundance of fish and wildlife can readily recognize the sound rationale in including the Delaware under the provisions of this protective act.

With our cities rapidly encroaching on the relatively few areas of untouched natural beauty, it is incumbent upon Congress to assure the preservation of wilderness areas for future generations.

Including the Delaware River within the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act is a manifestation of our enthusiastic support for the preservation of our Nation's natural beauty.

NATIONWIDE REFORESTATION IS CALLED FOR

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of the House are deeply concerned about obtaining adequate housing for all citizens of the country. Most certainly, achieving this goal is dependent upon an adequate supply of soft and hard lumber for such construction.

Mr. Gene C. Brewer, vice chairman of Southwest Forest Industries, has addressed himself to the problem of realizing and maintaining a reliable supply of wood products for the construction industry. Mr. Brewer's speech, which follows, points out the need for a nationwide reforestation program. I am hopeful that all Members will find Mr. Brewer's facts and remarks helpful in planning for the future.

AMERICA'S FORESTS AT THE CROSSROAD—PROBLEMS OR OPPORTUNITIES

(Address by Gene C. Brewer)

My purpose today is to share certain thoughts and convictions concerning our forests, to provide perspective on our problems and opportunities; and, hopefully, to excite your interest and your pride in our forest industry.

As a nation, The United States is at a forestry crossroad. We are faced with an urgent need to make some decisions—gutty decisions—vital to the economic and social well-being of our nation and vital to our leadership role of the world forest industry.

If our industry has a social responsibility, and I think it does, it is to the future of this nation. In my opinion the most meaningful way we can discharge that obligation is to pursue a vigorous, planned, nationwide reforestation program.

Our posture at the crossroad must be one of a positive and forthright search for solutions which lead to balanced use and full productivity of our forest lands. Choices must be made in an informed and rational way. This implies tradeoffs and compromises because our country cannot afford militant, winner take-all attitudes.

While we're pondering what the future might bring, let's pause just for a moment and reflect on our accomplishments. Let's put aside the goldfish bowl syndrome and the barbs of our critics. Let's recognize that we are responsibly serving some basic needs of the people of our nation—even in the face of heavy odds at times. And, finally, let's not be apologetic for shortfalls of the past.

As we stand at the crossroad, let's hold our heads a little higher and be proud of what we are now doing and in what the pioneers did before us. But let's not kid ourselves either—we can be *proud*, but we must also be humble in our service to our fellow man and take note that our achievements, over time, will be measured in the crucible of the marketplace. So let's see what our problems and opportunities might be.

At this moment, we are faced with what might seem to be insurmountable problems; but, in reality, are great opportunities in worldwide marketing potentials for the products of American forests. However, we also must conclude that if we don't start now to practice intensive management on every forested acre available to us and begin intensive forest management of every idle acre, coupled with an accelerated research and product development program, we will fail to take advantage of our opportunities and, in fact, we won't have enough wood and wood fiber to even meet domestic demands by the end of the century.

In a way, the current "Energy Crisis" has brought our national forestry situation into focus.

The looming loss of heat, motive power, and cooling and lighting capabilities have demonstrated that untoward delay can be catastrophic. On the other hand, in terms of forest productivity, by starting now, we can avoid anything like the worsening "Energy Crisis". And we can do so at great benefit for our nation, for the people of our industry and for the total environment.

A great deal of attention has been focused on our forests and on the profession of forestry in the last four or five years. The resulting publicity, for the most part, has not been favorable. However, it is questionable how many conclusions drawn from this concentrated attention and criticism have any basis in fact.

Some critics argue that we are cutting our trees faster than we are growing them. Some contend that the last tree available to us will be cut down very soon. There are even those who feel that since we arrived on the shores of the Pacific, there is no place else to go—they think we have literally "used-up" America from border to border and from coast to coast. No more frontiers to conquer!

The facts disagree with both the last-tree thesis and the last-frontier idea. We do have yet other frontiers and they are to be found in (1) the increased yield which modern management of our commercial forest base can bring; and (2) accelerated research for improved utilization and new product development, both keyed to the expanding world demand for forest products.

To be sure we understand each other, when I speak of forest products, I am speaking of solid wood and wood fiber in its various forms from timber to tissue, which altogether includes several thousand separate products.

Let's examine the world situation first. Free trade is the essence of American business and foreign policy. The forest industry is an integral part of the total trade structure. Pulp, paper, lumber, plywood, hardboard, and particleboard and many other woodbased items are highly significant worldwide. Today, due to international trade, these products are playing an increasingly important part of everyday living everywhere, and we cannot afford to be isolated from that trade.

Let's first play a numbers game and take a look at population figures. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations estimates that the total population of the world will be about 6.5 billion people by the year 2000—an increase of 3.5 billion, or more than 100 percent—or, simply, two for every one now on earth!

With these figures and economic forecasts as background, FAO and other world forestry leaders predict that consumption of wood products in all forms will double by the year 2000.

To put this in perspective, world consumption today totals about 250 billion board feet annually, in roundwood equivalents.

Double that is indeed an impressive figure!

What does all this mean to our forest products industry, *and where in the world is all of this wood and wood fiber going to come from?*

A satellite view shows that forests cover about 28 percent of the world's land area, or about 9 billion acres out of the total 32 billion. FAO estimates that world commercial timber inventories for both hardwood and softwood total 12.6 trillion cubic feet of softwood and 8.2 trillion cubic feet of hardwood, or a one-third—two-third ratio. The softwoods primarily are in North America and the Soviet Union, and the hardwoods, mostly tropical species, in Latin America, Africa and Southeast Asia, with lesser volumes in North American temperate zones.

So, it would appear, on the surface, that we have enough inventory around the world to take care of growing demand. Therefore, it would seem the only problem is, over the span of time, to move the resource from where it is to where it is needed, at the right time, in the proper form, and at acceptable costs. But let's dig deeper—the timber volume harvested does not follow the inventory, either geographically or by softwood or hardwood. In 1969, worldwide timber harvest figures show the softwood harvest exceeded hardwoods by 2½ times—180 billion to 70 billion board feet—that red flags the danger of a future softwood shortage, with which I'm mainly concerned.

Latin American forests, like those in some parts of the Far East and Africa, are many years away from full development. Not only are they relatively inaccessible, but they are composed of a tremendous variety of mixed hardwoods for which markets and manufacturing technology either do not exist or are only beginning to come under significant research. The exceptions are certain types of mahogany and related species flowing from Southeast Asia and Africa, and some from the Amazon—for the most part in solid wood products—lumber, veneer, and plywood.

Western Europe is intensively managing every available forest acre and has been doing so for a long time, but productive capacity of the land has just about peaked out. A trade journal reported recently that construction of one more pulp mill proposed in Scandinavia could be the last.

The Soviet Union has the largest volume of softwood timber growing stock—about 2.3 trillion cubic feet, or more than one-half (53%) of the world total. However, most of it is in Siberia. This suggests that Russia has the potential to be a more important supplier to world markets; but for a variety of reasons, not much change is expected for the near term.

The U.S. and Canada, combined, has nearly one-third of the total softwood timber stand, or 1.4 trillion cubic feet. But FAO reports that about 40 percent of the harvest presently comes from these nations, which suggests that, here again, harvest and inventory are out of balance.

Fortunately, Canada has an excellent forest land base that is capable, over time, according to the Canadian Forestry Service, of producing twice its current output of about 4 billion cubic feet—in round wood equivalents. Fortunately, too, in many respects, the U.S. is Canada's natural market.

Of particular interest to the U.S. is that, not too many years ago, leaders in Japan also wanted to know where in the world they could go to satisfy pyramiding demands for wood-based products. Then engaged a well-known international forestry consultant and he literally scoured the planet in search of appropriate sources of raw materials for Japanese industry. The results were interesting.

The research pointed up that the best places in the world for Japan to obtain softwood fiber were Alaska, British Columbia and the Pacific Northwest. *The evidence is quite conclusive that the consultant's advice was followed. It appears that the Japanese were alert to our potential long before we were.*

Perhaps they perceived that the forests of North America, generally, and the United States, specifically, have the capability of sustaining substantial additional per acre yield of long fiber softwoods when modern forestry techniques are applied.

In that regard, we have many dedicated professional foresters, in both public and private service, who have the know-how to manage our forests creatively. Examples of their years of planning and researching and intensively managing the productive forest base can be found in many parts of the nation.

Realization of their goals was sometimes an uphill battle against all odds, but renewability of our forests is now an established fact. With well-funded, balanced management programs, we can increase not only per acre yields of timber, but we can improve the forest environment with full recognition of ecological concerns.

Nature has a marvelous system called photosynthesis, which captures solar energy and converts carbon dioxide to lifegiving oxygen to produce what Bruce Barton called, "The Miracle of the Ages, The Tree."

There are other benefits to be accrued in this process of growing and supplying increasing quantities of long fiber softwood to both the domestic and world markets. John Strange, president of the Institute of Paper Chemistry, recently said it this way: "I don't think it's stretching things to say that the forest-based industries are among the principal stewards of the entire ecosystem and that a substantial number of the programs aimed at environmental control and energy conservation would be relatively futile in the absence of this stewardship."

Strange continued, "The fact that our raw material is renewable is important to us, but the fact that it is regenerative to the entire fabric of life is important to everyone!

And Dr. Barry Commoner, the environmentalist, has said, "Forestry is the only natural resource industry that puts anything back."

This, then, is one part of the new frontier!

Let's recall, just for a moment, our earlier discussion about populations around the world. Forget the figures themselves, but remember the fact that the world will soon

have a new dimension in the consumption of the earth's resources, which I don't believe has been fully appreciated.

An emerging fact of life is a growing awareness throughout the world that raw materials are the key to an industrial economy. These resources are often located in undeveloped countries, but these countries are no longer eager to export raw materials which can better be used in developing their own economies and social structures.

So, we must recognize the ability of "Emerging Nations" to buy material things and we must also recognize the ability of "Developed Nations" to compete increasingly for raw materials. Witness Japan and Western Europe.

Now let's examine briefly how the U.S. forest industry has been involved in world trade. Of interest is the fact that we have been a net importer of wood-based products since 1941; and since 1948, the imbalance has been running between 6 and 7 billion board feet annually—expressed in roundwood equivalents.

In 1971, in roundwood equivalents, we exported 7.2 billion board feet and we imported 16.4 billion board feet for a net imbalance of 9.2 billion board feet. Altogether, we produced about 66 billion, so our usage was 75 billion board feet in all product categories.

Quickly, imports were primarily lumber and pulp and paper products from Canada, with smaller amounts of logs and plywood, mostly hardwood from the Far East. Exports were composed chiefly of pulp and paper and logs, with lesser amounts of lumber and plywood.

The United States does a lot of business with Japan, of course, since it is one of the world's largest importers of wood and fiber products. We are heavy suppliers not only of logs and chips, but are shipping increasing quantities of lumber and pulp and paper products. Japan's economy is booming and there is every reason to believe her requirements will continue to expand. Just in pulp and paper products alone, Japanese requirements are expected to double by 1985.

Our country also is supplying markets in Spain, the Netherlands, Ireland, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Portugal, Norway, Iceland, Greece and Yugoslavia and many others. This trade demonstrates that we have the technology to meet virtually any market requirement.

Curiously enough, even though Sweden and Finland dominate the European markets for kraft, newsprint and other paper and wood products, our own multinational companies are supplying some of that same market with many of the same products, and doing so on a highly competitive basis.

We must strive to export more of the things that we *must* do best, and that is produce high-value finished products. Research must lead the way to highly sophisticated production techniques which should become a way of life in this country as we go about the business of selling what we have, and buying what we don't have, in the international market for wood and wood fiber products.

On the domestic scene, we also face problems and opportunities. Simply stated, how do we participate in growing world markets for forest products and, at the same time, furnish our growing domestic requirements? This latter is no small task since it is conservatively estimated that, by 1985, our needs will have increased by 50 percent and doubled by the turn of the century, or before!

As I see it, we have three alternatives—

(1) We can keep the status quo with adverse consequence to our standard of living; or

(2) We can increase our imports with further consequence to our balance of trade and competitive pressures; or

(3) We can accept the challenge and increase our output of finished products by—

(a) Increased annual timber harvest resulting from improved forest management.

(b) Greater utilization of forest residues.

(c) Greater manufacturing efficiencies.

(d) Accelerated research and product development.

In my opinion, alternatives 1 and 2 are not acceptable so we are left with the third, and that is to increase our output.

But here's the crunch. Let's assume that the demographers and the economists are right and that our own and world requirements for wood-based products will double by 2000, which indicates a modest growth rate of less than 3 percent annually. This means *that just to keep even* with the current imbalance of trade, *we must double our domestic output!*

That sounds good. But, on that premise, we would also be doubling our imports and thus be short 18 billion board feet of softwood lumber rather than 9, so this is yet another gap to close. Our nation and its people must rise to this challenge and assume the responsibility for stretching our wood supply to the ultimate through research and applied engineering as well as managing all commercial forest lands intensively so we can grow all the wood we obviously must have.

We need even more of the kind of innovative talent and curiosity that led Dr. Mason to invent hardboard; that led to the development of plywood and particleboard, and hosts of other products.

In wood, we have an efficient, relatively inexpensive, and potentially readily available fiber which, fortunately, provides many beneficial aspects to the environment. As a "for instance," let's take advantage of wood's inherent characteristics and, in combination with elements of the chemical and mineral world, develop a "universal" material that can be "engineered" for a particular requirement. We're doing some of that now, but we need to go much further. Thus, as another part of our new frontier, we need not only to stretch our materials, we need to "stretch our minds"—in short, to imagine what may at present seem unimaginable.

To do less than proceed aggressively on our twin frontiers—forestry and product research—would be unwise and costly, as an even worse crunch will come when international competition for available wood fiber intensifies and shortages begin to appear around the world. We've had a taste of that already.

What can we in the U.S. do about it?

For perspective, consider this. When Columbus sailed, there were over a billion acres of forest land in what are now the 48 contiguous states. The Forest Service has reported that in 1970, about 28 percent of the nation was forested. This means that today, more than 500 years and 200 million people later, there still are 754 million acres of forest land remaining—70 percent of the original stand! Of this 500 million acres are classified as commercial forest land.

When you consider the cities we have built; the farms we cultivate; the highways and the airports that span the country, it is amazing that this much forest land still exists. Consider, too, that 250 million acres have been set aside for non-commercial use. This includes national parks, wilderness areas, national monuments and the like.

On this point, it might seem that the forest industry is "against" these projects. Not at all, but the industry does say these single-purpose, non-commercial uses should be weighed against the other needs of our nation in the scale of public interest.

The 500 million productive acres remaining in the U.S. for intensive management are basic to the market opportunity I have mentioned several times. Of this acreage, industry owns 13 percent. Various governmental jurisdictions own about 30 percent and the remainder, or nearly 60 percent, is owned by about 4 million individual citizens. But, here again, the inventory and harvest are not in line. For example, federal agencies own almost 60 percent of the softwood sawtimber inventory, primarily in the West, and yet contribute only a third to the harvest. For the most part, these timber stands are mature and are not putting on growth—a cogent reason for an orderly increase in harvest, thereby freeing the land for regeneration with its attendant benefits.

In that regard, with adequate funding and intensive management, yield from forest lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service could be increased in the short term by at least 50 percent, according to both retired Chief of the Forest Service Ed Cliff, and present Chief John McGuire. It is further indicated that by 2000, the yield could be doubled—*a dramatic and vital input to future needs.*

Industrial forest owners are doing everything possible to increase yields. Weyerhaeuser Company, for instance, estimates that by using modern forestry techniques, a given acreage may provide up to five times as much wood fiber over a three-century growth cycle than it would if it were left to nature alone.

What basically is needed is a similar attitude and will on the part of the Congress and the Executive Branch—directed to both the public ownership and the millions of small private owners whose 300 million acres offer great potential. Since these private lands represent the nation's most significant underdeveloped fiber source for the long-term, specific legislation providing timber-growing incentives is essential.

On the public side, a redefinition of the mission of the federal timber agencies will be required. No longer is it appropriate for the federal role on these public lands to be custodial. Public lands must be managed productively for the benefit of *all* the owners. All citizens have the right to expect a fair return on their forest ownerships.

Some legislators share that view. Sen. John Sparkman of Alabama has introduced a bill to make it happen. The Sparkman Bill, which merits immediate and continued support, is S. 1775, "The Wood Supply and National Forest Lands Investment Act of 1973." It is co-sponsored by Sen. John Tower of Texas.

Sen. Sparkman's measure would not only stimulate tree growing on small private woodlots, it would establish a forest lands planning and investment fund to provide long-term, sustained financing for timber management and reforestation in the national forests. Sen. Mark Hatfield of Oregon has introduced S. 1996, "American Forestry Act", which authorizes programs to increase all forest values, including timber management on Federal lands and provides forestry incentives for small private woodland owners.

Another measure, sponsored by Sen. Stennis of Mississippi is now a part of the Senate Farm Bill and also provides incentives for indiivdual non-industrial woodland owners.

Historically, our federal land managing agencies have been, and still are, hampered by appropriated fund constraints which do not permit sustained allocation of funds for timber stand improvement, reforestation, mortality salvage, and all other aspects of intensive forest management so badly needed on publicly owned timber lands.

Beyond this, we need a funding method that would assure continuity in research for the development of new products, new meth-

ods of utilization, and perhaps entirely new concepts that cannot be entertained due to the constraints induced by the appropriation procedure.

It's time to get to the heart of the matter and provide permanent financing procedures through "earmarked" funds from timber sale receipts. This will permit the government agencies to make long-term plans and do the job of balanced timber management and product research the nation and the world need and which we know they are capable of doing.

In turn, those in the private sector, dependent on federal timber, must be encouraged to make investments in new facilities and embark on sustained product development and marketing programs.

Putting all this together, it is my view that the projected world demand for industrial wood *can* be balanced with supply, *provided* that all forested areas are developed to full potential and provided, too, that accelerated research and product development is carried on simultaneously. Improved utilization goes hand-in-hand with increased forest yields.

With respect to softwood, it is essential that Canada and the U.S. double forest output over the next 30 years. Russia will become an increasingly important supplier to world-wide softwood markets, but primarily directed to Europe and Japan.

On domestic hardwoods, certain species are now in short supply, but the long-range outlook is encouraging, given reasonable environmental requirements. Tropical hardwoods are plentiful and will become more of a factor in world markets, but economic circumstances and the nature of the forests will inhibit rapid development.

America's forests, as is apparent, are at the crossroad. We have a tremendous challenge ahead if we are to simultaneously meet domestic needs and participate in expanding world markets.

Our problem may be just one of waking up to our opportunity. We have a commercial forest base second to none in the world. We have the technology, a favorable climate, and access to the capital required to implement a program for increased productivity. But we must have a new, vigorous, sense of direction along with a sense of urgency. We know what to do. We know how to do it. What we lack is the will to do it. *We must define our national purpose and goals with respect to our forest lands.* Land is our basic asset. How we put it to use will determine to a very great extent the economic and social well-being of our nation.

Land, literally, lies at the root of man's partnership with the forest. Only we, among natural resource based industries are free of the problem of using up reserves. We are free of that constraint because we are dealing with a predictably renewable resource—the tree! Based on the renewability of the forest, ours is a self-perpetuating industry and we have it within our grasp to initiate programs now which will insure that future generations of Americans will not only have sufficient wood fiber for the necessities of life but will have forests for other social, aesthetic and recreational amenities, also important in the lives of us all.

On that point, I might raise the question, "who in our scheme of things, is responsible for tomorrow?" Bear in mind that in forestry we are not talking about the 5 or 8 year lead time indicated in the energy situation. We are talking about 25–40 years because, by definition, forestry is a long-range business. We are, indeed, at the crossroad and the time span is critical. The year 2000 is only 27 years away—less time than it takes to bring a Douglas fir or a Southern pine seedling to harvest.

Many public figures are claiming that the current "Energy Crisis is contrived—a conspiracy by the major energy companies. I wonder what will be said at the turn of the century if we face a similar crisis in forest products with the possibility of rationed housing, newsprint, and household items.

Now is the time for decisions—gutty decisions by the industry, by Congress, and the Executive Branch. This calls for vision, courage and statesmanship of the highest order because there is no short-term payoff. Once accomplished, however, we'll have sound investments, ever enhancing in value, in research and development programs and in balanced forestry programs on both public and private lands. Forestry, along with agriculture, could well be the lifeline of our nation.

THE COMPREHENSIVE CHRONIC ILLNESS ACT OF 1973

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced a discussion draft of a proposal that would provide all Americans who suffer from disabling chronic illnesses with federally financed home care, nursing home care, and other custodial care. Today, I am reintroducing that proposal, entitled "The Comprehensive Chronic Illness Act of 1973."

In a time of such rampant inflation, to be chronically ill in America is to be chronically in debt. Escalating hospital and doctor bills have driven millions of sick people to the verge of bankruptcy. Many who cannot afford proper care go unaided. The bill is designed to meet both the human and financial needs of those 22 million Americans who suffer from disabling chronic ailments.

Chronic illness is not a problem of the unfortunate few, but of the unfortunate millions. With the advances in medical science, more Americans are reaching the age at which they become vulnerable to arthritis, emphysema, cancer, heart disease, and other chronic illnesses. Nearly 11 million Americans suffer from arthritis alone. Rheumatism afflicts another 6 million. Heart diseases have stricken more than 15 million Americans with another 13 million suspected sufferers. More than 500,000 people suffer from multiple sclerosis. Parkinson's disease, which is primary among the crippling neurological diseases, afflicts more than 1 million individuals, and 50,000 more Americans will be stricken by this disease this year.

The majority of the chronically ill are poor. The poor suffer three times more heart disease than the general population; seven times as many eye defects; five times more mental retardation; and five times more nervous disorders. The victims of chronic ailments have an average income bordering on the poverty level, with the high costs of medical treatment—between $900 and $1,000 a month for some ailments—they often cannot afford the basic necessities for life. Their afflictions worsen when the needed care cannot be obtained; the person is forced to miss more work, thus reducing the level of income still further. It is a vicious circle.

No one is immune from the risk of catastrophic illness, and no one should be left without the means to pay for treatment. The bill I offer would help break the cruel link between health and wealth.

Chronic illnesses know no age restrictions; they disable both young and old. The physically handicapped, the mentally retarded, the autistic child, the young or middle-aged person suffering from multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, heart disease, Hodgkins disease, and other diseases all are equally in need of adequate health care, regardless of adequate health care, regardless of level of income of them, their parents, or spouses.

In recent years, we have become increasingly aware of the misutilization of high cost hospital facilities and institutions for health care which could be accomplished elsewhere. We need a middle ground between the home and hospital. We need facilities where a person can obtain custodial care and still remain in close contact with his family. It has been estimated that 10 percent or more of the chronic, long-term patients in Massachusetts hospitals and institutions could be released if they had foster homes or halfway nursing home facilities available to them. We need to examine our present method of health care delivery to these people.

I know that the legislation I am introducing today is very costly. No clear and definite cost estimate has ever been made. But we know that it will cost several billion dollars. Many will accuse me of irresponsible legislating—of failing to understand that our financial resources are finite. My answer is that I do not offer this bill as the only answer to the problem. I offer it so that we may have a forum from which to speak about those individuals who will not be covered by national health insurance. We cannot simply close our eyes to the fact that millions of people will not get health coverage; that millions of people will be forced into debt and will not receive the adequate care or training which they deserve. If national health insurance cannot cover everyone, then let us admit this and let us at least choose those whom we want to cover. But let us not fool our constituents into believing that national health insurance will, indeed, be comprehensive.

The problem as I see it is that as a Nation we have failed to set our priorities. And one reason we have failed to set those priorities is that we have not clearly articulated them. Obviously, the elderly, the retarded, and others with long-term, chronic conditions are a priority. The question is how much help the Federal Government is willing to give them.

Mr. Speaker, with the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Public Health and the Environment intending to hold hearings on the issue of national health insurance, it is impera-

tive that we not forget the health needs of at least 10 percent of our population.

I offer this bill so that we may finally get down to an honest and forthright discussion of our own capacities as a nation to give assistance to the various citizens who need it.

An analysis of the bill follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The bill will cover the chronically ill who have been neglected by most Federal programs. Services covered by the proposal will include:

1. Nursing home care: medically necessary care and services provided to an individual who is chronicaly ill in a qualified nursing home;

2. Other custodial care: necessary care and services (other than nursing home care) provided to an individual who is chronically ill or is mentally retarded in a facility that meets the requirements established under the Act;

3. Home care: care and services which are furnished to an individual in his home for the purpose of maintaining his health. Such service will include the provision of medication, medical equipment, nursing care, homemaker services, and rehabilitation including occupational counseling;

4. Paramedical care: medically-related care and services which are furnished by an agency approved by the Secretary of HEW;

5. Emergency medical care: the effective delivery of health care services under emergency conditions which are a result of the patient's condition;

6. Education and training: services provided to physically and mentally handicapped children and adults, tailored to their individual needs and provided by nonprofit agencies;

7. Day nursing home care: care and services provided to an individual in an approved facility which does not provide its patients with 24-hour acommodations subject to the same limitations as provided for nursing home care;

8. Night nursing home care: care and services provided to an individual in an approved facility which furnishes nursing home care and other custodial care during the night-time hours, but does not provide the patients with 24-hour accommodations, subject to the same limitations as provided for nursing home care;

9. Weekend nursing home care: care and services provided to an individual in an approved facilty which is primarily engaged in furnishing nursing home care and other custodial care and services from Friday evening to Sunday evening, subject to the same limitations as provided for nursing home care.

The part-time nursing home programs are based on successful experience in Great Britain. The purpose of this kind of care is to provide needed treatment while keeping the patient in close contact with his family.

The restrictions on nursing homes are similar to, but more stringent than, those proposed in the Kennedy-Griffiths bill. These regulations include:

1. The establishment of a 10-member utilization review board which will consist of four members of the general public, two physicians, one registered nurse, one paraprofessional, and two patients, not more than two of whom shall be on the staff of the facility. This board will meet every thirty days to determine the need of future care in each case;

2. Annual policy review on the advice of the utilization review board;

3. Designation of a physician responsible for the execution of such policies;

4. Operation by an accredited hospital or under the supervision of a nursing home administrator licensed by the state in which the facility is located;

5. The requirement that the health care of every patient be under the supervision of a physician, and that a physician be available to furnish the necessary medical care in case of an emergency;

6. Maintenance of adequate clinical records on all patients;

7. Provision of 24-hour registered nurse service sufficient to meet the needs of the patients. At least one registered nurse would be on duty at all times;

8. Appropriate methods for the prescription and dispensing of drugs;

9. Designation of an officer charged with the duty of protecting the legal rights of patients.

Any other custodial care facility must be a nursing home, a public or private institution or training school which is primarily engaged in providing care or training, or both, to the chronically ill. The facility must meet other appropriate requirements as determined by the Secretary of HEW.

All institutions participating in the act must keep written policies and procedures which are subject to the review of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. They must also meet the standards and regulations of the State in which they are located.

Payment to the providers will be determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The act will be funded through general revenues. There will be no duplication of benefits between this act and other governmental programs.

Over a 5-year period, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall complete a study on the costs of providing the care under this act, and he shall transmit his report to the Congress and to the President.

The act will be effective on the first day of the first calendar month which begins 6 months after the date of the enactment.

Mr. Speaker, this program will adequately meet the needs of the chronically ill in America. They have been neglected too long.

FEDERAL POST CARD REGISTRATION

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, I inserted the preliminary results of a poll of the 50 secretaries of State in the RECORD on page 26018. This poll was taken in an effort to determine the amount of support for a Federal post card registration system.

Since many Members indicated interest in the final results of the poll, they are as follows: 40 election officials responded; 3 secretaries felt that a system of Federal post card registration is a better alternative than their current State system; 30 stated that they preferred their current registration system to the proposed Federal post card system; 8 felt that at a given cost other alternatives may or will be better than the post card system; 3 secretaries thought any of the alternatives were acceptable or were neutral. The total number of responses is 44 which is greater than the number who replied, 40. This is due to the manner in which the questionnaire was constructed. It was possible for a secretary to check two alternatives.

I hope all Members will be interested in these responses from the people who are charged with making our registration system work.

"GOODBYE LIBERALISM FOREVER," AN ADDRESS BY THOMAS L. HUGHES, PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, OREG.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to draw to the attention of Members of Congress the text of an outstanding address delivered by Thomas L. Hughes, president of the Carnegie Endowment for Peace, at the commencement exercises at Portland State University, Portland, Oreg., on June 9, 1973.

Mr. Hughes has had a distinguished career in public service, having been for a time administrative assistant to our then-colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable Chester Bowles, and later as Director of the Department of Intelligence and Research in the Department of State.

The text of Mr. Hughes' address, entitled "Goodbye Liberalism Forever," follows:

GOODBYE LIBERALISM FOREVER

(Commencement address by Thomas L. Hughes)

Young women and young men of the Class of 1973, your parents, teachers, and friends:

It took President Wolfe some time to phone. He explained when he wrote: "You were not here in 1969 because we invited Pat Harris. You were not here in 1970 because we wanted Art Buchwald. You were not here in 1971 because we had John Forbes Kerry. You were not here last year because we preferred Marya Mannes. But we want you for commencement, 1973."

Somehow all this rather reminded me of that lovely passage in Margaret Truman's recent memoirs of her father about what actually happened on Inauguration Day, 1953. According to Margaret, the President-Elect, General Eisenhower, tried to force the incumbent, President Truman, to pick him up at the Statler Hotel en route to the ceremonies. Dad, reports Margaret, was very conscious of the fact that he was still President, and he announced: "If Ike doesn't pick me up, then we'll go in separate cars." Eisenhower capitulated and stopped by the White House to pick up Truman. There was very

little conversation during their one-mile ride to the Capitol. Finally Ike remarked he had not come to Truman's own inauguration in 1949 because he had not wanted to attract attention away from the President. That roused Dad, according to Margaret, and he said to Ike: "You were not here in 1949 because I did not send for you. But if I had sent for you, you would have come."

Your President sent for me, and here I am. I come to you, of course, from Washington. There, as we took off, the pilot said: "Directly ahead of us on our line of ascent, at approximately 1:00 o'clock those on the right side of the aircraft can't miss the famous Watergate complex, while on the other side, at about 11:00 o'clock those on the left will have a superb view of the equally famous Lincoln Memorial." All the way in to National Airport to catch the flight the latest bumper stickers were also in evidence: "Free the Watergate 500", "We brake for animals and wiremen", and "Honk if you think he's guilty."

ALMOST CYNICAL

Commencements are, traditionally, the best of times for some—like you. They are the worst of times for others—like myself, whose advance billing on this occasion nearly makes me guilty by association with the whole rotten system. I refer to a recent issue in the Portland State *Perspective*. It began by referring to me as "one of the few genuine intellectuals of the Kennedy era, a funny, skeptical, almost cynical man." These sentiments were snatched from David Halberstam's new book, "The Best and The Brightest". Simple self-restraint prevents me from demonstrating the first three of those characteristics this afternoon. But, I suppose, that "almost cynical" will haunt me, the way quotations from best sellers have a habit of doing, right into the obituary columns.

"Almost cynical". A hell of a lot rides on that almost. I suppose he means something more than the forgivable bouts of soul-satisfying pessimism which anyone of sensitivity must have experienced from time to time during the disappointments of the past decade. "Seeing things as they really are is true cynicism", Noel Coward used to say, thereby proclaiming himself a true cynic. Seeing things as they almost really are makes one, I suppose, almost cynical. Yet my parents would still have been offended by David Halberstam's phrase. They brought me up in the tradition of Charles Kingsley—most often remembered as the author of *Westward Ho*—whose only other claim to fame is his deathbed advice to his daughter: "Be good sweet child, and let who will be clever." She, like me, was clearly intended to be one of the best, not one of the brightest.

THINGS FALL APART

Just as cynicism grew while Americans debated their alleged betrayal by the best and the brightest, so cynicism is now galloping ahead as we confront the high-level crimes of the creeps and the crudest. This is a time of forboding when, as Yeats said, things fall apart. If the Johnson Administration taught us that the best lacked all conviction, the Nixon Administration is teaching us that the worst are full of passionate intensity. The cynics who conceived, ordered, and performed the lies and the laundering, the bugs and the break-ins, the forgeries and the cover-ups, are in part relying upon—and are excused by—their fellow cynics who tell the Gallop pollsters that everybody does it. The result is that Americans in general at this unhappy moment do, in fact, risk being divided between the cynical and the almost cynical.

In his charming autobiographic letters to his grandson, Victor Gollancz tells of a telegram he received during World War I from his best friend at Oxford. The message was sent just before the friend went into action for the first time on the Western front. It ended with the words: "Goodbye Liberalism Forever." Gollancz read it as written, without stops. Only later did he find out that it was the fault of the telegraph office and was supposed to read: "Goodbye. Liberalism Forever!" It was meant as a flaming watchword—not a farewell cry of despair.

A ONCE AND FUTURE LIBERAL AMERICA

Only yesterday the private eyes and plastic bags were well on their way to poisoning the politics of a once liberal America. The plumbers and polygraphers and perjurers whose names are now household words clearly had one thing in common: their liberal chromosomes were missing. Those who sent the burglars and buggers forth with their red wigs and rubber gloves were prepared, you may be sure, to say goodbye to liberalism forever. We are only beginning to realize how close they came to succeeding: how near we have just been to saying goodbye to any near-term chances for an effective regeneration of the liberal spirit in America. The Spirit of '76 which men in the White House had in mind for us, and which animated their conspiracies, was a spirit utterly foreign to Jefferson's Declaration—a spirit that had nothing to do with liberty, nor with the pursuit of happiness, nor with the inalienable rights of men who are created equal. Some of the nation's leaders deliberately set about alienating the rights which other Americans thought they enjoyed by birth.

THE WATERGATE POISON: THAT WRONG CAN BE RIGHT

Nor is there evidence, even at this late date, that those who planned and perpetrated these outrages understand what, if anything, they have done wrong. "All I did", says the indicted former Attorney General, "was to help re-elect the President." By contrast, even Clifford Irving had the honesty to say en route to jail for his fraud sentence: "If I had had the slightest idea it would have turned out the way it did, I wouldn't have done it." By the same token, the residual liberalism of contrition seems to be missing among the President's practitioners of domestic *Realpolitik*. Even this week Mr. Haldeman was reportedly still at his White House desk with the familiar sign on it: "No problem is so big or complicated that it can't be run away from." We shall see.

Of course, liberals and illiberals alike have said goodbye to many forms of liberalism during its rich and checkered history. Moreover it has always been one of the chief frustrations of liberalism, as well as one of its chief glories, that every liberal is free to define it in his or her own way. But the presence or absence of identifiable liberal ingredients also still defines the difference between true cynics and those whose pessimism is tempered with hope.

NOT A DEGREE-LESS MAN AMONG THEM—WHAT DID THEY LEARN?

Thus one wonders what these graduates of institutions of higher learning learned at their alma maters—about the realities behind the phrases that used to trip so easily from their lips: law and order . . . public morality . . . integrity in government. "Watch what we do instead of what we say", said John Newton Mitchell of Fordham and St. John's. Bit by bit we are now learning what he did, and what the others did as well: Colson of Brown and George Washington University; Ehrlichman of UCLA and Stanford; Haldeman of Redlands and the University of California; Mardian of Columbia and USC; Magruder of Williams and the University of Chicago; and so it goes. Not a degree-less man among them, most of them with two, some of them with three, from many of America's most famous educational institutions.

Eagle scouts, lawyers, Junior Chamber of Commerce award winners, YMCA directors, men of the year—think what they might have learned from their liberal educations if they had bothered to do so. Think what they could have brought to their high offices instead of what they did bring:

Instead of zealotry, they could have brought the liberalism of proportionality—the spirit of a government of laws, not men.

LIBERAL SKEPTICISM MISSING

Instead of fanaticism, they could have brought the liberalism of skepticism—that safeguard against being too sure that one is always right.

Instead of trampling over statutory responsibilities, they could have brought the liberalism of respect for institutions established for specific purposes, not to be bypassed, contaminated, subverted, or supplanted at the personal whims of a President.

Instead of the closed circuitry of a private cabal, they could have brought the liberalism of public responsibility, the instincts for accountable leadership and collaboration in an open society.

Instead of unreasoning servility, they could have brought the liberalism of critical loyalty along with the judiciousness which distinguishes it from disloyalty.

Instead of corrupting the domestic scene by importing alien practices, they could have resisted the temptation to overleap the boundary lines between covert operations abroad and Constitutional rights at home.

Instead of creeping amorality, they could have inculcated habits of thought which might have preserved some consequential glimmerings of the difference between ends and means.

Instead of suspending moral judgment, they could have brought the liberalism of self-insight, self-awareness, even conscience.

In short, instead of a crisis of governance, they could have given us a respectably conservative chapter in the world's oldest continuing experiment in building a practical liberal society.

AN UNENDING PROCESS OF LEARNING

The liberal options have always been open—and fortunately remain open—to any American who wishes to choose them. But they are especially available to those whose liberal education best justifies itself as preparation for a liberal life—in the professions, public service, or whatever else. The process is unending, and therefore, so is the hope. And it is appropriate to remind ourselves of that set of liberal themes as well, especially on occasions like this.

A generation ago I remember sitting where you are sitting. The identity of our commencement speaker I have long since forgotten, but I do recall his theme. He told us that there was little hope for humanity unless we proved to be at least twice as good as our parents. By twice as good, he meant twice as free from superstition and prejudice, twice as emancipated from the dying gods of yesterday, twice as able to face facts without disguising or distorting them, twice as clear in intellectual perceptions, twice as inventive in social action, twice as interested in achieving and preserving world peace, twice as courageous in purpose and committed in aim—in short, twice as dedicated, twice as liberal, and twice as mature.

The audience reaction was instantly favorable and unanimous. Our parents nodded their confident agreement with the speaker's

sentiments, smilingly accepting his recitation of their own inadequacies. To the extent that the exhortation to outdo our parents provoked much thought at all among the graduating class, we implicitly responded "that's easy".

A quarter century later, I suspect you do not think it possible that we have been twice as good as our parents. Hence even by the normal criteria of geometric progression, you will presumably have to be many times as good as we. At any rate it is no news to you that you graduate into a society uptight with crises beyond the Watergate—the priorities crisis, the poverty crisis, the racial, urban, cultural, and monetary crisis, and the crisis of Cold War battle fatigue.

I do not know how many of you accept how many of the following propositions, let alone with what degree or fervor or fear. For most militant student colleagues, however, the issues of contemporary industrialized societies have become increasingly the same. They share a common loss of faith in the capacity of existing societies to reform. They are tired of asking the right questions about integration, urbanization, automation, and consensus politics. They are bored with all bureaucracies. They are repelled by the mass media, business comforts, the technological prison, and the malaise of affluence. They are offended by the tamed liberals, the irrelevant labor unions, the hypocrisies of personal ambition and the condescensions of the Old Politics. They feel powerless before the obvious manipulations of the law itself, before the diversion of domestic substance into demoralizing foreign ventures, before the dead hand control of men and ideas whose time has gone.

WE NEED ALL THE MORAL INSIGHT WE CAN GET

But copping out in reaction to these propositions is not very helpful when we need all the moral insight we can get. Thus we shall have no vacation from foreign policy, no time off for good behavior at home, and surely no time off for bad behavior. The arts of dialogue and conciliation—each of them liberal arts—may be in short supply both here and abroad, which means we will need them all the more. In both places the issues always will be what they always have been: the everlasting, value-laden issues of where to stand and when.

Above all else that simple inevitability speaks truth to the generation gap, saying: defy it, span it, close it, work across it, live beyond it. Consider, just consider, that the famous psychedelic barrier of age thirty is not really the generational divide to end all generational divides. I know how intimidating it is. But I suggest that it is not too early for you to start making your own adjustments to the infallible proposition that you will, before long, be thirty-one. Indeed, incredible as it may seem, two and one-half million Americans stop being thirty every year and become thirty-one.

ACCEPT SOME OF THE TRUTHS ALREADY ACCEPTED

Meanwhile in the few years you have left before entering the older generation, I invite you to give some thought to another liberal proposition. You do not have to feel that you necessarily lose your originality by accepting some of the truths already accepted by your predecessors. Allow for the possibility that your generation may not in fact be the world's first discoverers of music or art or the dignity of man—perhaps not even the inventors of sex and peace and justice. There remain a few practitioners of each over 30 whose liberal education is not yet at an end.

Predictions are hazardous. But I suspect that when you are as old as I am, and look back from 1998 on the intervening 25 years, you will be conscious of rediscovering some old discoveries. By then, depending on your temperament, you will be relishing or squirming under the embrace of a new establishment. You will have earned resentments by prematurely retiring men of unique experience like me who will find it self-evident that we merit many more years of public service. We will shamelessly be accusing you of elbowing us aside with an alleged ruthlessness quite unheard of hitherto.

OLD FOGEYISM CAN BEGIN AT ANY AGE

Some things, of course will have changed. Dr. Spock, the steadiest of your lifetime companions—from birth through draft cards crises to the heady politics of war and peace—will have retired by then to write about geriatrics. The children of light and the children of darkness and the children of permissiveness alike will sit in the seats of power. The New Left will have become the Old Left as the New Men themselves grow old. You will be manning old barricades against hordes of youthful nihilists who lack your mellowing appreciation of both substance and style. At best they will regard you as Old Fogies, and you will be accusing one another of the same. What is worse, you will all be right, for Old Fogeyism can begin at any age. Some of you are undoubtedly Old Fogies already. At any rate you will long since have surmounted and survived the Orwellian doomsday of 1984. You will be but two short years this side of Herman Kahn and the year 2000. And as the 21st century rolls around, I anticipate that many of you will be meditating about the timelessness of age and the timelessness of youth.

Like other old men around you, you will have started to believe the liberal proposition that youth is not a time of life, but a state of mind. There is no reason why you should not learn this before you become too old yourselves. Because it, too, just happens to be true. "Are you ready?" Martin Buber asked a group of us on an Israeli kibbutz in 1950. "That is the great question," he said. "Are you ready—for each other, for history, for the world?" Conceivably some of you are ready now. Some others of you will never be. There are others three times your age, who have always been ready—and who continue to live lives full of positive, imaginative, constructive engagement, wrestling with the great issues with undiminished zest. Next to my family, I count as the greatest privilege of my life to have known and worked closely with some of the most youthful members of an older generation. They were liberals. I can report the obverse as well—that I have also worked with colleagues, years younger than I who are among the oldest men I know. They were not liberals. I have been around long enough to tell the difference between the old who are young and the young who are old.

SEPARATED OR LINKED, NOT BY GENERATIONS, BUT BY IDEAS

Sooner or later you will find, if you have not already found, that the great gaps in conversation are not generational gaps, but gaps inside generations. You will be helped in this discovery by the course of events themselves. For a generation never takes power on its own, except in schools and universities. Very shortly now you will have all the rest of us for competitors, critics, and colleagues—separated or linked together by a mutuality of interests or, best of all, ideas.

The links across generations between persons of notably generous spirit—these rank high among the gifts which liberalism forever bestows. Their presence or absence will, I think, be utterly decisive in redefining the character of our national interest, not to speak of making our national interest once again interesting to others. Here is a task which can in full measure all the dedication and spontaneity which the conscience-stricken cutting edge of the graduating classes of 1973 can provide.

Your generation already has a reputation for the intensity of your individuality—your stress on bone honesty, your introspection. Overdone, however, concentration on your individual selves can jeopardize our common democracy. Once more the liberal tradition puts the problem in the constructive balance which it requires. Despite the liberal's individualism, self-awareness, passion for uniqueness, rejection of the lowest common denominator, he or she cleaves to the wider human angle of vision—to the special insights it engenders, the special appreciations it teaches, the special requirements it lays upon our American officialdom and public alike. If you can be both the liberal individualist and the liberal humanitarian, then you will have grasped an essential key to the future, very possibly the key of keys.

ELEMENTS OF SUSTAINING POWER

If these are not the elements of sustaining power that lie at the roots of the only American worth having and holding, then I do not know what those elements are. If I were not sure that these are the ultimate, indispensable underpinnings of America's policies at home and abroad, then I would be prepared to give the cynics their day. If I did not believe that the liberal tradition eternally provides the kind of head start we all need, then I would not see why anyone should expect a new birth of liberalism from you. But as it is, I do.

And so, at the end of the day, I am a liberal without apology, a liberal without embarrassment, a liberal without regret. To the degree that I am sorry for anything, it is not that I am a liberal, but that I am not more liberal than I am.

Here on the rim of the Pacific it has always been easier to say such things than in the convoluted East. "Eastward I go only by force, but westward I go free," wrote Thoreau over a century ago. "I must walk toward Oregon," he added, "and not toward Europe."

Since then Oregon has had more than its per capita share of the nation's liberal leadership and insight. Men and women of both parties have reinvigorated that tradition in public life and carried it forward at critical moments in the recent past. You are doubly fortunate to have learned and labored under the long liberal shadows some of them have cast.

Whatever it is you now say goodbye to, take enough liberalism along with you to last a lifetime of decent, democratic effort. If you do, you will create that "tie between the person and the event" which the poet thought was the "secret of the world."* If you do, you will personally help assure that the inner voice of liberalism will speak as insistently to the better angels of our nature a hundred years hence as it did in the Victorian idiom of a hundred years ago:

Say not the struggle naught availeth,
The labor and the wounds are vain,
The enemy faints not, nor faileth,
And as things have been they remain.

If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars;
It may be, in yon smoke conceal'd,
Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,
And, but for you, possess the field.

For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

*Ralph Waldo Emerson.

And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light;
In front the sun climbs slow, how slowly.
But westward, look! the land is bright!"

—*Arthur Hugh Clough.*

FAIR PLAY

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, this past week Mr. George Bush, chairman of the Republican National Committee, made a statement which brought out extremely important information in relation to the Watergate hearings. It is extremely important in terms of "fair play" during the course of the hearings. It raises some very serious questions about Mr. Carmine Bellino, the man who is currently serving as Chief Investigator of the Senate Watergate Committee. I would like to have the text of Mr. Bush's remarks placed in the RECORD for my colleague's information:

STATEMENT BY HONORABLE GEORGE BUSH, CHAIRMAN, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

A few weeks ago information came to my attention that led me to believe that the Republican National Committee and certain Republican Party and Presidential campaign officials had been spied upon during the 1960 Presidential campaign.

Further there was a strong indication that the spying included the use of electronic devices and possibly even electronic surveillance of the hotel space in which then Vice President Nixon prepared for his television debates with then Senator John F. Kennedy.

Further there was strong indication, and I have no doubt in my own mind that such was the case, that this spying and surveillance had been ordered by a key aide of the Kennedy campaign manager.

I retained counsel for the purpose of investigating and analyzing the information in order that, to the limited extent facts can be gathered without legal or court process, I might know whether there was substance to such allegations or whether they were simply unfounded rumors.

I am now convinced that there is, in fact, substance to the allegations, for I have been given three affidavits sworn to under oath together with other investigative and analytical material which provide that substance.

The Republican National Committee and key officials of the Committee and of the 1960 Presidential campaign were indeed under surveillance and spied upon. This surveillance and spying was for the purpose of watching the movements specifically of one employee of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Ab Hermann, who had important duties in the 1960 Nixon campaign. Mr. Hermann was not aware he was being watched. One of the sworn statements by one individual alleges that it was that person's clear impression that electronic surveillance against Richard Nixon "wrapped up" the debates for then Senator Kennedy.

A second affidavit by a former Inspector of Police of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia states that he was approached on behalf of this same man to assist in gaining access and entry to certain suites at the then Wardman Park Hotel for the purpose of installing electronic eavesdropping devices in those suites.

The man, who according to these affidavits ordered and directed the spying on these Republicans, is the Chief Investigator of the Senate Watergate Committee, Carmine S. Bellino.

I have never met the people who executed these sworn affidavits, but I do have the sworn affidavits. I had planned to release this information at a news conference on July 14, 1973, but one of the men who signed an affidavit, Mr. John Leon, died the previous day. In deference to his widow and family, I cancelled the news conference on July 14.

I cannot and do not vouch for the veracity of the statements contained in the affidavits, but I do believe that this matter is serious enough to concern the Senate Watergate Committee, and particularly since its Chief Investigator is the subject of the charges contained in the affidavits. If these charges are true, a taint would most certainly be attached to some of the Committee's work.

Some will say in releasing this information that I am trying to justify Watergate. That simply is not true.

I have deplored Watergate openly and publicly. I have felt troubled by it and, indeed, sickened by it. I have urged that the matter be promptly resolved by full disclosure. I have urged the prompt calling of all material witnesses.

It is not my intention to be saying, "Oh, everyone does this stuff in politics, so forget Watergate." It is my intention to say that elementary fairness requires that some balance prevail, that serious violations of the public trust have gone on prior to Watergate and that it is a gross distortion to microscopically analyze one campaign and totally ignore what others have done in other campaigns.

I have been seriously concerned at the fervor of attention, at the distortion of perspective on all of this. There was corruption. No honest Republican would deny it. Every honest Republican deplores it. In fact, every honest Republican hates it.

But now I have presented some serious allegations that if true could well have affected the outcome of the 1960 Presidential race. The Nixon-Kennedy election was a real cliffhanger, and the debates bore heavily on the outcome of the people's decision.

If the recollections and impressions contained in these affidavits are true and attempts were made to bug Richard Nixon's hotel suite before the debates to affect their outcome, then the public should know about it.

It also seems important to me, and I believe to any fair-minded person given the sensationalism of Watergate and the vitriolic commentary by some that is being unloaded on the 1972 Nixon campaign and in some quarters on the President himself, that the public realize that the Democrats did, in fact, according to all three affidavits in my possession, spy on an official of the Republican National Committee and that they approached an Inspector of the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department to gain his cooperation in bugging Republican rooms at the then Wardman Park Hotel.

Fair play dictates that the United States Senate immediately conduct an investigation into the charges contained in the attached affidavits. It seems to me in fairness that this investigation be conducted before the television cameras with appropriate parties under oath.

To the extent that any of the allegations contained in the affidavits are true, it is my fervent hope that they will aid this Committee in its quest for legislative answers to ending once and for all illegal, unlawful, corrupt and detestible campaign activities conducted by one camp against the other.

One final point. The justification for the Committee's existence is to design legislation to end the kind of activity that is alleged to have occurred, both in 1960 and 1972, and possibly even in other campaigns in other years and for other federal offices. Thus I urge the Senate Watergate Committee to begin immediately to draft appropriate legislation that will forever clearly make such activity unlawful and to that end I offer my services and the services of the Republican National Committee. I call upon my counterpart, Mr. Strauss and the Democratic National Committee, to do likewise for this issue transcends even the most remote partisan consideration. It has been said before by others but I believe worth repeating that the very confidence of a people in its government is directly proportionate to their confidence in their nation's electoral process. This is a matter not to be trifled with, but one which cries out for the immediate attention of the Senate Watergate Committee, the Congress, the President and all Americans.

COMMISSION ON FEDERAL ELECTIONS TO CARRY OUT THE FEDERAL CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill "To establish a Commission on Federal Elections to carry out the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and to recommend further reforms with respect to regulation of campaign activities; and for other purposes."

This bill contains many of the recommendations of the President of the United States and some of the best provisions of the various bills introduced in this and the other body to date.

The purpose of my bill is to provide a Commission on Federal Elections that is wholly independent, charged with implementing the Federal Elections Campaign Act of 1971 and studying and recommending such changes to that act as may be necessary. I have attempted to make it more attractive for the small contributor to contribute to Federal elections and, unlike the bill passed by the other body, to State and local elections. By the same token, I have limited the amounts that can be contributed to any one candidate and have strengthened what I believe to be the intent of the 1971 Federal Elections Campaign Act—that is, accountability—by providing that only one committee may be authorized to make expenditures on behalf of and receive contributions for any one candidate.

I recently polled the constituents of my district and 1 of the 10 questions I asked was: "Should Federal tax dollars be used to finance election campaigns?" The response I received was overwhelmingly in the negative. I therefore rejected any proposal to federally subsidize our time-honored free elections procedures but have, I believe, achieved the same results as those who advocate such financing by providing for a greater tax credit or deduction, at the election of the contributor, for his contribution to individual candidates.

I believe my bill offers a reasonable alternative to both those that say our present system of elections favors "those that have or can get it" and those that

advocate a Federal subsidy of potential politicians.

Briefly, my bill establishes a permanent five man Federal Election Commission appointed by the President. The Commission is given the power and authority to supervise and implement the Federal Elections Campaign Act of 1971 as amended.

I also establish a Nominating Committee to recommend to the President suitable persons, for appointment to the permanent Commission. This Nominating Committee consists of Members of Congress and individuals from private life. The President is not bound by the recommendations of the Nominating Committee; however, their combined expertise should aid the President in appointing only the highest qualified to the Elections Commissions and result in a balanced effort on the part of the Commission.

The Commission is further charged with conducting an extensive study of the practices engaged in by political parties and individuals in the course of Federal elections campaigns and to recommend to the Congress the changes and reforms it deems necessary.

The Commission is given administrative and investigatory powers and is required to report its recommendations to the Congress and the President by December 1, 1974.

The bill makes it unlawful for any person other than a candidate, an official national party committee, or any official congressional or Senate campaign committee to make directly or indirectly contributions or expenditures on behalf of any candidate, including the authorized committee of that candidate, in any calendar year any amount in excess of $2,500 in case of a Presidential or Vice Presidential election and $1,000 in the case of congressional election. What I mean by the official national committee of a candidate or his authorized committee is that committee that is certified by the Federal Election Commission under the 1971 Act, as amended, and I limit the number of such committees to one and only one. Every candidate for Federal office is required to appoint a single committee to handle his campaign financing. In addition, I have provided procedures whereby a candidate for State and local office, may for the purposes of complying with Internal Revenue Code, designate a single political committee which would then be bound by the campaign act provisions. Intercommittee transfers of money are prohibited.

As I have already alluded, one of the most important sections of my bill is that providing tax incentives for political contributions. I have provided that contributions or gifts of money to a candidate must be made to the single authorized committee appointed to handle that candidate's campaign finances. I also provide for an increase in the allowable tax credit from $12.50 to $250 and for the deduction from $50 to $500, both in the case of individuals.

However, the aggregate contributions and gifts of money by a taxpayer to any such committee may not exceed either $25 for tax credit treatment and $50 for deduction treatment in any 1 year. In order to take advantage of the maximum tax credit or deduction for a political contribution, the contributor would, therefore, have to contribute to more than one political candidate.

The text of my bill is as follows:

H.R. 9983

A bill to establish a Commission on Federal Elections to carry out the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and to recommend further reforms with respect to regulation of campaign activities; 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 "Election Reform Act of 1973".

COMMISSION ON FEDERAL ELECTIONS

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created a commission to be known as the Commission on Federal Elections (hereafter in this Act referred to as "Commission") which shall be composed of five members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom shall be designated by the President as Chairman. In making appointments, the President shall consider the recommendations of the nominating committee made pursuant to section 3. The Chairman, when so designated, shall act as Chairman until the expiration of his term of office as Commissioner. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office but for no other cause.

(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), (A) the Commissioners first appointed under this section shall be appointed for terms ending three, four, five, six, and seven years, respectively, after the date of the enactment of this Act, the term of each to be designated by the President at the time of nomination: and (B) each of their successors shall be appointed for a term of seven years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed.

(2) Any Commissioner appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A Commissioner may continue to serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office, except that he may not so continue to serve more than one year after the date on which his term would otherwise expire under this subsection.

(c) Not more than three of the Commissioners shall be affiliated with the same political party. A Commissioner may not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(d) No vacancy in the Commission shall impair the right of the remaining Commissioners to exercise all the powers of the Commission, but three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The Commission shall annually elect a Vice Chairman to act in the absence or disability of the Chairman or in case of a vacancy in the office of the Chairman.

(e) The Commission shall maintain a principal office and such field offices as it deems necessary and may meet and exercise any of its powers at any other place.

(f)(1) The Chairman of the Commission shall be the principal executive officer of the Commission, and he shall exercise all of the executive and administrative functions of the Commission, including functions of the Commission with respect to (A) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the Commission (other than personnel employed regularly and full time in the immediate offices of commissioners other than the Chairman), (B) the distribution of business among personnel appointed and supervised by the Chairman and among administrative units of the Commission, and (C) the use and expenditure of funds.

(2) In carrying out any of his functions under the provisions of this subsection the Chairman shall be governed by general policies of the Commission and by such regulatory decisions, findings, and determinations as the Commission may by law be authorized to make.

(g) The Chairman, subject to subsection (f)(2), may employ such other officers and employees (including attorneys) as are necessary in the execution of the Commission's functions.

(h)(1) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(60) Chairman, Commission on Federal Elections."

(2) Section 5315 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(98) Members, Commission on Federal Elections (4)."

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a nominating committee, which shall have the duty of recommending to the President suitable persons for appointment to the Commission. Not less than ninety days before transmitting to the Senate the name of any person he intends to appoint to the Commission (or within ninety days before making any recess appointment) the President shall request the committee's recommendations respecting the appointment. Within thirty days after receiving such request, the committee shall submit to the President the names of at least two recommended individuals for each appointment to be made.

(b) The committee shall consist of the following members:

(1) Four members of the Senate, two from each of the major political parties, appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Four members of the House of Representatives, two from each of the major political parties, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(3) Nine individuals from private life to be appointed by the President of the United States, of whom (A) two shall be the respective Chairman of the national political parties having polled the highest and second highest vote pluralities in the last national election, and (B) seven shall be selected from the general public on the basis of their experience and expertise in public service or political science. No more than four of the seven selected from the general public shall be members of the same political party.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), members shall be appointed under subsection (b)(1), (2), and (3)(B) for terms of four years.

(2) Of such members first appointed—

(A) 3 shall be appointed for terms of one year,

(B) 4 shall be appointed for terms of two years,

(C) 4 shall be appointed for terms of three years, and

(D) 4 shall be appointed for terms of four years,

as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(3) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A member may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office.

(4) A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(5) The Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be designated by the committee from among the members of the committee.

(d)(1) Members of Congress who are members of the committee shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee.

(2) Each member of the committee who is appointed by the President is entitled to pay at the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay of Level II of the Executive Schedule for each day he is engaged on the work of the Commission, and is entitled to travel expenses, including a per diem allowance, in accordance with section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(e) The committee shall adopt rules of procedure to govern its proceedings. Vacancies on the committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to continue the committee's activities, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

STUDIES BY COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall——

(1) conduct an extensive and exhaustive study of the practices engaged in by political parties and individuals in the course of Federal political campaigns, which might include, but would not be limited to, such matters as:

(A) the adequacy of procedures for the enforcement of existing laws relating to political campaigns and campaign financing:

(B) the existing and alternative methods of financing political campaigns and limitations on campaign spending;

(C) the review of Federal tax laws as they relate to the financing of political campaigns;

(D) the purposes for which money is expended in political campaigns, such as development of campaign organizations, campaign advertising, voter registration, and polling;

(E) the methods and procedures by which candidates are nominated for Federal office by political parties;

(F) the adequacy of safeguards against unethical, disruptive, fraudulent, violent, or otherwise wrongful campaign tactics;

(G) the interrelationship of Federal, State and local campaigns, and of Federal, State and local laws relating to campaigns and campaign financing; and

(H) the length of the period over which candidates are required to campaign for nomination and election to Federal office;

(2) make recommendations for such legislation, constitutional amendment or other reforms as its findings indicate, and in its judgment are desirable to revise and control the practices and procedures of political parties, organizations, and individuals participating in the Federal electoral process.

(b) The Commission may require directly from the head of any Federal executive department or agency or from the Congress, available information which the Commission deems useful in the discharge of its duties under this section. All Federal executive departments and agencies and the Congress shall cooperate with the Commission and furnish all information requested by the Commission to the extent permitted by law.

(c) The Commission may enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of its duties under this section.

(d) The Commission shall submit to the Congress and the President such interim reports and recommendations as it considers appropriate, and the Commission shall make a final report of the results of the study conducted by it pursuant to this section, together with its findings and such legislative proposals as it deems necessary or desirable, to the Congress and the President at the earliest practicable date, but no later than December 1, 1974.

SUPERVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION PRACTICES

SEC. 5. (a)(1) Section 102 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) The term 'Commission' means the Federal Elections Commission established by section 2 of the Election Reform Act of 1973."

(2) Sections 104(a)(3)(C), 104(a)(B), 104(a)(5), 105, and 308(c) of such Act are each amended by striking out "Comptroller General" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Commission".

(3) Section 301(g) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) 'Commission' means the Federal Elections Commission established by section 312."

(4) Section 302(d), 302(f)(2) (A) and (B), 303(a), 303(b)(11), 303(c), 304(a), 304(b) (12) and 306 (b), (c), and (d), the section heading for section 308, and sections 308(a), 308(b) and 308(d)(1) of such Act are each amended by striking out "supervisory officer" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Commission".

(5) Section 304(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "appropriate supervisory officer" and inserting in lieu thereof "Commission".

(6) Sections 304(a) and 308(a) (1) and (4) of such Act are each amended by striking out "him" and inserting in lieu thereof "it".

(7) Section 307 of such Act is amended by striking out "Comptroller General of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "Commission".

(8) Section 308(a)(7) (B) and (C), 308 (a) (9), and 308(d)(1) of such Act are each amended by striking out "he" and inserting in lieu thereof "it".

(9) Section 309(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "a supervisory officer" and inserting "the Commission".

(b) The second sentence of section 303(a) of such Act is repealed (but such reepal shall not affect any obligation existing under such sentence on the effective date of this subsection).

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect 30 days after three members of the Commission first take office.

LIMITATIONS ON POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Section 608 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (f) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) It is unlawful for any person, other than a candidate, an official national party committee, or any official congressional or Senate campaign committee to make, directly or indirectly, contributions to or expenditures on behalf of, any candidate and the authorized committees of such candidate, during any calendar year, in total aggregate amount in excess of—

"(1) $2,500 in the case of a candidacy for President or Vice President of the United States; or

"(2) $1,000 in the case of a candidacy for the United States or House of Representatives.

"(d) It is unlawful, except as otherwise provided in subsection (c) of this section, for any person to make, directly or indirectly, contributions to, or expenditures on behalf of, any political committee, in any calendar year in excess of the aggregate amount of $2,500.

"(e) For the purposes of subsection (c) of this section the terms 'official national party committee', 'official congressional campaign committee', 'official Senate campaign committee', and 'authorized committee' of a candidate means a committee certified by the Federal Elections Commission under section 304A of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971."

(b) Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 is amended by inserting after section 304 the following new section:

"CERTIFICATION OF COMMITTEES

"SEC. 304A. (a) The chairman of any political organization or party which had candidates for Federal office on the ballot in ten or more States in the next previous Federal election may file a statement with the Commission, in such form and manner and at such times as it may require, designating the Official National Party Committee of such party or organization. Such statement shall include the information required by section 303 of this Act together with such additional information as the Commission may require.

"(b) The chairman of a committee organized by the House or Senate members of any political party having more than 20 per centum of the membership of either the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States, as the case may be, may file a statement with the Commission, in such form and manner and at such times as the Commission may require, designating the 'Official Senate Campaign Committee' or 'Official Congressional Campaign Committee', as appropriate, of such political party. Such Statement shall include the information required by section 303 of this Act together with such additional information as the Commission may require.

"(c) Upon receipt of a statement filed under subsections (a) or (b) the Commission shall promptly verify such statement, according to such procedures and criteria as it may establish, and certify not more than one official national party committee, official Senate campaign committee or official House congressional campaign committee, respectively, for any party meeting the requirements of this section.

"(d) Every candidate for Federal office shall file a statement with the Commission, in such manner and form and at such times as the Commission may prescribe, authorizing a political committee as the single committee authorized to receive contributions, and make expenditures in behalf of, such candidate. No political committee, other than such authorized committee, may, either directly or indirectly, receive contributions or make expenditures in behalf of, such candidate. Such committee may not make any contribution to any other political committee or to any candidate other than the candidate which authorized it; nor may it make any expenditure or other disbursement except on behalf of the candidate who authorized it.

"(e) A political committee, which is not a committee authorized by a candidate under subsection (d) or a committee certified under subsection (c), may not make a contribution to any political committee other than a committee authorized by a candidate under subsection (d) or a committee certified under subsection (c).

"(f) An individual who is a candidate for nomination or election to a State or local office may, for purposes of sections 41 and 218 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, designate a single political committee as the political committee authorized to receive contributions and make expenditures in behalf of such candidate. If a candidate designates a political committee under this subsection, then such committee may not make contributions, or expenditures or other disbursements, except on behalf of the candidacy of such candidate. The definitions in section 301 of the terms 'candidate,' 'political committee,' 'contribution,' and 'expenditure' shall apply for purposes of this subsection; except that in applying the definitions of such terms to this subsection, 'State or local election' shall be substituted for 'Federal election' wherever 'Federal election' appears in the definitions of such terms in section 301. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'State or local election' means an election for a public office of a State or of all or part of one or more political subdivisions thereof."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 1974.

INVESTIGATORY AND OTHER FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agency as it may designate, conduct any hearing or other inquiry necessary or appropriate to its functions anywhere in the United States. The Commission shall publish notice of any proposed hearing in the Federal Register and shall afford a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present relevant testimony and data.

(b) The Commission shall also have the power—

(1) to require, by special or general orders, any person to submit in writing such reports and answers to questions as the Commission may prescribe; and such submission shall be made within such reasonable period and under oath or otherwise as the Commission may determine;

(2) to administer oaths;

(3) to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to the execution of its duties;

(4) in any proceeding or investigation to order testimony to be taken by deposition before any person who is designated by the Commission and has the power to administer oaths and, in such instances, to compel testimony and the production of evidence in the same manner as authorized under paragraph (3) of this subsection;

(5) to pay witnesses the same fees and mileage as are paid in like circumstances in the courts of the United States;

(6) to initiate, prosecute, defend, or appeal any court action in the name of the Commission for the purpose of enforcing the laws subject to its jurisdiction, through its own legal representative with the concurrence of the Attorney General or through the Attorney General; and

(7) to delegate any of its functions or powers other than the power to issue subpenas under paragraph (3), to any officer or employee of the Commission.

(c) Any United States district court within the jurisdiction of which any inquiry is carried on, may, upon petition by the Commission with the concurrence of the Attorney General or by the Attorney General, in case of refusal to obey a subpena or order of the Commission issued under subsection (b) of this section, issue an order requiring compliance therewith; and any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(d) The Commission is authorized to enter into contracts with governmental entities, private organizations, or individuals for the conduct of activities authorized by this Act.

TAX INCENTIVES

SEC. 8. (a) Section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to political contributions to candidates for public office) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "qualifying" before "political contributions",

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking out "$12.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$250", and striking out "$25" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500".

(3) in subsection (b)(3), by inserting "qualifying" before "political contribution", and

(4) by striking out subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this subsection:

"(1) Qualifying political contribution.—The term 'qualifying political contribution' means a contribution or gift of money to an eligible committee, to the extent that the aggregate contributions and gifts of money by the taxpayer to such committee do not exceed $25 in the taxable year.

"(2) Eligible committee.—The term 'eligible committee' means a political committee certified under subsection (c) of section 304A of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 or a political committee authorized by a candidate under subsection (d) or (f) of such section."

(b) Section 218 of such Code (relating to contributions to candidates for public office) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "qualifying" before "political contributions" and by striking out "(as defined in section 41(c)(1))",

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking out "$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500", and by striking out "$100" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000",

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting "qualifying" before "political contributions", and

(4) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) Qualifying Political Contribution.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualifying political contribution' means a contribution or gift of money to an eligible political committee (as defined in section 41(c)(1)), to the extent that the aggregate contributions and gifts of money by the taxpayer to such committee do not exceed $50 in the taxable year."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1972.

SECRET BOMBING, SECRET ANSWERS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I read in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with my colleagues in the Congress, the response of the Defense Department to my Resolution of Inquiry into the secret bombing of Cambodia and Laos. Their answer, as well as the effort of the Armed Services Committee to obtain it, seems incredibly meager in light of the extensive secrecy and deception surrounding these raids.

That a $1.5 billion activity of the U.S. Government can go unreported to the American people and their representatives is, in itself, a terrible affront to our supposedly open processes of Government. But that the authorities who knew about that operation must be bludgeoned by Congress into releasing the information is even more tragic.

After several years of successfully keeping the massive bombing raids secret, the Defense Department has only seen fit to inform the public when sternly prodded. Even with the filing of a Resolution of Inquiry with the cosponsorship of 32 Members of Congress, the information provided is incomplete in several respects. Therefore I have today introduced a new resolution to obtain that data, including: The cost of American aircraft lost, the immediate release of all available records pertaining to American casualties, and the places targeted and hit in the secret raids.

The manner in which this information reached the Congress is indicative of the low priority placed on keeping the people informed that has characterized our military policy in Indochina. I received no communication from the committee, no letter from the Department of Defense, and no advance indication that the statistics were to be furnished. Even at this late date, the Defense Department and the Armed Services Committee continue to exhibit little desire to disseminate the truth concerning our Indochina military activities.

In one sense, the continued silence of those Members of Congress who were informed of the bombing raids—Congressmen ARENDS, and FORD, and Senator STENNIS are the only ones who are alive—is a puzzling and regrettable aspect of this entire affair. That they would allow official misstatements about the bombing go unanswered is another sorry measure of the depth to which secrecy has driven us, and stands as an affront to every Member of Congress from whom the truth was hidden.

For those of my colleagues who were unable to find the reply of the Defense Department in the obscurity of the body of the RECORD, I am inserting below the text of the answers as they appeared yesterday on pages 27751 through 27752:

QUESTIONS OF BOMBING OF CAMBODIA AND LAOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1973, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) submitted a privileged resolution which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The resolution posed a series of 10 questions concerning the extent of the bombing of Cambodia and Laos, during the period January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970.

Immediately, upon receipt of House Resolution 508 by the Committee on Armed Services, a written request was made to the Department of Defense for an expedited report on the questions raised in the resolution.

Subsequent to the introduction of House Resolution 508, Mr. HARRINGTON introduced an identical resolution on July 31, 1973, House Resolution 519, for himself and a number of other Members. Also, on Wednesday, August 1, 1973, Mr. HARRINGTON again introduced an identical resolution, House Resolution 520, for himself and a number of other Members.

Set out below is a communication from the Department of Defense received by the Committee on Armed Services on Thursday, August 2, 1973. The communication is self-explanatory and responsive to the questions raised in the resolutions. I wish, however, to point out that since the response to question No. 5 is classified it can not be included in the public record. The details of the response to question No. 5 are, under Rules of the Committee on Armed Services, available to Members of Congress in the room of the Committee on Armed Services.

The Defense Department's letter and enclosure follow:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1973.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Secretary Schlesinger has asked that I reply to your letter of July 26, which enclosed House Resolution 508.

Attached are specific responses to the questions raised in this House Resolution. As noted, some of these data are under continuing review and other information is not immediately available within the Department of Defense. We are reexamining many of these statistics and will provide your Com-

mittee with an update of them prior to the conclusion of the August recess.

In the interest of making this information available as widely as possible, all but one of these answers have been prepared in an unclassified form. The one classified question is, of course, clearly identified as such.

Sincerely,

JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.

ENCLOSURE: ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS POSED IN HOUSE RESOLUTION 508, JULY 25, 1973

Some degree of error may be expected in the statistics provided herein, primarily as a result of imprecise location of borders and disputed claims. Deviation from earlier release figures may also be expected as a result of the continuing refinement of the data base.

Question: "(1) The number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, over Cambodia and Laos during the period January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970, distinguished by type of aircraft."

Answer: The following data are derived from that already provided to the Congress. They include the entire month of January, 1969. The data provided to the Congress do not permit a separate identification of sorties for the period 20–31 January 1969. We are continuing our review of these statistics to verify their accuracy. We expect that this review will result in changes to these data. Revised data will be submitted prior to the conclusion of the Congressional recess.

	Laos	Cambodia
TACAIR	191,402	22
B–52	8,520	3,630

Question: "(2) The tonnages of bombs and shells fired or dropped on Cambodia and Laos during the period January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970."

Answer: The following data are derived from that already provided to the Congress. They include the entire month of January, 1969. The data provided to the Congress do not permit a separate identification of sorties for the period 20–31 January 1969. We are continuing our review of these statistics to verify their accuracy. We expect that this review will result in changes to these data. Revised data will be submitted prior to the conclusion of the Congressional recess.

	Laos	Cambodia
U.S. TACAIR	476,571	0
B–52	244,586	103,921

No U.S. naval gunfire was used in Cambodia or Laos. No records are available to provide the amount of U.S. artillery expended in the two countries during this period. It is believed to be negligible if any. Not included in these figures are NVN ordnance expenditures nor ordnance expended by the opposing Laotian/Cambodian forces or other third country forces.

Question: "(3) The number and nomenclature of airplanes lost by the United States over Cambodia and Laos during the period January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970."

Answer: U.S. Military Aircraft Losses in Cambodia and Laos 20 January 1969–30 April 1970

	Laos			Cambodia			
	Combat	Operational	Total	Combat	Operational	Total	Total
A–1	28	1	29	0	0	0	29
A–26	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
A–4	7	8	15	0	0	0	15
A–6	7	1	8	0	0	0	8
A–7	8	10	18	0	0	0	18
AC–130	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
B–57	3	0	3	0	0	0	3
C–130	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
CH–3	5	0	5	0	0	0	5
EC–47	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
RA–3	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
RA–5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
RF–4	8	0	8	0	0	0	8
RF–8	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
TA–4	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
U–1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
F–100	16	0	16	0	0	0	16
F–105	19	0	19	0	0	0	19
F–4	53	2	55	0	0	0	55
HH–8	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
HH–53	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
O–1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
O–2	6	1	7	0	0	0	7
OH–6	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
OV–1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
OV–10	4	1	5	0	0	0	5
UH–1	9	1	10	4	0	4	14
UH–2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
YQU	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
Total	186	29	215	7	0	7	222

Question: "(4) The number of members of the Armed Forces of the United States killed, wounded, captured, or missing in action while participating in missions in or flights over Cambodia and Laos during the period January 1, 1965, through July 25, 1973, including the date of and the country in which the member of the Armed Forces was killed, wounded, captured, or missing in action during that period."

Answer: This information is not currently available in the Department of Defense. We have taken action to obtain this information. It will be provided to the Congress prior to conclusion of the August recess.

Question: "(5) The sources of intelligence permitting the identification of priority bombing targets in Cambodia and Laos during the period January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970, including the number of reconnaissance sorties flown by United States airplanes and the names and number of units involved in the collection and processing of intelligence on the ground in or out of Cambodia and Laos to identify priority bombing targets in Cambodia and Laos."

Answers:

The answer to this question is classified SECRET by the Department of Defense.

The classified response to Question No. 5, in accordance with the rules of the Committee on Armed Services, is available for review and inspection by Members of Congress in the rooms of the Committee on Armed Services.

Question: "(6) Documents giving the best available estimate of civilian and military casualties incurred by Cambodia and Laos during the period January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970, including the targets of bombing in Cambodia and Laos."

Answer: We have no documents which provide useful information on the totals of either civilian or military casualties in Cambodia or Laos during this time frame. Several factors prevented the maintenance of such records:

(a) Heavy jungle canopy precluded effective aerial photography.

(b) Heavy antiaircraft fire frequently prevented flying observation craft from making post-strike reconnaissance.

(c) There were usually no on-scene ground observers to report casualties.

(d) Bomb damage reporting that does exist is fragmentary, occasionally inconsistent, and inadequate to support any estimates of casualties.

(e) It is important to realize that many civilian casualties in both Laos and Cambodia have been caused by enemy forces.

Question: "(7) The cost incurred by the United States as a result of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over Cambodia and Laos during the period January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships, and airplanes employed in the transportation, and dropping and firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes during such period, salaries of United States military personnel, during such periods, involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, cost of equipment destroyed or damaged while participating in bombing missions over Cambodia and Laos, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling, during the period January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970."

Answer: Based upon the fighter bomber and B–52 sorties data user for answers 1 and 2, the estimated total costs of these sorties are as follows:

[Millions of dollars]

Fighter bomber	$1,204
B–52	343
Total	1,547

The costs of these sorties are based upon an average cost per sortie which includes such increments as fuel, bombs, maintenance and personnel. The costs do not include logistical support provided from the United States in support of operations, since these costs cannot be identified to specific combat operations. Also, an average cost for B–52 sorties has been used without differentiation between the origins of the sorties.

Also, the incremental costs of these sorties; that is, the differential between the cost of a combat sortie versus a peacetime training sortie is as follows:

[Millions of dollars]

Fighter bomber	$49
B–52	74
Total	123

Again, average sortie costs have been used and this calculation assumes that for training purposes essentially the same amount of sorties would have been flown by the aircraft in order to maintain combat proficiency.

Question: "(8) The names of the military and civilian authorities approving the decisions to undertake bombing in Cambodia and Laos during the period January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970."

Answer: These operations were approved by the Commander-in-Chief.

Question: "(9) The names of the military and civilian authorities approving the decisions to maintain inaccurate files and information and to submit false documents to

Congress concerning the bombing of Cambodia and Laos during the period January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970."

Answer: The dual reporting system for these operations was established to maintain the security directed by senior civilian authorities. The procedures were developed by military authorities. The senior civilian in the Department of Defense in 1969 was the Honorable Melvin R. Laird, Secretary of Defense. The senior military officer was General Earle Wheeler, USA, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

No military or civilian authority made or approved a decision to submit false documents to the Congress.

Question: "(10) The names of the officials in the executive branch and Congress, as well as others outside of Government, who received correct and accurate information regarding the bombing of Cambodia and Laos during the period January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970."

Answer: Attached are two lists of DoD personnel who had varying degrees of information on these operations. One list identifies key personnel for the Planning stage and the other identifies key personnel in the Execution stage.

Listed below are members of Congress advised of these operations. They were not briefed on a continuing basis throughout the operation: Senators Russell, Stennis and Dirksen; Congressmen Rivers, Arends and Ford.

We have no lists of personnel in other departments of the Executive Branch who had access to this information.

KEY PERSONS HAVING ACCESS TO SPECIAL ARC LIGHT STRIKES—OPERATION MENU—PLANNING STAGE, THROUGH MARCH 17, 1969

OSD: Secretary Laird, Deputy Secretary Packard, and BGen. R. E. Pursley.

JCS: Gen. E. G. Wheeler, Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, Gen. J. P. McConnell, Adm. T. H. Moorer, Gen. L. F. Chapman, LGen. J. B. McPherson, VAdm. N. C. Johnson, LGen. J. C. Meyer, MGen. G. B. Pickett, BGen. J. E. Glick, Col. D. P. McAuliffe, Col. F. L. Smith, Col. G. D. Roberts, Col. R. B. Sitton, and Mr. P. M. Kearney.

CINCPAC: Adm. J. S. McCain, Jr.

CINCSAC: Gen. B. K. Holloway.

COMUSMACV: Gen. C. W. Abrams.

The scope and depth of participation by those on these lists varies considerably, all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were kept fully informed. However, they were not involved in planning or discussions outside DoD except when acting as CJCS, Gen. McConnell and Adm. Moorer were the only chiefs who were acting CJCS during the planning phase.

KEY PERSONS HAVING ACCESS TO SPECIAL ARC LIGHT STRIKES—OPERATION MENU—EXECUTION STAGE, MARCH 18, 1969, TO MAY 1970

OSD: Secretary Laird, Deputy Secretary Packard, Brig. Gen. R. E. Pursley, and Capt. D. J. Murphy.

JCS: Gen. E. G. Wheeler, Gen. J. P. McConnell, Adm. T. H. Moorer, Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, Gen. J. D. Ryan, Gen. L. F. Chapman, Lt. Gen. J. B. McPherson, Vice Adm. N. C. Johnson, Lt. Gen. J. C. Meyer, Lt. Gen. John W. Vogt, Rear Adm. M. B. Freeman, Brig. Gen. M. W. Kendall, Brig. Gen. C. A. Jackson, Brig. Gen. J. E. Glick, Col. D. P. McAuliffe, Col. F. L. Smith, Col. E. S. Harris, Jr., Col. R. B. Sitton, Col. B. L. Davis, Col. J. W. Pauly, Mr. P. M. Kearney, Lt. Col. P. R. Zavitz, Col. J. S. Mace, and Col. R. A. Monge.

CINCPAC: Adm. J. S. McCain, Jr.

CINCSAC: Gen. B. K. Holloway.

COMUSMACV: Gen. C. W. Abrams.

Eighth Air Force (SAC): Lt. Gen. A. C. Gillem.

VISIT TO FRENCH ENERGY PROJECT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have received a report from Representative MIKE MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Washington, of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. It is based on his visit to two French energy projects during the committee visit to the 30th International Paris Air Show. His observations and conclusions merit the attention of my colleagues, the executive department, and the public. To solve our energy problems we should learn as much as we possibly can from other nations.

In connection with the visit of members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics to the Paris Air Show, I spent May 29 and May 30, 1973, visiting two major French energy projects: the Rance Tidal Power Station and the Phenix Demonstration Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor. Dr. Thomas Ratchford of the committee staff, accompanied me on these visits. Our hosts for both visits were extremely gracious, informative, and candid in their technological discussion and economic projections.

From my various discussions with French officials several points immediately emerge. The French do not see themselves in an energy crisis. They believe that their nuclear energy program will provide the electrical power they need on schedule. They do not appear concerned with their requirements to import large amounts of oil.

RANCE TIDAL POWER STATION

The Rance Tidal Power Station is located on the Rance River estuary near St. Malo and Dinard on the Britanny coast. During the equinoctinal tides, the amplitudes there reach 44 feet. Mills utilizing tidal power appeared in this area as early as the 12th century.

The Rance estuary is closed off by a 535-foot rock-fill dike and a 378-foot movable dam. The dam contains six sluice gates which permit the exchange of water between the estuary and the sea.

Construction on the project began in January 1961. The first bulb unit—high volume, low velocity horizontal turbine—was placed in service in August 1966. The 24th and last unit was placed in service in December 1967. M. Dominique Roux is the chief engineer and his assistant is M. Picne Simon. Other explanations were aided greatly by Jacques Feuillebois, our interpreter.

The installed electrical capacity is 240 megawatts, about one-fourth the size of large modern thermal plants in this country. Because of the intermittent operation due to the tidal flow, the average power level during 1972 was about 60 megawatts. This means that the total electrical power output was equivalent to about an 8-megawatt thermal powerplant.

The Rance facility is controlled by a sophisticated computer system which feeds its output into the electrical distribution generated where needed. This is necessary for efficient operation, because the tidal power production of course does not necessarily correspond with the demand peaks of the power grid. This further reduces the value of any tidal powerplant.

Of particular interest was the Rance pumping system. The turbines are run backwards to pump seawater into the estuary at a low head; this water then generates electricity at a large head, getting back about 4 kilowatt hours for each kilowatt hour used in pumping.

The tidal powerplant was built and is operated by the French Government power monopoly, Electricité de France—EDF. I was unable to get precise figures as to the cost of the electricity which is generated by the Rance facility, although it is evidently more than 10 mills per kilowatt hour. Tidal power has been judged not competitive with nuclear power by EDF, and the proposal for a much larger power station enclosing the area between the peninsulas of Britanny and Cotentin has been shelved.

The high quality of engineering and workmanship was noteworthy. In fact, the Rance facility was somewhat "gold plated," that is, it seemed to be overengineered and designed as a showcase for this unique French technology. It was working smoothly, and it was quite easy to follow the operation of the plant from the control room. A major technical accomplishment was the cathodic protection for the metal turbines; although they have been exposed to seawater since 1967, there is absolutely no evidence of any corrosion.

As the French readily pointed out to us, the plant is not economically successful, because of the high capital costs, and there is not likely to be any further construction of this type of facility. Their analysis indicates they should go nuclear simply because it is cheaper.

PHENIX DEMONSTRATION LIQUID METAL FAST BREEDER REACTOR

The Phenix Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor—LMFBR—is located in Marcoule, about 30 kilometers north of Avignon. Located on the Rhône River, Marcoule is about 30 kilometers south of Pierrelatte, the French uranium diffusion facility. Phenix is being constructed by the Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique—CEA, and Electricité de France—EDF. It will be operated by EDF.

Dr. Jean Megy is head of Project Phenix and explained the Phenix design and operation in great detail. He was assisted by Andre Cregut, chief of the Management Group; Pierre Gabet, deputy to Cregut; Bernard Guillemard, chief of testing; Tanneguy Le Marechal, deputy to Guillemard; and Pierre Labat, chief of implementation. Mr. George Le Guelte, of the International Relations Section of the CEA headquarters in Paris, accompanied us from Paris to Marcoule and return. He briefed us ahead of time on the activities of the CEA, with emphasis on its breeder program.

Phenix is a sodium cooled fast neutron

reactor with a rating of 250 megawatts electric. This demonstration plant is expected to go into operation late this year. It will utilize secondary heat exchanges with once through cooling from the Rhône. After it has been in operation for about a year, construction is scheduled to begin on a prototype 1,000 megawatts electrical LMFBR northwest of Lyon, also on the Rhône.

The test facility for the fast neutron reactor fuel, Rapsodie, has been in operation at the Cadarache Nuclear Research Center since 1967. The French officials think that potential problems which might arise with the fuel elements and the sodium coolant have been solved with the Rapsodie experiments.

The total cost of Phenix is estimated at $110 million. This means that installed cost by kilowatt would be $440, an exceptionally low figure for a demonstration plant such as this which utilizes advanced technology in a fast neutron environment.

The Phenix design utilizes three cooling loops. One radioactive sodium loop through the reactor exchanges its heat to another — nonradioactive — sodium loop. The second sodium loop in turn transfers its heat to a water loop that furnished steam at 510 degrees C. for the steam turbines. The thermal efficiency is calculated to be greater than 40 percent.

We were most impressed with the Phenix reactor. It will be ready to go on line in the fall of 1973, about 9 years ahead of our first LMFBR demonstration plant. Sodium has already been loaded and sodium tests were underway while we were present.

Although some observers have expressed reservations about this French effort, I am convinced the Phenix reactor will start up as planned, barring some unforeseen accident. The 1,000 megawatts electrical LMFBR near Lyon may well be in operation 2 to 3 years before the first U.S. demonstration plant is on the line. We in this country would do well to learn all we can from the French experience.

CARL DIEFFENDERFER: A YOUNG MAN OF COURAGE

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to call to my colleagues' attention a recent incident in Carroll County that did not capture national headlines, but one that holds a valuable lesson for all of us.

I am speaking of the raw courage and quick thinking of a seriously injured Eldersburg youth who was determined to live and found the strength to do just that. His left leg almost gone from an accidental gunshot blast, young Carl Dieffenderfer, 15, took quick action to save his own life by making a pressure bandage and tourniquet out of his shirt and belt and then dragged himself over a barbed wire fence and then 200 yards out of the woods where he had been hunting to get help.

It is with great respect and admiration for Carl's courage and fierce determination in the face of overwhelming odds that I pay tribute to him publicly today. For it is young men such as Carl who will turn the promise of a great American future into reality. I hope his actions will serve as an example for all of us to follow.

GYPSY MOTH CONTINUES MARCH THROUGH PENNSYLVANIA

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this House the word "environmentalists" was very much overworked. I am not certain how one defines this word, but I like to think I fall into the category of an environmentalist and that I have been one long before many who preach conservation today were born.

In too many instances we appear to have developed a new breed of "instant experts" who disregard the rule of reason and adopt an emotional approach where the environment is concerned. I, personally, have had a few battles with these emotion-oriented individuals in the course of hearings conducted by the congressional committees on which I serve.

These persons belong to that group who cannot see the forest because of the trees. It is a sad commentary that this group is in a position of authority with respect to the establishment of pollution standards and, consequently, must bear the sole responsibility for the destruction of millions of acres of forest trees. In the East, the gypsy moth is having a field day. In the Pacific Northwest, the tussock moth is in the process of destroying more than 400,000 acres of desirable evergreens. Both of these destructive insects were being kept within reasonable bounds until scientific fact gave way to emotion, and the use of DDT was banned. While attempts to find desirable substitutes are being made, the deciduous and evergreen banquet tables continue to be crowded by hungry moths with insatiable appetites.

An interesting article appeared in a recent issue of the York Dispatch, York, Pa. I submit it for the record, hoping that the environmentalists will read it and gain an awareness of the destruction they have wrought through their emotional approach to a practical problem of vast dimensions.

GYPSY MOTH CONTINUES MARCH THROUGH PENNSYLVANIA

The Gypsy moth, with its insatiable appetite for vegetation, has encountered little trouble while eating its way across large areas of Pennsylvania, according to state officials.

Although official figures are not yet in, state forestry officials say the insect could defoliate more than a million acres. Last year's loss, 404,000 acres, was a record.

"We keep trying to tell people," lamented Sydney Kurtz, assistant district forester for a hard-hit four-county area of eastern Pennsylvania. "But it's like everything else. Until it comes, nobody cares about it."

Lack of funds has hampered the battle against the gypsy moth, officials report.

Operating on a $300,000 budget, funded by federal, state and county authorities, Pennsylvania pest control officials this year were able to spray some 40,000 acres with a temporarily effective substance called Dylo.

"If we treated all the infestations that exist, it would run $3 million to $4 million," said Jim Michols, chief of forest pest management for the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources.

RESEARCH FUND

With a $200,000 research fund, the state is working toward developing parasite insects, the only form of control considered environmentally sound. This summer, five varieties of wasps and flies were released. The results now are being evaluated.

Until it was banned in 1963 for environmental reasons, DDT was successful in preventing the spread of the moth.

Over the weekend, Sen. Hugh Scott urged approval of an additional $500,000 to stop the scourge of the forests.

Scott said the additional money would bring to more than $2.2 million the total appropriations request for control of the gypsy moth.

The defoliation is occurring in Pike, Monroe, Carbon, Northampton, Lehigh, Berks, Schuylkill, Centre, Lebanon and Bucks counties, Scott said.

IMPORTED FROM EUROPE

The moth was first imported from Europe to Massachusetts in 1869 for silk producing purposes. Now it is chewing southwestward across Pennsylvania at an average pace of six miles a year. It has been spotted in every county in the state.

Tourism has felt the effect. The moths, in their caterpillar stage, plopped into swimming pools and turned mountain roads into slippery byways. Some disgruntled visitors reportedly cut short their stays in some motels.

"These things will probably be in Harrisburg next year and there's some beautiful trees around that Capitol building," commented Bob Uguccioni, executive director of the Pocono Mountain vacation bureau.

"It's really crazy that that little moth from Europe could have this effect, and we can't seem to get the proper people alarmed enough about this thing," he observed.

FORT WORTH FIVE DEFENDANT NEEDS HELP

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I just received a letter from Paschal Morahan, who is one of the Fort Worth Five unjustly imprisoned in a jail in Texas. He received word that his father is gravely ill and may be close to death. He is seeking the permission of the court to go to Ireland and visit his ailing father.

Mr. Morahan's father was admitted to Merlin Park Hospital in Galway, Ireland, in June for an operation on his hip and for spinal arthritis. Since the operation, he has not responded to treatment making another operation necessary last week. His situation is critical.

It is a crime not to permit Paschal Morahan to visit his father. He and the others have done nothing except to exercise their constitutional rights and privileges. They should not be in jail in the first place. His request for a furlough to visit his father should certainly be granted. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in writing to Judge

Leo Brewster, U.S. Court House, Fort Worth, Tex. 76102, and ask that he grant Paschal Morahan's request for permission to visit his father.

PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAMS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues two reports recently released by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee in conjunction with its review of public welfare programs. These reports are: Paper No. 7—"Issues in the Coordination of Public Welfare Programs," and Paper No. 8—"Income-Tested Social Benefits in New York: Adequacy, Incentives, and Equity."

Paper No. 7 contains studies of the relation to welfare reform of programs for social security, unemployment insurance, day care, health care, and State and local cash welfare assistance. This volume offers the sometimes unorthodox views of six authors on how to achieve a more rational public welfare system instead of the hodge-podge collection of programs we now have.

Two general conclusions which I personally have drawn from these papers are:

Many low- and moderate-income workers gain little or no financial advantage from their own or their employers' contributions to social insurance programs such as social security and unemployment insurance. Because of the peculiar relationship of these programs to cash welfare assistance, they have contributed in vain.

We have developed a two-tier benefit system in programs as diverse as day care, health care, and housing. We directly subsidize these services for some of the poor, and we indirectly subsidize them through the income tax system for upper-income groups. The great losers are moderate-income workers.

Paper No. 8 is a case study of public welfare programs in New York. While findings for other locations might be similar, New York is especially interesting, because the city and the State have made full use of various Federal programs available at local option; they have set eligibility standards and benefits at levels among the highest in the Nation; they have developed many State and local programs to fill identifiable gaps in Federal programs; and because a substantial share of New York City's population receives some public welfare benefit.

Facts on specific areas are valuable to Federal policymakers if we are to understand how laws and regulations adopted at the national level are implemented locally. This study analyzes the disparate and complicated rules in nine major program areas, and examines the level of benefits provided, how fairly benefits are distributed, whether the programs result in disincentives to work, and how effectively they are administered. The program areas include public assistance, food stamps, school lunches, medicaid, publicly subsidized housing, day care, dental care, foster care and homemaker services, and veterans pensions. It is the first analysis of the interrelationship of Federal, State, and city programs in New York and their impact on incentives to increase income.

Copies of these studies may be obtained from the Government Printing Office or the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy.

E. BRUCE CAFKY RETIRES FROM SBA

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, our friend and fellow Oklahoman E. Bruce Cafky, a truly outstanding career public servant, recently announced his retirement.

Bruce Cafky spent 40 years in government service, the last 11 of them as branch manager of the Small Business Administration in Oklahoma. In that position he received a number of citations for superior work.

Whether handling the many inquiries of the public interested in the SBA program, or dealing with natural disasters such as tornado and flood, Bruce Cafky always did a courteous and conscientious job.

The following article released by SBA gives the highlights of his career:

E. BRUCE CAFKY RETIRES AFTER 40 YEARS OF GOVERNMENT SERVICE

E. Bruce Cafky, District Director for the Oklahoma City office of the Small Business Administration, has announced his retirement after 40 years of government service.

Cafky, a native Oklahoman, became branch manager of the Oklahoma operation of SBA in June, 1962. Oklahoma was one of the first states west of the Mississippi River to open a Small Business Development Center. Until his appointment as branch manager, he was in charge of procurement and technical assistance functions in Oklahoma for SBA.

Cafky was responsible for administering SBA's programs in the state for small businesses. These include financial counseling and assistance, help in selling to or buying from the federal government and advice and assistance with management and production problems.

In 1966, the Oklahoma City office, under Cafky's direction, ranked second most effective office in the nation. In 1972, this office ranked 2nd in the 5-state region and is having another banner year in all program categories this fiscal year.

Cafky was reared and educated in Forgan, in Beaver County, then attended the University of Oklahoma. He went to work for the government in 1933, serving in the treasury, interior and agriculture departments, the general accounting office and the bureau of aeronautics before affiliating with the SBA. He spent three years in the Navy in World War II.

Cafky's parents were pioneers of the state, coming here long before statehood. His father, the late O. H. Cafky, spent a lifetime in the banking business in Western Oklahoma as did his two older brothers. His mother, the late Ella Wright Cafky, was active in women's and civic clubs, serving as national committeewoman for the Democratic party and as President of the National Federation of Women's Clubs.

He and his wife Lee live at 4212 NW 36th St. in Oklahoma City. They have one daughter and one grandson.

CONGRESSMAN TOM STEED'S COMMENTS CONCERNING MR. CAFKY'S RETIREMENT

"I am proud to have been Bruce's personal friend for over 30 years and was pleased beyond word when he was presented with a citation a few years ago by the National Small Business Administration. He has done an outstanding job for Oklahoma and SBA and I want to wish him a happy retirement life."

SPEAKER CARL ALBERT'S STATEMENT CONCERNING MR. CAFKY'S RETIREMENT

"I have never known a more devoted public servant than Bruce Cafky. To me, he employs all those qualities which make for an outstanding government employee. His tremendous knowledge in his field; his complete dedication to his mission; his willingness to go the extra mile; his ability to communicate; his eagerness to be of service and his export advice and counsel have all been invaluable in his performance as Director of the Oklahoma City Office of the Small Business Administration. To my staff and me, he is "Mr. Small Business of Oklahoma." Not only have we appreciated and enjoyed our professional relationship with Mr. Cafky, we have treasured our personal relationship with Mr. Cafky. We certainly are going to miss Mr. Cafky but we are delighted that he will now have an opportunity to take a well deserved rest and do some of the things he has always wanted to do but did not have time for in the past. We salute him and wish him every happiness."

DECEPTION PERPETRATED ON THE HOUSE AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I note that several Members of Congress, including Mr. ARENDS and Mr. GERALD R. FORD, were informed by the Pentagon that this Nation was bombing on a sustained basis the neutral nation of Cambodia during a time when our President denied such was taking place.

Without commenting on the monstrous nature of this deception on the American people, let me express my disappointment and regret that our colleagues did not inform us of this policy.

I know the CIA reports only to a few Congressmen and we must accept in faith they are performing their responsibilities properly but it is too much to now agree the Pentagon need only report to a select few who favor their policies and thereby comply with their responsibility to Congress.

Not only do I protest the contempt of our system demonstrated by the President when he lied to the American people and to the Congress when he stated we respected "scrupulously" Cambodian neutrality, but I vehemently protest the action of my colleagues, Mr. ARENDS and Mr. GERALD R. FORD, in with-

holding this vital information from the Congress.

RESTRICTIONS INCREASE TRAVEL COST

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, whenever I am in my district in California, I encounter a number of constituents who express a desire to come to Washington and see in person the workings of the Federal Government, the scenes of historical importance, and the monuments to our national heritage. They tell me, though, that such an excursion is impossible due to the time and effort demanded in undertaking a 3,000-mile automobile trip, and the prohibitively high cost of flying such a distance. As a result, the vast majority of my constituents have never been able to take advantage of the valuable experiences to be gained from a visit to the Nation's Capital, experiences which I do not feel should be denied any American.

A bill will soon be coming before the House which will partially remedy this situation, increasing the economic feasibility of air travel for many of my constituents, and Americans in general. This bill, H.R. 8570, is an amendment to the Federal Aviation Act of 1959, whereby the restrictions that have hampered the growth and development of low-cost Inclusive Tour Charter—ITC—vacation travel within the United States will be removed.

An ITC is a tour package designed in accordance with principles of mass purchasing. Long popular in Europe, where over 12 million people took advantage of them last year alone, these packages consist of transportation on a specially designated charter flight, and in many cases, food and lodging. Volume sales contribute to radically decreasing the cost of these items. An ITC would permit a constituent from my California district to save up to 50 percent over the cost of a nonpackage vacation in Washington.

In addition to the personal benefits millions of American travelers will receive from ITC's, the American tourism industry will get an enormous, and much-needed boost. The low price-tag of an ITC will serve not only to influence greater numbers of our countrymen to expend their travel dollars within the United States, but also to encourage foreign travel to our country.

Americans should be given all possible opportunities to see their native land. The westerner should see the East; the easterner should enjoy the beauties of the West. As more people become able to travel around the country and experience the personal contact with the people and places of other regions, we might look forward to a growth of communication and understanding among the American people, and an enhancement of our sense of national identity. With this goal in mind, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all Members to vote in favor of H.R. 8570 when it comes before the House.

The National Air Carriers in a recent publication point up the air needs of the country as follows:

Business and industry should "expand their efforts to bring the cost of travel, lodging and means within reach of millions of additional visitors" to the nation's bicentennial celebrations. Air carriers and shipping lines should "continue exploring new ways of inexpensive transportation to and from this country."

—President Nixon, July 4, 1972.

One out of every two Americans have never taken a vacation away from home. More than 50 million over the age of 18 have never traveled by air.

Yet in Europe it's a different story. Millions of people of modest means find that they can afford to take not one, but two, flying holidays each year to such places as Spain, Greece, the Middle East, or Africa.

During Senate hearings on May 15, 1973, Senator Howard Cannon, chairman of the Aviation subcommittee, compared vacation travel opportunities in Europe and the U.S. "While we like to say we lead in most areas," he said, "I think insofar as low-cost mass transportation is concerned, it appears that we do not lead in that field and they are quite well ahead of us."

One reason for the difference in vacation travel habits on the two sides of the Atlantic is price. Most European governments encourage low-cost travel. As a result of these policies, last year 12 million of their working people purchased inexpensive one-stop Inclusive Tour Charters (ITCs), popularly known as packaged holidays.

The U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) will not permit the sale of similar budget holidays to Americans, or to foreign citizens who wish to visit the U.S.A. Though one-stop Inclusive Tour Charters have been the most popular mode of vacation travel abroad for some 15 years, they are still barred from our airlines.

Meanwhile the cost of domestic travel keeps rising. Airlines received governmental approval for two increases in domestic air fares, totaling nearly 9 percent, within the past two years.

In a report to the President on June 25, 1973, the National Tourism Resources Commission said, "The European experience with package tours shows that the concept has merit . . . if air travel within the United States were more economical, Americans might be less inclined to vacation abroad . . . it is difficult for the United States to compete with inclusive tour charters to other countries when restrictions are applied to mass air travel opportunities to this country."

TRIBUTE TO BILL HUDDY

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call to the attention of the Congress today a man who, for 20 years, has distinguished himself as a broadcast journalist. Mr. Bill Huddy of Santa Barbara, Calif., is a dedicated and tireless individual who exemplifies the very essence of public broadcasting in America today.

A nationally recognized and honored television newsman at television station KEYT channel 3 of Santa Barbara, he is anchor man for the "Bill Huddy Report" which marked its 20th year with KEYT on July 24, 1973. During this time he has personally logged 10,000 broadcasts, a remarkable achievement in itself.

In 1972 KEYT News of Santa Barbara and the "Bill Huddy Report" were awarded five Golden Mike Awards for excellence in broadcast journalism by the Radio and Television News Association of Southern California. This had never been accomplished previously by any man or station in the history of the association.

Nationally, the Radio-Television News Directors Association, on whose board of directors he is privileged to serve, recognized him for distinguished achievement in broadcast journalism. There is no finer compliment than one's own colleagues from across the Nation taking a rare action such as this one.

In addition, countless service clubs, philanthropic organizations, charities, and associations have time and time again counted on KEYT and the "Bill Huddy Report" to assist them in whatever manner they could, and they have frequently commended both Bill Huddy and the television station for the immense display of community concern with which they responded. Both the Air Force and the Naval Reserve have likewise honored him. Indeed, his contributions, on the screen and off, weigh mightily in promoting community understanding among the many areas KEYT serves.

Bill Huddy is active in national campaigns to protect what he feels is a most cherished freedom of ours, freedom of speech. As chairman of the rules committee of the national Radio-Television News Directors Association, he authored and saw through to passage at the national convention a resolution urging strong shield laws for newsmen throughout the Nation.

A native Californian, he was born in Los Angeles and launched his career in broadcasting with KIST radio of Santa Barbara and KCMJ of Palm Springs. He and his wife, Jean, have two sons—Bill Jr., 19, and Bryan, 17. Bill Huddy is a member of the Navy League and is a vice president of KEYT.

Bill is not only a personal friend of mine, but is known and respected by many individuals throughout the country. He is a man of outstanding character and ability, dedicated to the quality of excellence in his field. I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Bill Huddy and television station KEYT on the tremendous accomplishments and honors of the past, and in wishing them every continued success in their ceaseless efforts to achieve broadcast excellence.

HANDICAPPED VETERANS WHO TRAVEL BY AIR

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, a wounded veteran of

World War II, who has had shrapnel imbedded in his chest for some 25 years, has brought to my attention the complications encountered when traveling by air because of the magnetic inspection procedures that have been instituted at all airports. In response to my inquiries directed to officials at the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration, the suggestions to alleviate these difficulties were given to me to pass on to my constituent, and, since this may be of interest to others with a similar problem, I am asking permission that the response from FAA be include in the RECORD.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I feel it would also be appropriate to commend the FAA for the effective inspection procedures that have been established and the success achieved to date in deterring airplane skyjacking.

The suggestions to handicapped veterans follow:

SUGGESTIONS TO HANDICAPPED VETERANS WHO TRAVEL BY AIR

Present airport security measures for screening passengers and their carry-on baggage apply to everyone without exception, the Federal Aviation Administration says.

However, the agency has issued special instructions to airline security personnel urging them to process the handicapped in a "tactful, effective and considerate manner." Instructions note that ambulatory patients generally can be cleared with walk-thru or hand-held detection devices, but those confined to wheelchairs or those with prosthetic devices, shrapnel, etc. may require a consent search consisting of a simple "pat down."

To further expedite the screening process, a handicapped person should:

1. Call the airline in advance requesting special handling or a private screening, if desired.

2. Arrive at the airport early. This will give security personnel sufficient time to make the security screening checks required by law.

3. Identify himself. FAA suggests that handicapped veterans use the Veterans Administration's "Prosthetic Service Card," VA Form 10-2501 and/or present a letter from the VA or his personal physician that indicates that the individual has shrapnel or surgically implanted metal devices in his body which might trigger the screening detectors.

4. Cooperate fully. In many cases, the "pat down" consent search may be the fastest means of clearing a handicapped person and it is suggested for some of the handicapped air travellers.

FAA's main concern is to assure safe flight to all air passengers. The 100 percent screening program is designed to accomplish this.

SWISSVALE BOROUGH MARKS ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation prepares to celebrate the 200th anniversary of its birth, I believe it fitting and proper to salute the many communities which have played a role in its growth and development.

Therefore, on behalf of my colleagues, I would like to extend the congratulations of the U.S. House of Representatives to a small community in western Pennsylvania which is marking its 75th anniversary.

The borough of Swissvale, although formally chartered on July 30, 1898, will be observing its diamond jubilee August 13–18 and a gala celebration has been planned by local merchants, civic leaders, and elected officials. The borough occupies its own niche in the history of the United States for it was named by a woman novelist who achieved national recognition for her work with the underground railroad during the Civil War—Jane Grey Swisshelm.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in wishing the residents of Swissvale the very best on this occasion and may their future be as rich as their past.

RESTORING OUR PROMISE TO VA PENSIONERS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, the House passed a worthy bill to provide a cost-of-living increase to those most in need in the non-service-connected pension program. But during this period of runaway inflation, there is still a need which is unmet in this area. At the beginning of this year, 1.6 million Americans—about 70 percent of those receiving non-service-connected VA pensions—were notified of reductions in their allotments. These cutbacks were not the result of any affirmative income-producing activity on the part of the pensioners themselves. Rather, they resulted from the 20 percent increase in social security benefits which the Congress overwhelmingly approved last year. Pending before the Veterans' Affairs Committee is a bill which I have cosponsored—H.R. 4751—which is intended to deal with this problem. The bill provides that the 20 percent increase in social security benefits approved last year shall be disregarded in determining a pensioner's entitlement under the non-service-connected pension program. This legislation is vitally needed to both insure that the intent of Congress in passing the social security increase be fully implemented and to guarantee to those recipients of Federal aid on fixed incomes that their needs will be met during this period of rampant inflation.

The fact that the distribution of non-service-connected pension benefits is geared to a recipient's income does not sufficiently explain to the 1.6 million non-service-connected pensioners who are social security recipients why they cannot receive the full benefit of last year's congressional action. The reduction of non-service-connected benefits in this instance in effect discriminates against a particular class of social security recipients by making the value of the increase voted them last year less than the value it has to others. While Congress last year voted the VA pensioner receiving social security benefits an average increase of $26.50 per month in his social security benefits, the net increase in the income of the non-service-connected pensioner will be only $19. This kind of discrimination against a certain group of social security recipients is simply not justified. The immediate concern should be with making adequate provision for those receiving assistance during a period of runaway inflation. That concern was expressed last year in the Congress' action with regard to social security.

What was done in 1972 to meet a pressing need should not be undone, even partially, in 1973, when that need still exists.

The necessity for legislation like H.R. 4751 becomes even clearer when one considers the human effect of these pension reductions. Those receiving non-service-connected pensions exist on the margin of subsistence. The maximum income limitation for payment of non-service-connected pension benefits is $2,600 per year for persons without dependents and $3,800 per year for pensioners with dependents. Even the most minor of downward adjustments in the income of these Americans to meet program formulas can impose the harshest of human costs. Examples of these harsh results are legion. One constituent of mine—a veteran of both world wars—wrote to me that the social security increase last year raised his total annual income to $2,633.04—$33.04 above the income limitation for the non-service-connected pension program. As a result of this increase, veteran benefits of $1,158.96 were terminated. The net effect on this veteran's income was a loss of approximately $700 per year.

To be sure, this constituent of mine presents an extreme example of the problem addressed by H.R. 4751. But this kind of result is a far cry from what Congress intended in enacting the Social Security increases last year. Those pensioners receiving social security benefits had the right to rely upon the actions of the 92d Congress, to believe that Congress meant what it said last year, and to expect that the full increase in aid they received last fall would not be suddenly reduced by winter. Downward adjustments of income legitimately relied upon by these veteran pensioners play havoc with their lives. It is a harshness of present Federal programs which should be ended—and it will be ended if H.R. 4751 is adopted.

Like the legislation we have recently passed, H.R. 4751 is limited legislation to deal with a particular problem—the full implementation of congressional intent with regard to the social security increase of last year. As such, it would not be inconsistent with any attempt to look at the broader picture. I would hope that the Veterans' Affairs Committee would favorably report H.R. 4751 and restore the commitment Congress made to these 1.6 million pensioners last year.

THE 1973 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, both here and abroad the 1973 Captive Nations Week observance was a huge success. As in the past, in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Chicago, Los Angeles, and in many other cities citizens rallied to express their hopes and feelings toward the 1 billion of mankind still held in totalitarian Communist captivity. This augurs well for our future America.

The following indicate these expressions:

First. Proclamations by Mayors Moon Landrieu of New Orleans, Clifford S. Bartholomew of Allentown, Pa., and Maurice A. Ferre of Miami, Fla.; and

Second. Reports in the Binghamton, N.Y., Press and Svoboda concerning the week and rights in Ukraine.

The material follows:

COMMUNITIES PREPARE TO MARK CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

NEW YORK, N.Y.—Scores of communities across the nation have finalized plans for the annual observances of the Captive Nations Week, designated for the third week of July each year by Public Law 86-90 which was passed by U.S. Congress in 1959 and signed by the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The law "authorizes and requests the President of the United States to issue a proclamation" on that occasion and to continue issuing such proclamations each year "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

Since 1959, each President of the U.S. has issued such a proclamation. Last year, President Nixon issued such a document on the eve of the CN Week and is expected to do likewise this year.

The nation-wide observances, involving ethnic communities whose members trace their ancestral ties to the nations held captive by the Communists, are preceded by similar proclamations issued by state governors and city mayors. To mark the Week, special committees are set up in various centers of the U.S. The National Captive Nations Committee is headed by Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is also president of the UCCA.

Ukrainian Americans, usually in the forefront of these observances, take part through local chapters of the UCCA.

Prof. Dobriansky has sent out a letter to all U.S. Senators and members of the House, reminding them of the Captive Nations Week resolution and public law 86-90 and calling upon them to make appropriate statements on the floor of the Congress.

Among the first to do so was Rep. Edward J. Derwinski (R.-Ill.) who on June 4th reminded his colleagues of the annual observance and its importance to the cause of freedom for the nations held captive by the Communists. Mr. Derwinski entered into the Congressional Record an article by Dr. Dobriansky, titled "On the Threshold of New Captive Nations." U.S. Senators and Congressmen are expected to make their statements in the course of the CN Week, beginning Sunday, July 15, through Saturday, July 21.

In New York City, Mayor John V. Lindsey will sign a proclamation Tuesday, July 17, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Hall's Blue Room.

The actual observances in the city will begin Sunday, July 15, with a Liturgy at St. Patrick's Cathedral at 10 a.m., according to an announcement of the CN Week Committee headed by Judge Matthew Troy.

The religious services will be preceded by a parade down Fifth Avenue from 59th street. After the services at St. Patrick's, Judge Troy and many guests of honor will lead a colorful parade up Fifth Avenue to 72nd street, then up to Central Park Mall where a rally and a concert will be held.

On Thursday, July 19, a motorcade through midtown Manhattan will start at 6 p.m. from First Avenue and 40th Street.

The Ukrainian contingent in these events will be led by the officers of the United Ukrainian American Organizations which constitutes the local UCCA chapter.

CITY OF ALLENTOWN, PA.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Communist Russia, which has engulfed the countries of Eastern and Central Europe, the territories of half of Asia and Cuba at the very doorstep of the United States, continues to demonstrate its aggressive policies in many parts of the world; and

Whereas, the avowed aim of Communist Russia is the enslavement of the entire free world, including the United States; and

Whereas, the people whose native lands have suffered the horrors of Russian captivity, will never allow the cause and spirit of freedom to be stifled; and

Whereas, the United States of America remains the true citadel of freedom and hope of all the oppressed peoples in the world; and

Whereas, the observance of "Captive Nations Week" throughout the United States will dramatize the plight of the captive and enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain; and

Whereas, the Lehigh Valley Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America will mark this year's "Captive Nations Week" with appropriate ceremonies to be held on Sunday, July 15, 1973. Nineteen hundred and seventy-three marks the Fifteenth Anniversary of the first Proclamation of "Captive Nations Week".

Now, therefore, I, Clifford S. Bartholomew, Mayor of the City of Allentown, Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim that the week of July 15-21, 1973 be observed as—"Captive Nations Week".

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, each year, Captive Nations Week has served as a dramatic demonstration of the solidarity of the American people with their captive brethren in East-Central Europe; and,

Whereas, the justification of Captive Nations Week was forcefully stated in the following words of Public Law 86-90: "The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace;" and,

Whereas, nationwide observance, preceded by Captive Nations Week proclamations by the President and by Governors and Mayors of many states and cities, offer Americans a public platform for manifesting their continued concern for the plight of 100 million East and Central Europeans living under Communist rule; and,

Whereas, it is surely in the interest of the free world to do everything in its power to encourage and support the will to freedom to the Captive Nations of the Soviet empire—because, in the words of PL 86-90, this bill to freedom "constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace:"

Now, therefore, I, Moon Landrieu, Mayor of the City of New Orleans, do hereby proclaim the period of July 15-21, 1973 to be "Captive Nations Week" in New Orleans.

PROTECTION FOR DIPLOMATIC COMMUNITY IN NEW YORK

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, New York City proudly hosts the United Nations and the approximately 200 foreign missions and consulates which comprise its extensive diplomatic community. But the substantial cost of protecting that community has fallen, unfairly I believe, on the New York City taxpayer rather than on the Federal Government.

Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation to:

First. Extend executive protective service coverage to the United Nations and the diplomatic community in New York City, and

Second. Reimburse New York City for the additional security costs of the United Nations' 25th anniversay celebration in 1970.

Joining me in cosponsoring this legislation are: BELLA ABZUG, JOSEPH ADDABBO, HERMAN BADILLO, MARIO BIAGGI, JONATHAN BINGHAM, FRANK BRASCO, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, JAMES DELANEY, ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN, EDWARD KOCH, PETER PEYSER, BERTRAM PODELL, CHARLES RANGEL, LESTER WOLFF, and JOHN MURPHY.

As one of the world's central cities, New York hosts numerous foreign diplomatic and trade delegations and has always provided the necessary support for them. With its many foreign consulates and missions, New York proudly plays a vital role in world affairs, but the city cannot afford the cost of supplying police protection to the diplomatic community itself. Such a burden is an unfair demand upon New York residents.

The police and security problems of the diplomatic community are actually more demanding in New York City than in Washington. New York has nearly 200 consulates and missions compared to Washington's 122 embassies. The Federal Government provides executive protective service for Washington diplomats and fairness dictates that coverage be extended to New York City as well.

In addition, the U.N.'s 25th anniversary celebration called for heavy police protection costing over $2.6 million. These expenses should be covered by the U.S. Treasury with a reimbursement to the city.

Under my proposal, the 70 police now assigned to guard the foreign missions in midtown Manhattan would be more effectively employed in directly protecting the citizens of the city—and at an annual saving of $1.9 million.

Each time world tensions increase, whether in the Middle East or as a result of the treatment of Soviety Jewry or an even such as the Munich Olympic massacre or because of racial policies in South Africa or Rhodesia, special security problems arise and New York police are required to provide additional protection. This represents an additional drain on New York's already overburdened police force.

I therefore urge support for this legislation which would free both city police

and city funds for use in other essential areas in New York City.

HEROIC ACTION

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the recent heroic action of a young man from my district has been called to my attention by my friend and colleague, Congressman WALTER B. JONES, who represents the First District of North Carolina. I would like to share this wonderful story.

Mr. Randall Edwards, while vacationing at Atlantic Beach, N.C. on June 12, 1973, rescued four individuals from the turbulent waters of the Atlantic Ocean, while approximately 100 people stood by watching without attempting to help those in danger.

Randy is a native of Bristol, Tenn., and was educated in Tennessee and Florida. He is presently employed at Bristol Univac and is married to the former Nancy Huff. They have two wonderful children, Stevie, age 4, and Jamie, age 2.

This young man is an avid outdoorsman and he enjoys hunting, fishing, and swimming. His newest interest includes karate, and he has already earned his first belt.

Randy, who is 23 years of age, is a very modest man and does not feel that his actions deserve any special praise.

However, I cannot agree with him. I feel his courage merits the highest recognition.

This story is the perfect modern-day example of the parable of the Good Samaritan, who stopped and ministered to the needs of a fellow human being, rather than passing on the other side of the road.

I nominate Randy for the highest award in heroism this country or any organization can bestow and I am pleased and proud to bring this remarkable feat to the attention of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD readers.

The following narrative furnished me depicts a full account of this incident:

The following people are involved in this narrative:

Mrs. Howard T. Waldrop (Gay) and her daughter, Tricia (9 years old) 1207 Drexel Lane, Greenville, North Carolina.

Mrs. Ray Hassell (Judy), Gay's daughter, Morehead City, North Carolina.

Wendy Cayton (11 years old), Morehead City or Beaufort, North Carolina.

Randy Edwards (Randall S.) 206 Hemlock Road, Bristol, Tennessee.

On June 12, 1973, while on the beach near the Sportsmen's Pier at Atlantic Beach, Gay Waldrop noticed that her daughter, Tricia, and Wendy Cayton had drifted out farther than she wished on a rubber raft. She did not consider that the girls were in danger because they were less than one hundred feet from shore; however, when she motioned for them to come in they did not respond.

After requesting help from men on shore and being refused, Gay went after the girls herself. When she reached them, even though she could still touch bottom herself, she could not get the footing necessary to push the raft toward shore and soon found herself in water over her head, swimming the side stroke and trying to push the raft—unsuccessfully.

When Gay's older daughter, who was on the beach with her two pre-school children, realized that her mother was in trouble, she entered the water to try to help. Judy is a strong swimmer and a certified Water Safety Instructor. She could neither get the raft to shore nor help her mother.

Meanwhile people on the shore and on the pier were gathering and seemed to be aware of the dilemma, but no one took any action either to help the four people or to seek help. Eventually two young men made an attempt to move the children on the raft toward shore, but were unsuccessful. Finally Randy Edwards, who had just come on the beach, realizing that some one was in trouble, swam out. After several efforts, he managed to get the children to the beach, leaving Gay and Judy still in the water, Gay holding onto the raft and Judy swimming.

After taking the children to safety, Randy returned to assist Gay, who was exhausted by this time. With Randy's help, Gay managed to get on top of the raft so that he could push it more easily. However, each time he pushed the raft toward shore where he thought she could gain her footing, she was carried out beyond his grasp by the action of the waves. Time after time he went back for her, and finally, after she had been in the water for approximately half an hour, he was able to get her to shore.

Meanwhile, Judy was still swimming, but could not get in through the riptide. Randy immediately turned his attention to her. By this time a rope with a life-ring had been supplied, and Judy was pulled to safety.

It should be pointed out, that except for the two young men who had tried unsuccessfully to help, none of the many, many on-lookers on shore offered any assistance. Gay was not able to get the names of the men because they had disappeared by the time she reached shore.

Randy Edwards' persistence and courage, in face of great danger to himself, saved four people from needlessly drowning (with more than one hundred people looking on).

Gay feels that it was an act of God that Randy was on the beach that day. He was on a vacation with his family and had planned a deep-sea fishing trip. However, he had decided against the fishing trip because of seasickness on the previous day. He had arrived on the beach after this drama had begun.

It should be noted that the water did not appear to be rough on that day. However, immediately after this near tragedy occurred the beach was posted and closed to swimmers for the remainder of the day.

CAN IT BE THAT JOHN DEAN, OF ADMITTED GUILT, WILL SUCCEED IN HIS SCHEME TO TALK HIS WAY OUT OF A TRIP TO THE PEN?

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the massive publicity generated by the Senate select committee and by the news media in an effort to prove that President Nixon had been informed that some of his aides were secretly involved in a Watergate coverup conspiracy, has caused many Americans to wonder what effect this movement, regardless of its ultimate outcome, will have on the accountability of such admitted criminal conspirators as John W. Dean III. Tapes have taken over recently and may prove to be useful, but people still wonder what is going on.

While the President's possible involvement is of vital interest, if proven, I find many people deeply concerned about the guilty whose trials may be affected by the Senate hearings. The thrust of the inquiry now seems to focus on the President. Referring to the committee's primary objective a July 2 issue of Newsweek stated:

A member of the committee conceded privately last week that, whatever the legislative purposes of the inquiry, it amounts to a trial of Richard Nixon.

With evidence of guilt stacked heavily against him, Dean's strategy since his exposure has been to admit complicity but to seek immunity from prosecution at any cost. Exploiting to the limit the forum provided him by the Ervin committee, which granted him immunity from prosecution for anything he might choose to say, the former White House counsel made a pitch for public sympathy and at the same time sought to cash in on the extremely generous treatment accorded him by such publications as the New York Times, the Washington Post, Time, and Newsweek magazines.

Accordingly, with the help of two lawyers he prepared an elaborate 245-page statement, carefully tailored to achieve his objectives, and expertly designed to maximize its usefulness for TV coverage.

DEAN'S MOTIVATIONS AND STRATEGY

To evaluate Dean's veracity, his motivations, and the grand strategy to escape punishment, it is well to review some of the activities his course of action has followed and the degree of apparent success to which he can point thus far.

It was on last March 21 that John Dean, then counsel to the President, at the urging of Richard A. Moore, a senior White House aide whom Dean often relied upon for advice, sought and obtained a private meeting with President Nixon for the purpose of disclosing what he knew about the Watergate coverup, activities. Although Dean now claims the President already had knowledge about some aspects of the coverup it is significant that it was not until March 21 that he sought a special audience in order to divulge his own complicity and other coverup details he evidently assumed the President knew nothing about as of March 21.

It appears that Dean's defense plans began to jell after one of the top Watergate convicted burglars, James McCord, wrote a letter to Judge Sirica in which McCord charged that others were involved in the scandal. Dean knew that could include him. At about that time, according to Time, the White House counsel developed a fear H. R. Haldeman was back-pedaling, and Dean "was beginning to protect his flanks." A written report on the Watergate scandal, requested by Haldeman, was partially completed by Dean but withheld while he secretly sought legal advice. At that point he frantically began a series of secret meetings with the Justice Department prosecutors, hoping for immunity in exchange for his testimony.

The real payoff came on April 17 when President Nixon announced there would be "no immunity" for any White House people involved. At the March

21 meeting the President reportedly told Dean he had to go before the grand jury without immunity. Dean, according to Newsweek, took all of that as a threat to him personally and 2 days after April 17 vowed "never to be made a scapegoat." Two weeks later he was fired, and the grand strategy to escape prison was accelerated. He readily embraced and decided to exploit the role of Judas in the official White House family.

DEAN SEEKS IMMUNITY FROM JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

The press reported that following his dismissal Dean returned to the Justice Department, again offering to incriminate others as a trade-out for immunity. But the prosecutors apparently felt they had the goods on him and declined his offer. He then rushed to Capitol Hill where he went into a huddle with Ervin committee staffmen—seeking immunity. In accordance with committee practice, he had to outline his proposed testimony, what he had to offer that would justify the committee to take the extraordinary action of granting immunity from prosecution. The committee had been searching in vain for evidence which would link the President to knowledge that a coverup had taken place. Dean was very much aware of the committee's dilemma, and he made the most of it. The committee promptly accepted his offer and immunity was arranged.

Speaking of John Dean's craving for immunity, one pundit said of him:

I'll talk and I'll talk, with impunity. But only if I'm granted immunity.

Archibald Cox, the special prosecutor, tried in vain to block the televised testimony of Dean, fearing the immunity and the publicity would jeopardize the Government's criminal case it was preparing against the former White House counsel, now recognized as a ringleader among the conspirators. Cox then filed with Judge Sirica sealed copies of evidence the Government had accumulated against Dean, and expressed the belief a case could be made without it being fatally affected by anything which might develop during Dean's forthcoming committee testimony, to which immunity would apply.

In appraising John Dean's motivations, it should be kept in mind that he made no secret of his obsession against going to prison. One Washington press report stated Dean feared his youthful appearance would make of him a special sex target at the hands of fellow prison inmates.

JOHN DEAN'S ANTIPATHY FOR PRESIDENT AND OTHERS

After or perhaps before he left the White House John Dean developed a bitter attitude toward the President and some of Dean's former coworkers. On the eve of his departure he seems to have collected copies of all the memos and other documents which he might be able to use to embarrass the White House. In fact, during his committee testimony he produced 50 exhibits, only a limited number of which related in any meaningful way to the Watergate scandal. They included items obviously offered for the sole purpose of publicity and designed to embarrass the President and Dean's former associates—not relevant to Watergate at all.

Since the non-Watergate portion of Dean's testimony serves to illustrate an ignominious aspect of Dean's modus operandi, a few examples will be cited.

Taking advantage of freedom to talk about anything or anybody, whether related to Watergate or not, Dean produced an informal list of 200 names put together in the summer of 1971 by a White House staffman, which Dean claimed "the White House staff" considered to be the administration's prime domestic enemies. There was no claim the President had in fact ever seen the list or approved it, but it made top billing for the TV audience and the press. Although prepared more than a year before the Watergate burglary, and could have no remote connection with factual information relating to the alleged coverup, it afforded Dean a rare opportunity to vent his spleen toward the White House and court the favor of the press.

Dean's ingenuity and sense of news appeal paid off for him. The list of "enemies" which he sneaked out of the White House gained top coverage. Time magazine, for example, described it thus:

The most bizarrely captivating documents that John W. Dean turned over to the Ervin committee were the ones from the White House (relating to the "enemies").

Dean felt impelled to let the world know that in the White House he picked up a piece of gossip from some source that periodic surveillance of Senator EDWARD KENNEDY was surreptitiously ordered by somebody—as if that had any remote relationship to the Watergate scandal which was supposed to be the subject of the committee hearing.

As another example, Dean felt his role as a star witness was further enhanced by disclosing an occasion he said the President saw a lone man carrying a 10-foot sign stretched out in front of Lafayette Park, within sight of the President's window, and that prompted the President to order "thugs" to be gathered to take care of the protester. How utterly absurd and how petty could a witness indulge in his efforts to ridicule the man who had adorned him with a high position of honor and trust.

As everyone in Washington knows, there are pickets in front of the White House every week carrying an assortment of banners. It goes without saying that if anything resembling Dean's report actually occurred, it had to be a big joke, perhaps based upon a wisecrack. In any event no "thugs" were gathered and there was no surveillance of Senator KENNEDY. Above all, what possible relevancy could such nonsense have to the subject of the committee's inquiry—the Watergate coverage? But it made good copy for headlines.

There were any number of other descriptions of incidents, totally and completely unrelated to Watergate, included in the free-wheeling, sky's-the-limit 245-page hodgepodge, obviously presented for embarrassment and to endear the White House turncoat to the news media. His long-range purpose was, of course, to add fuel to news reports and, hopefully, aid in his battle to "beat the rap," as jailbirds call it.

Dean's far-ranging non-Watergate breaches earned for him the unenviable sorbriquet of "John the squealer."

THE REAL NITTY-GRITTY OF THE GRAND STRATEGY

Even Newsweek recognized John Dean's desperate plight, and reported "he is equally concerned with staying out of prison." Then added:

His chances now depend heavily on his making such a splash before the committee that he will at last be granted immunity by the Watergate prosecutors—or, alternatively, that his case will be thrown out of court because of publicity.

John Dean did make good on his assurance to the committee staff that he would implicate the President in Watergate. That was evidently the key output which gained for Dean the committee's promise of immunity against prosecution for anything he might choose to say, and enabled him to take full advantage of much sought and much needed publicity called for in his grand strategy.

RICHARD MOORE'S BOMBSHELL

What neutral observers recognize as the biggest single bombshell that has been tossed into the hearings thus far was the testimony given by venerable Presidential Aide Richard A. Moore. After telling the committee in carefully measured words that Dean on March 30 confided in him for the first time about Watergate coverup matters, Moore insisted that Dean promptly relay all the information he had directly to the President. Dean assured Moore that he was convinced the President was in the dark about the coverup activities. Following Moore's urging, Dean sought and obtained the March 21 meeting with Mr. Nixon, following which Dean told Moore his report had included everything he knew to tell, and that the President showed surprise.

Moore, quiet-like but positive about what he remembered, was undoubtedly the most impressive witness from the standpoint of truth and veracity, relating to the coverup, that the committee has thus far heard. Commenting on Moore's devastating testimony, the Wall Street Journal editorially stated:

Mr. Moore is one of the few Watergate witnesses who inspires personal faith . . . His conduct before the committee, finally, carries the ring of a man who is not telling a contrived story but merely relating the truth as he sees it.

DEAN'S PUBLICITY MAY PAY OFF

Despite the committee's grant of immunity, it must be kept in mind that the Department of Justice maintains that it had already accumulated enough evidence to justify a conviction. But he appears to have good reason to hope that the massive publicity he achieved at the hearing may insulate him against a sustainable conviction. There is considerable judicial precedent to justify that belief.

In the case of United States against Delaney, which publicitywise was somewhat similar to the Watergate case, a Federal circuit court held that the publicity in that instance prevented a fair trial and required a reversal of the conviction. That publicity, of course, was mild indeed compared with the Senate committee hearings, particularly as applied to John Wesley Dean III.

If publicity, aside from immunity, was

John Dean's chief objective, it was more than realized. In addition to nationwide TV coverage of his testimony, newspapers pulled out all the stoppers and both Time and Newsweek featured Dean on their front covers 2 weeks in a row. Rarely if ever has such recognition been accorded an admitted participant in a criminal conspiracy.

Incidentally, most of the press coverage seemed to discount the seriousness of Dean's unauthorized withdrawal of $4,850 from a $15,200 account which he was holding in trust for undetermined political use by the Republican Party. He said that his raiding of the cookie jar was mostly to pay for his wedding last fall. He admitted he did not bother to replace the money which he took illegally until this spring when, on advice of his lawyer, he put the entire $15,200 in a trust. That was probably the best advice his lawyer has ever given him.

This misappropriation may be considered relatively unimportant, but in the minds of many people it serves as an alert warning concerning John Dean's reliability.

HEARINGS DIFFICULT TO CONTROL

Grave concern has been expressed about the conduct of the hearings. Such emotionally packed inquiries are difficult for any committee to contain, although I am sure the committee did not condone audience outbursts of partisan approval or disapproval during the testimony of witnesses. Such expressions may have an adverse and perhaps irreparable effect on the listening audience and jeopardize possible convictions. A Houston Chronicle editorial deplored the practice, and commented:

> Outbursts of hissing and laughter are detracting from the dignity and purpose of the hearing. Carried a little further, the Watergate hearing will become an audience participation show.

The July issue of Newsweek coverage of Dean's testimony was interspersed with the following: "The audience burst into stormy applause." "The audience cheered." "The audience roared with laughter." "It got lost in the titters of the audience."

All of this adds to the sum total of the publicity picture which enveloped the hearings during Dean's appearance, as well as that of others, and will undoubtedly figure significantly in any criminal prosecutions.

PEOPLE WANT WATERGATE CONCLUDED

Mr. Speaker, the public has a right to expect John Dean and every other proven participant in the Watergate scandal to answer and be held fully accountable for their misdeeds against society.

We can only hope the select committee will soon be able to conclude its hearings. It seems to be generally agreed that thus far the committee's efforts, however well intentioned, have produced more thunder than lightning so far as light on the proof of guilt of Watergate suspects is concerned. And it may be that more reliable evidence will be forthcoming. That remains to be seen.

We do know that many Americans are fed up with Watergate. They want every proper step to be taken, but they want the issues resolved. They know that seven principals in the break-in and bugging have been tried and convicted—long ago. If there are a half dozen—or a dozen—others who did anything wrong, then they wonder why it is necessary to spend a million dollars to finance the hearings and some $4 million to finance an array of 36 special prosecutors to perform a function which many think could and should be done within a few weeks by a hard-working, well-directed grand jury.

Unfortunately, the accuracy of public knowledge of the true facts relating to Watergate still leaves much to be desired. Certainly televised testimony such as that given by such "Waterbuggers" as James McCord and such coverup conspirators as John Dean must leave a terribly distorted and obviously confused and misleading understanding of what the true facts are.

ENTIRE NATION SUFFERS

Moreover, the public has shown understandable concern over the adverse effect this type of publicity is having upon America, both at home and abroad. If substantive results are achieved, that is one thing. Certainly some dignified and enlightening testimony has been heard. But if, as in the past, most of the testimony features conflicts, self-serving claims, cross-accusations, unconfirmed rumors, nonrelevant aspersions, hearsay impressions, and TV-oriented exposure, comprise the total product—that is quite another thing. And it tends to tarnish the Nation's image and tends to undermine confidence in governmental processes. We can only hope that some good, somehow, will come out of the overpublicized inquiry. Again, it remains to be seen.

DRUG ABUSE

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am today cosponsoring legislation which is being introduced to implement the Crime Committee recommendations concerning drug abuse in our schools.

During the hearings conducted by the Select Committee on Crime, it was found that drug abuse in our schools has increased at an alarming rate—that 80 to 90 percent of all high school students have been introduced to drugs and that the problem is now serious among elementary school children.

A recent Gallup poll showed that since March of 1971, drug addiction has risen from seventh to third place on the public's list of "most important" national problems.

The number of heroin addicts has also been steadily rising—from 315,000 in 1969 to 559,000 in 1971. By March of that year, President Nixon officially determined that the heroin menace in this country had reached the dimensions of a "national emergency."

In addressing this grave problem, the legislation which I am cosponsoring today will accomplish the following objectives:

First, a program of Federal assistance is established to enable each school board in the country to develop a plan directed at ending drug abuse in the schools. In this regard, each school district should institute programs of instruction for its teachers whereby the teachers are thoroughly educated in the drug abuse problems germane to the school district and school at which the teacher is employed. Schools are also encouraged to condition promotions and salary increases on attendance at such drug abuse programs, and there should be drug abuse counselors for every school which requires them.

Second, a program of Federal support to State and local school agencies is established to enable them to train counselors and parents, as well as teachers, on the subject of drug abuse. Therapy and peer pressure group programs to rehabilitate these young people would also be included.

This legislation, when enacted by the Congress, will undoubtedly have a meaningful impact in lessening the extent of drug abuse throughout our country's school systems.

The entire thrust of this legislation is to prevent drug abuse amongst students in our Nation's schools.

For too long, teachers, school administrators, school boards, and even parents have ignored the problem in the blind hope that the scourge of drug abuse would not strike their students or their children.

Close cooperation between schools and law enforcement agencies will be emphasized in the drug education programs that will be undertaken if this legislation is adopted.

It is the aim of this legislation to turn the tide against those who seek to make our schools havens for drug abuse.

When students really understand that they only get one chance to live life and that drugs destroy the capability and human potential they possess, the students' attitudes and opinions will come down on the drug dealer, and those who seek to infect fellow students with the disease of drugs.

One of the most significant findings of all of our investigations into drug abuse in schools was that students themselves were pushing drugs on other students and that the nature of drug use was infectious.

When a convert to drugs "turned on," the first thing he sought to do was turn on his friends and associates—first for the fun of having companionship in drug use and later for the pure profit of dealing in drugs and, of course, to support his own drug habit.

The legislation introduced today is broad in scope and ambitious in design but the problem confronting U.S. parents, U.S. students, and U.S. schools is very, very large.

I urge early consideration of this bill by the appropriate committees to make this program a reality.

I would like to emphasize to my colleagues two other important recommendations of the Crime Committee which do not require specific legislation, but which do require dilligent followup efforts by the Congress:

First, it was recommended that there be a continued investigation and research program into the propriety of placing

more rigid controls on the production and distribution of barbiturates not already placed under strict government control; and

Second, that Congress carefully monitor over-the-counter drug advertisements on radio and television to determine the effectiveness of the industry's efforts at self-regulation.

These two additional recommendations of the Crime Committee are most important if the attack on drug abuse is to be comprehensive and ultimately successful.

SENIOR CITIZENS DEDICATE "JOHN FRASER HALL"

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Allegheny County Housing Authority dedicated a new $1.6 million, senior citizen, high-rise apartment building July 26 in the Borough of Turtle Creek, Pa.

This community is part of the 20th Congressional District, which I am proud to represent, and I want to assure my colleagues the construction of this edifice is greatly appreciated by many of its residents. It is more than just a 10-story building of brick and stone to them. It is home. It also is evidence that Government can do something to help the people of this Nation who have given it so much for so long.

John Fraser Hall was built through the combined efforts of Turtle Creek's officials and civic leaders, working in cooperation with county, State, and Federal authorities, including the Department of Housing and Urban Development. With its completion, the county housing authority now has the responsibility for managing approximately 3,400 units, both elderly and family, in this section of Pennsylvania.

Taking part in the dedication ceremony were some of Allegheny County's most prominent figures, who lauded the hours of unselfish efforts and years put forth toward the building's completion. Words of tribute came from Mr. Thomas R. Finlon, chairman of the county housing authority; Mayor Thomas I. Stevenson of Turtle Creek, and Mr. John J. Rettger, president of the borough council; County Commissioners Leonard C. Staisey and Thomas J. Foerster, and Mr. James W. Knox, executive director of the housing authority.

Mr. Knox presented the key to the new building to its eldest resident, Mrs. Beatrice Eisele, a gracious lady of 91, and it was my privilege to furnish it with an American flag that had been flown over our Capitol. This was raised into position by Mrs. Patricia M. Meyers, manager of the building; Mayor Stevenson; Mrs. Mary Sauter, the first tenant, and Louis Kreiling, Jr., commander of American Legion Post 640.

During the course of the ceremony, it was mentioned that if more Federal officials left Washington to view what can be accomplished with tax dollars perhaps there would be less of an inclination to impound funds for domestic programs which our people need. I find a great deal of truth in the observation.

I might also point out there is an historical significance to the new John Fraser Hall. It is built near the site of Fraser's Trading Post, which was located in 1753–54 on the west side of Turtle Creek at its junction with the Monongahela River. The ground now is occupied by Edgar Thomas Works, U.S. Steel Corp., but there is a marker calling attention to the original tenant of the area. Mr. Fraser came to Turtle Creek from Venago, Pa., when the French occupied that area. His stay was short, however, and he abandoned the post when the French advanced to Fort Duquesne.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure I call the dedication of John Fraser Hall to the attention of my colleagues and I invite them to join me in wishing the new residents many years of enjoyment in their new home.

PROBLEMS FACED BY SMALL, NONPROFIT MUSEUM GROUPS

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to have located within my district a fine example of an organization which is dedicated to the people of its community—an organization which is making every effort to continue in its service, despite insurmountable financial obstacles.

The Merabash Museum in Willingboro, N.J., has operated over the past 3 years on a most meager budget and has only survived due to the determination and resourcefulness of its founder and president, Mark Henderson, Jr.

I believe Mr. Henderson's remarks before the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts and Humanities in support of the Museum Services Act are, therefore, most appropriate. Hopefully, his statement will provide my colleagues with a better insight into the problems faced by small, nonprofit museum groups.

STATEMENT BY MARK HENDERSON, JR.

Merabash Museum transformed its purpose, objectives and philosophy into effectively, active and stimulating programs in less than one year, attesting to the perception, initiative and sincerity of the organization.

Four highly successful exhibitions have been presented, capturing the attention of the communities and winning public acclaim. Total attendance exceeded 40,000 visitors.

Immediately following the first exhibition, public schools requested programs for their pupils. Education being its primary purpose and objectives, Merebash embarked upon its project of presenting museological experiences in schools. As of March 1973, ten schools had been serviced, all unsolicited requests. This indicates the value attributed to the innovative and delightfully appealing approaches to exhibiting and providing student learning experiences.

In the process of serving the public and educational institutions, yet another program was conceived to serve as an incentive for youth while providing cultural direction. Merabash undertook a project for training high school and college students in museum operations. This program was extremely successful in both engaging the youth and the community in cultural activities with positive benefits derived.

All the services provided by Merabash Museum were made possible by the private contributions of the corporate membership and interested individuals; donations from the business community; in kind services of professional and trades people, through intermuseum cooperation; and collaborating artists, collectors' and galleries assisting.

The demands for the museums services have grown beyond our expectations and capability.

Merabash Museums immediate needs are the capital to acquire: Facilities, equipment, personnel, and material.

The corporation has established the organizational plans and its five year budget plan and in view of the high receptivity of its pilot projects, is absolutely convinced that the museum should proceed with expansion of its programs without delay.

The Merabash Museum Corporation together with its affiliate the friends of Merabash, Incorporated, will proceed to engage in the most productive self-sustaining activities possible. However, the development of access to and the actual acquisition of financial support from other than revenue producing activities of the corporations is essential to survival.

Both the purpose and the benefits to be derived justify supporting the financial needs of Merabash Museum.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the inflow of responses and results regarding the recent observance of Captive Nations Week is both remarkable and inspiring. Despite our peaceable overtures toward the totalitarian regimes in the Communist empire, these results show that our people are morally bound to the struggle for freedom by the captive peoples and nations themselves.

Further examples of this are as follows:

First. Proclamation by Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska;

Second. Proclamations by Mayors Jason Luby of Corpus Christi, Tex., Batholomew F. Guida of New Haven, and Harry W. Maier of Milwaukee; and

Third. An enlightening statement by citizens in the triple cities of New York on Brezhnev's visit.

I include the proclamation and statements at this point in the RECORD:

PROCLAMATION—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The citizens of Alaska are sympathetic toward the people of captive nations and their goal for renewed self-destiny.

We recognize the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in the world's conquered nations and strongly support their efforts to regain individual liberty and freedom.

The freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom.

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 this week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples.

I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, hereby proclaim the week beginning July 15, 1973, as

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

in Alaska, and call upon the citizens of our State 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.

Dated this 16th day of July, 1973.

WILLIAM EGAN,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION

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; and,

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the majority of peoples in these 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;

Now, therefore, pursuant to the powers vested in me as Mayor of the City of Corpus Christi, I do hereby proclaim the week of July 15 through 21, 1973

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

in Corpus Christi and call upon the citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of Corpus Christi, Texas, to be affixed this 11 day of July, 1973.

JASON LUBY,
Mayor, City of Corpus Christi, Tex.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas: The quest for general relaxation of tension and world peace is the key objective of all freedom-loving peoples and one to which the American Friends of the Captive Nations have always fully subscribed; and

Whereas: One of the requisites for achieving this goal is a Europe united in freedom, with each and every nation able to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination; and

Whereas: The greatness of our Country stems from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas: In accordance with Public Law 86–90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States by which the third week of July is annually designated as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas: Captive Nations Week provides an opportunity for all Americans to show the freedom seeking peoples of Ukrainia, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Romania that they have not been forgotten; and

Whereas: A successful Captive Nations Week would continue importantly to raising the morale of captive people and would thus serve the vital interests of the United States and the entire free world.

Now, therefore, I, Bartholomew F. Guida, Mayor of the City of New Haven, Connecticut, do hereby designate the period of July 15–21, 1973, as "Captive Nations Week" and call upon all to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies.

In witness thereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of The City of New Haven to be affixed.

BARTHOLOMEW F. GUIDA,
Mayor, City of New Haven, Conn.

[Office of the Mayor, City of Milwaukee]

PROCLAMATION

Whereas: Public Law 86–90, adopted unanimously by the Congress of the United States in 1959, designated the third week of July each year as a period during which special concern for people living under Communist rule is to be shown; and

Whereas, In the words of Public Law 86–90, ". . . . The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace. . ."; and

Whereas, Captive Nations Week, since its inception in 1959, has provided a fitting opportunity for Americans to show their solidarity with the people of East and Central Europe; and

Whereas, This year's Captive Nations Week will be observed against the background of the recent summit meetings between President Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev, Secretary-General of the Soviet Communist Party, and the recognized need to continue diplomatic talks despite the ideological differences that separate the Free from the Communist World;

Now, therefore, I, Henry W. Maier, Mayor of Milwaukee, do hereby proclaim the period of July 15–21, 1973, as CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, and I urge all freedom-loving citizens to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies aimed at reaffirming our dedication to the principles of national self-determination for all peoples and sustaining the hopes and aspirations of the captive nations.

HENRY W. MAIER,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION—CITY OF MIAMI, FLA.

Whereas: the period of July 15–21, 1973, represents the 15th observance of Captive Nations Week, as recognized by joint Resolution of the United States Congress and signed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and

Whereas this event has traditionally served as a dramatic demonstration of the solidarity of the American people with their captive brethren in East-Central Europe, and

Whereas nationwide observances, preceded by Captive Nations Week proclamations by President Richard M. Nixon, as well as by the Governors and Mayors of many states and cities, offer all Americans a fresh opportunity for manifesting their continued concern with the plight of 100 million East and Central Europeans deprived of their inalienable rights by the Communist regimes;

Now, therefore, I, Maurice A. Ferre, Mayor of the City of Miami, Florida, do hereby proclaim the week beginning Sunday, July 15, 1973, as

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

In observance thereof I urge the people of the City of Miami, to join with me in reaffirmation of America's fixed dedication to freedom and national self-determination for all peoples in order to sustain the hopes and aspirations of those seeking escape from despotic oppression in the captive nations.

In witness whereof I hereunto set my hand and cause the seal of the City of Miami to be affixed.

Done in the office of the Mayor of the City of Miami, Florida.

MAURICE A. FERRE,
Mayor.

JULY 15, 1973.

[From the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Triple Cities Branch]

STATEMENT ON BREZHNEV'S VISIT

BINGHAMTON, N.Y., June 17, 1973.—On Monday, June 18, 1973, Leonid I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), will begin his official visit to the United States, having been invited here by President Richard M. Nixon. He comes to our shores as the uncrowned Czar of the Soviet Russian Empire.

The purpose of his visit is very clear: he will endeavor to obtain more U.S. credits, American grain and American technological equipment. As a self-appointed "peace bearer", Brezhnev will also seek Washington's approval of his European policy aimed at the maintenance of the status quo dividing Europe, the removal of U.S. armed forces from Western Europe and the strengthening of the Soviet Russian political, economic and cultural hegemony over all of Europe.

CRIMES OF BREZHNEV AGAINST THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE

For almost a decade, Brezhnev has been veritable dictator over the millions of people in the USSR and the satellite states.

As free American citizens, we publicly accuse Brezhnev and his regime of inhuman crimes, and cultural and ethnic genocide committed against the Ukrainian people, as well as against all other non-Russian peoples of the USSR. Specifically:

(1) Numerous arrests, illegal trials, and severe sentences meted out to hundreds of Ukrainian intellectuals for demanding and defending the right of the Ukrainian language and Human Rights, to which the Ukrainian people are entitled according to Soviet Constitution and the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(2) The enforced Russification policy in Ukraine and the forcible imposition of the Russian language in all schools, universities, as well as in the administration, courts, and all public offices in Ukraine;

(3) Ruthless exploitation of the economic resources and riches of Ukraine for the strengthening of the Soviet Russian empire and the expansion of its domination in Europe, Asia, and in the world at large;

(4) The brutal destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Ukranian Autocephalic Orthodox Church.

APPEAL TO PRESIDENT NIXON

Telegrams have been sent to our congressional leaders: Senator James L. Buckley, Senator Jacob K. Javits, and Representative Howard W. Robison. In these telegrams they are asked to intercede with President Nixon so that no U.S. economic concessions be made to Brezhnev until:

(1) The Soviet government desists from arresting Ukrainian intellectuals;

(2) The Soviet government releases those intellectuals who have been sentenced to concentration camps and "psychiatric wards";

(3) The Soviet government grants the Ukrainian people and other non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union the basic human rights including the freedom of religion and the freedom to emigrate.

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, June 18, 1973]

AREA UKRAINIANS ASK RESTORATION OF RIGHTS

When Soviet leader Leonid I. Brezhnev meets in Washington with President Nixon this week he should be granted no economic concessions from the United States until Russian crimes against non-Soviet citizens are ended, according to Triple Cities Ukrainians.

In a telegram to Rep. Howard W. Robison of Tioga County and Sens. Jacob Javits and James L. Buckley, the Triple Cities branch of the Ukrainian Congress of America has

asked the Congress members to appeal to Nixon before the U.S.-Soviet talks close.

The Ukrainians said Nixon should wait for these Soviet concessions before approving any economic aid to Russia:

The Soviet government stop its arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals.

The Russians agree to release intellectuals who have been sentenced to concentration camps and "psychiatric wards" for the expression of their beliefs.

Brezhnev allows the Ukrainian people and other non-Russians living in the Soviet Union the basic human rights of freedom of religion and freedom to emigrate.

Before Brezhnev is given more United States credit, grain and technological aid, the Ukrainians said he must be forced to amend his internal policies.

The group said Brezhnev and other Soviet leaders were guilty of Cultural and ethnic genocide against Ukrainians and other non-Russians, including illegal arrests and trials, religious suppression and economic exploitation of many of its citizens.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in considering the military procurement authorization we had the opportunity to express the will of the Congress on the question of troop commitments in Europe. Mr. Speaker, I supported the O'Neill amendment and opposed the substitute because I felt we had an opportunity to break new ground in developing a rational foreign policy based on world realities. Regrettably, we apparently failed to develop the proper record to support the argument for troop reductions. Nevertheless, in providing for a study, we did not close the door on the issue.

Our present military strength and our commitment to European defense is an issue with which only Congress can and should come to grips. It is readily apparent from the testimony of the Secretary of Defense, James Schlesinger, before the House Committee on Armed Forces, that the administration is content to rely on the same old homilies relative to our relationship and commitment to Europe. The Defense Department relies on these homilies in spite of post-World War II and post-Vietnam war agreements which most recently include the SALT-I agreements, the Common Market and England's entry into it, as well as other economic, diplomatic, and military treaties and agreements which have changed the relative position of the United States to Europe. In spite of this change, we continue to operate as if the lessons of two decades had not been burned into our history.

The fact is that Europe, thanks to our subsidizing a major portion of its defense needs, is enjoying a boom economy while the United States, in large part due to an unfavorable balance of payments, is vainly attempting to fight off a severe recession. The balance-of-payments deficit due to our military forces in Europe alone will come to more than $1.5 billion in fiscal 1973. The security of this Nation or of any nation depends more on its internal political and economic stability than on outward appearances of strength. It is absurd to presume that we can bargain from an appearance of strength and assume the other side will be blinded by mirrors. In today's world, just as we are capable of making intelligent estimates as to the ability of the other side to wage war, they too are capable of making the same estimates as to our ability. And both sides look beyond the mirrors to domestic economics and politics.

In addition to economic considerations, the new ability of Europe to provide for its own defense, and developments on the diplomatic front which have changed the relationship between the United States, Europe, and the Soviet bloc, we are faced in this country with a major domestic issue. That question, which seems lately to arise on every foreign and domestic proposal presented to the Congress, is the tendency over the past 25 years of the Congress to acquiesce to the diminution of our powers in favor of the Executive.

As a result of the Congress willingness to permit the aggrandizement of power by the Presidency, we have created in that office an almost mythic quality which prevents us from considering rationally the proposals submitted to us by the executive branch. Indeed, we have acquiesced to such a degree that the executive branch no longer submits proposals to the Congress; rather it submits fiat accompli, leaving the Congress and the people to like it or lump it.

We still express incredulity over the Gulf of Tonkin resolution which was presented to the Congress without hearings and on the questionable assertions from the "best and the brightest" in the administration. Certainly the Vietnam war, whose escalation followed from that resolution, should have taught us that Congress, while it is not the repository of all wisdom, certainly is the repository of more collective wisdom than seems to pervade the executive branch. Proper congressional consideration of major questions of national policy are critical to the well-being of the Nation and are more reliable than the cool assertions of so-called experts in the Department of Defense.

Recently in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Law and Organization of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD made a telling point. He stated that—

The fundamental difficulty in discerning semblance to America's policy abroad during the past 25 years is that the commitment and level of U.S. forces abroad has determined our policy rather than our policy determining the level of U.S. forces abroad. (Emphasis in original.)

Thus, we make war not because we have rationally thought out the consequences and then provide the troops, but we make war because we have the troops and then rationalize the consequences. That is the story of Vietnam and unless we face reality, that will be the story of the next war into whose quagmire we will become stuck. Congress must take the responsibility and provide only those resources necessary for the defense of the Nation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, September 5, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Msgr. James P. Cassidy, Ph. D., director of health and hospitals, Archdiocese of New York, offered the following prayer:

O Heavenly Father, we ask Your blessing upon this historic assemblage as it begins its deliberation. We ask you to bless them with the wisdom of Solomon, that they may legislate for the good of all the people of this land.

Bless them Lord, with the courage to ignore their own selves and to be sensitive to the needs of the people they have been elected to serve. May they be aware of the social, emotional, and health-care needs of the people of our country and the whole world.

Grant them the vision to see beyond themselves and beyond even their own country to the whole community of man which you have created. And may they look beyond this world to the next where we may all be joined together in Your wisdom and love forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 3, 1973, and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 6, 1973:

H.R. 8152. An act to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to improve law enforcement and criminal justice, and for other purposes.

On August 14, 1973:

H.R. 4083. An act to improve the laws relating to the regulation of insurance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6713. An act to amend the District of Columbia Election Act regarding the times for filing certain petitions, regulating the primary election for Delegate from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8658. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.