

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HEALTH CARE, HEALTH CARE
EMPLOYEES AND COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today can lead to the resolution of a problem this body tried to settle in 1972: How to accommodate the public's right to health care with the right of health care employees to a voice in the determination of their wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

Almost a year ago, we in this House passed a bill—which I supported—to bring private, nonprofit hospitals and their employees under the purview of the National Labor Relations Act and the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board. This is the primary purpose of my bill and of legislation proposed by our colleagues from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) and Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

The orderly procedures of the NLRA have proved beneficial in other industries and in other segments of the health care industry—proprietary hospitals and both proprietary and nonprofit nursing homes and clinics. Only nonprofit, private hospitals and their 1,500,000 employees have been excluded from this avenue for settling their disputes responsibly and peacefully. Bringing them under the act has merit, in my view.

Similarly, however, there is much merit to the contention that in practice the procedures of the NLRA may not lend themselves to the unique responsibilities and problems of this industry associated with the delivery of health services. For this reason, my bill suggests more than a simple extension of the NLRA.

It also includes limited variations from the act's procedures, variations intended to safeguard the care of patients when a labor dispute occurs.

Another provision of my bill recognizes that private hospitals frequently are sponsored by religious bodies and that among these religious bodies are those which historically have held conscientious objections to joining or financially supporting labor organizations. The bill, therefore, allows health care employees who are members of such religious bodies to refrain from union membership and from paying union dues.

A summary of my bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED
AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The intent of these amendments to the National Labor Relations Act is to accommodate the right of the public to health care with the right of health care employees to engage in collective bargaining while recognizing conscientious objections to union membership.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Sec. 1. The amendment to Section 1 declares it to be the policy of the United States to eliminate labor disputes in health care institutions.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. The amendment to Section 2(2) eliminates the exemption for nonprofit hospitals.

The amendment to Section 2(3) excludes physicians from the definition of employee.

Section 2(14) is new and defines "health care institutions" broadly so that all such institutions will be affected by the same rules.

BARGAINING PROCEDURE

Sec. 3. Section 8(g) is a new provision which in subsection (1) provides impasse resolution procedure for health care institutions in the event of an impasse in negotiations for a renewal agreement. Strikes, picketing, and lockouts will be prohibited until the impasse procedure has been exhausted.

Subsection (1) (A) requires 90-day notice of termination of the agreement.

Subsection (1) (B) requires good faith bargaining following the 90-day notice.

Subsection (1) (C) requires 60-day notice to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service prior to termination of the agreement. Requires mediation by Federal mediator during final 60 days prior to termination (unlike NLRA subsection 8(d), which requires notice to FMCS but does not require mediation).

Subsection (1) (D) provides for advisory (nonbinding) fact finding at request of either party.

Subsection (1) (E) requires an additional 30-day cooling-off period for further bargaining in light of the fact-finding recommendations or expiration of agreement. If agreement is not reached during that period, a 30-day strike notice or lockout notice may be given. If a strike notice is given, a secret ballot strike vote will be conducted by the FMCS. Provides for 10-day notice before strike or lockout can commence.

Subsection (2) provides same impasse resolution procedure in the event of an impasse in negotiations for an initial agreement.

Subsection (3) provides that any strike or picketing or lockout by a health care institution is an unfair labor practice, except in the impasse situation discussed above. Designed to prohibit recognition strikes (not prohibited by NLRA) and recognition picketing (inadequately regulated by NLRA subsection 8(b)(7)), and to plug loopholes in secondary boycott and other provisions of NLRA. Proviso permits handbilling and similar advertising that does not disrupt deliveries or result in work stoppages.

EXPEDITED RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS

Sec. 4. This amendment to Section 10 gives unfair labor practice charges involving strikes and picketing at health care institutions priority over other cases in NLRB regional offices.

Section 10(n) is a new provision which is patterned generally after NLRA subsection 10(1), although it would permit a health care institution to seek temporary injunctive relief in Federal court to prevent an unlawful strike or picketing while the board investigates and processes the institution's unfair labor practice charge. Experience under 10(1) has proved that, even in priority cases, the board cannot respond swiftly even in obtaining temporary injunctive relief to prevent irreparable injury.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION

Sec. 5. A new provision, Section 19, respects the right of a health care employee to refrain from joining or supporting a labor organization if he is a member of a bona fide religion which holds conscientious objection to union membership.

FOUR MEN ELECTED TO AGRICULTURAL
HALL OF FAME

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, four outstanding men, two living and two deceased, have been elected to Ohio's Agriculture Hall of Fame. The living recipients are Wilbur H. Bruner, retired swine specialist; and Max H. Scarff, seedsman.

Posthumous awards went to Lewis F. Warbington, prominent farm leader and C. G. Williams, noted agronomist.

More than 150 nominees were considered by the selection committee. The four new members to the coveted group join 46 other recipients named since 1965 when the program was started.

Ohio is truly proud of these men and their contributions to the field of agriculture in Ohio. Their accomplishments are many and include:

Lewis F. Warbington (deceased), whose son, Frank, is my district secretary, had a record of agricultural and community endeavor that truly spans the globe. He was one of only three people to receive silver plates from the West German Government for aid given to German people following World War II. He organized all of Shelby County to help finance such an operation, as well as a hospital in New Delhi, India and an orphanage in Haiti.

Through his planning and hard work, Ohio's Farm Bureau Advisory Councils were formed. In 1966, Mr. Warbington was awarded a citation for his 50 years of Distinguished Service to Ohio Agriculture by the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation.

He served as a director for the Co-operative League of America, Ohio Wool Growers, Farm Bureau Board, Landmark Board, and he was a charter member of the Shelby County Farm Bureau.

Carlos Grant Williams (deceased): C. G. Williams served as chief of the Agronomy Department of the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station from 1906 until he became director in 1921. Prior to this time he had been a successful farmer near his birthplace in Trumbull County.

He was a pioneer in crop breeding and crop rotation research. During his years of active service he originated three new varieties of wheat: Trumbull, Gladden and Portage. He was a member of the American Society of Agronomy and

served as president in 1925-26. He was a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and served as vice-president in 1931. For several years he wrote a column in the Ohio Farmer magazine.

Wilbur H. Bruner: The former Vo-Ag teacher, county agent and swine specialist made a credible mark on Ohio's swine industry. His work with numerous breed associations and at the Ohio State University has been instrumental in upgrading the quality of pork marketed in Ohio.

Bruner supervised the construction of the Ohio swine evaluation center—the first station of its kind in the United States. From 1954 to his retirement in 1969, he coordinated the work of the station which served as a pattern for the development of similar facilities and programs in other States.

In 1960, he received the American Society of Animal Science Award for outstanding service to the Nation's livestock industry.

Max M. Scarff: A pioneer worker and leader in the production of certified grains, soybeans and hybrid seed corn, Scarff was one of the first growers of hybrid seed corn in Ohio and helped pave the way for increased yields of corn.

He is a member and past president of a host of seed organizations at the State and national level. He is a charter member of the Clark County Farm Bureau. In 1943, he was elected president of the State organization and in 1946 he was named to the board of directors of the Nationwide Insurance Co., where he served until retirement in 1972.

Scarff is the recipient of numerous awards. These include the "Master Farmer" award presented by the Ohio Farmer, and the distinguished service to agriculture award made by the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED ON SOCIAL SECURITY COST OF LIVING INCREASE

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that calls for putting into effect immediately the 5.9 percent social security cost of living increase currently scheduled for July 1, 1974.

I know that we all realize the urgent need for this legislation in light of the severe crisis the 21 million elderly Americans are facing in this time of rampant inflation. The Department of Agriculture has conceded that the price of food alone will go up at least 20 percent this year.

As you know, just before the July 4 recess, Congress passed the Renegotiation Act which included an amendment to make the cost of living increase for social security recipients effective July 1, 1974 instead of January of 1975. The Democratic leadership had proposed that the increase become effective in April of 1974, but the President was very much against this earlier date and was able to muster sufficient support in the House to knock down this recommendation.

In my opinion, and I know in the opinion of the millions of elderly social security recipients across the country, this delay is intolerable.

I have received many letters from my constituents and have talked to many of them during the August recess. They have all expressed to me their dire situation due to the higher prices for food and other necessities.

This situation confronting the elderly citizen is deplorable. The President's economic policies are causing hardships on many citizens, but the elderly on fixed incomes are desperately struggling to survive. Yet the President was not willing to support a measure that would afford them the small increase they most assuredly need. Instead, he has placed the biggest burden of controlling inflation on the backs of the elderly social security recipient, and this is a situation that I believe Congress should not tolerate.

I intend to press for expeditious passage of this measure in order to bring some relief to the social security recipient who, in effect, must now wait until next year to meet the inflation our Nation is currently experiencing.

WHY DOCTORS VANISH FROM THE RESERVATIONS

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, in my recent visit to South Dakota I was again impressed with the fact that the subject of rural medical care is one of the issues that urgently needs and deserves the attention of Congress. An aspect of this problem was recently addressed by a New York physician in a letter written to the New York Times. This letter stresses the need for legislation that will enable Indian Health Service to attract doctors to serve on isolated reservations such as those found in South Dakota. I know of rural communities in my district where, for want of Indian Health Service doctors, private practitioners are overextended and overworked, and if the situation is not soon remedied, those doctors, so important to the rural community, will be forced to move to areas where the workload is lighter. This, rural America cannot afford.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the letter written by Dr. Robert P. Corson. It follows:

[From the New York Times]

WHY DOCTORS VANISH FROM THE RESERVATIONS TO THE EDITOR:

One of the negative side effects, perhaps the only one, of the elimination of the military draft law is the reduction of health care for the American Indian. While compulsory military service was in effect, physicians had the choice of serving in the Indian Health Service instead of the armed forces.

Since 75 per cent of the physicians who served with the I.H.S. were provided through this draft option, the delivery of health care for the Indians is now in serious jeopardy.

A recent I.H.S. report shows that the exodus of medical manpower has already begun in the Indian areas, most notably in the area of Aberdeen, S.D., where there is a shortage of sixteen doctors.

Historically, the United States Government has provided medical care to the Indians on reservations. It is incumbent on the Government to improve the compensation program for doctors in the I.H.S. in order to attract more volunteer medical talent. It should also assist Indian and other rural communities in establishing programs to attract physicians.

The neglect of health care for our Indian brethren and other rural inhabitants is anachronistic and a sad commentary on our way of life.

In an era when national attention has been focused on the plight and needs of the American Indian, health care should head the list of our debts. Such a priority can show that we have learned our history lesson.

ROBERT P. CORSON,

RALPH HERZ, JR., M.D.

New York, Aug. 22, 1973.

GENERAL AVIATION AND THE FAA

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the August 1973 issue of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association Pilot magazine:

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 unreasonable 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 air-space 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.

MINE RESCUE VEHICLE USES MOON ROVER IDEA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our national space program continues to contribute to the improvement of our daily lives. Among the more interesting application of Apollo space technology is a mine rescue vehicle based on the lunar rover development. With our increasing demands for energy, we will go deeper and deeper into the Earth. The need to provide safety of operation will undoubtedly become more difficult. A University of Kentucky project is applying space technology under the Earth to improve mine safety. I commend the reading of an informative Chicago Tribune article of July 19, 1973, on the subject to my colleagues and the general public:

MINE RESCUE VEHICLE USES MOON ROVER IDEA
LEXINGTON, KY., July 18.—The University of Kentucky soon will hold a public demonstration of an unmanned mine rescue vehicle that uses equipment developed for the moon rover.

Private tests already have been conducted and Dr. R. L. Cosgriff, one of its developers said "we didn't get a bad pulse out of 20 million in six hours of operation. It worked perfectly."

Cosgriff, a professor of electrical engineering at the university, explained that the mine vehicle is run by remote control through radio signals, or pulses, transmitted on a two-way basis.

The lunar rover navigational package was made available to the university under the auspices of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration technology utilization program, Cosgriff said. The experimental vehicle, the third in a series developed by Cosgriff and his students in the past 15 years, is called Kentucky Charlie. It is about two feet high and weighs two tons.

The rescue vehicle was developed for the Kentucky Department of Mines and Minerals.

A gyroscope on the vehicle calculates its exact location in the mine and activates a light on a map of the mine interior so the operator on the surface can see where it is and guide it.

In addition, the vehicle carries a television camera so the operator can see where it is going. This could help him locate victims in a mine accident and give them aid by remote control.

"The university is developing, at its own expense, rescue equipment to be carried on the unmanned car and we're modifying and improving it all the time," Cosgriff said in an interview.

"We could load it on a truck in 15 minutes and head for any mine disaster site at 60 miles an hour right now. I'd like to see this vehicle put on a standby basis," he said.

He said the cost of duplicating the vehicle would be about \$50,000.

The rescue equipment it will carry will include a balloon-like inflatable envelope that could be placed around victims in a mine to protect them from heat and fumes.

"Although miners are supposed to carry gas masks and fire extinguishers with them, they sometimes discard them and the car would carry those, too," Cosgriff said.

The inflatable envelope would be carried on a boom in front of the vehicle, with the

operator using the television camera to see how to place it around the victims.

"We've used blow torches on the vehicle and they don't hurt it much, so we think it will be able to travel through fires in a mine without being harmed," Cosgriff said.

In a test at a Consolidated Coal Co. mine near Middlesboro, Ky., last April, the vehicle was remotely controlled from a range of more than 2,100 feet, Cosgriff said.

YUBA COLLEGE—A RURAL INSTITUTION FOR NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Yuba College is just one of the many colleges in the California junior college system that is providing such a unique service for the State's students. For those who do not wish to take that giant step into a major 4-year school or for those who cannot afford a full 4-year education, the junior college provides a step for those who wish to transfer to a 4-year school or for those who only require 2 years of technical or vocational training offered by the junior college.

Yuba College, founded in 1927, moved to its current 160-acre site on the outskirts of Marysville, Calif., in 1962. Most of the 22 buildings are of the common institutional variety—steel girders and cement walls. When one examines the college catalog, however, one notices a distinct characteristic of Yuba College that is paralleled by few other schools in the country.

In addition to the customary freshman and sophomore year college level courses, Yuba College special education services division offers a unique system that serves the needs of the vast area the school district represents. With the school district covering such an enormous section of the State, students may take college courses in their own home towns. Local high schools offer their buildings so that many who would otherwise have to make the long drive to the Yuba campus can receive college credit right at home.

In Colusa County, the college operated 42 classes this year and plans for 60 this fall. In Lake County, a similar number is conducted, ranging from ceramics to animal husbandry, sewing on knits, modern dance, and gourmet entertaining.

For the many who do attend the campus at Marysville, dormitory space is available on a first-come first-serve basis. The room and board is free for students living more than 60 miles from campus or more than 11 miles from the nearest bus stop. These students are paid \$1.50 per day for travel expenses if they prefer to live at home and commute to school. For students who do not meet the residence requirements but wish to live in the dormitory, the fee is a modest \$898 per year.

Although Yuba College is small, 3,000 regular students which rises to 8,000 when night students and community program students are added in, it prides itself on its special programs. Much of the 160 acres the college owns is used by

the agriculture program. This includes a pasture for cattle, a greenhouse, an agricultural machine shop and a nursery.

But Yuba College is not totally centered around its agricultural program. Yuba has one of the largest nursing programs in the State junior college system, a program including a complete nursing lab and extensive practical training in hospitals.

Another special program of particular pride for Yuba College is their homicide investigation course. This course is currently drawing approximately 50 students, many from major law enforcement agencies in California, including the Los Angeles and Santa Barbara police forces.

For an outsider, Yuba College offers the standard college activities—football, student government and homecoming; but inside its courtyard and in the outlying areas, one finds an atmosphere at Yuba College of service to everyone in rural northern California. Yolo County benefits too in the Yuba program as the following Woodland Daily Democrat article demonstrates:

[From the Woodland-Davis (Calif.) Daily Democrat, July 20, 1973]

YUBA COLLEGE OFFERS COMMUNITY SERVICE

(NOTE.—Yolo county's free ticket into the community college system will soon end as state law requires all school districts not in a community college district to join one by 1975. The Yolo county school board will meet Monday at 8 p.m. in the Woodland high school library to decide which district the Woodland, Esparto and Winters school districts should join.)

The question will then go to the voters, probably next April. If the voters turn down the community college choice, then the community college board of governors will assign Yolo county to a district.

Davis and East Yolo are already in Los Rios community college district.

This is the second of a three-part series that will examine the three nearby community college districts that Yolo county may join—Solano, Yuba and Los Rios.)

(By Joyce Kreig)

Yuba college's chief asset can't be found in the small, drab campus on the outskirts of Marysville near Beale Air Force base. The hidden treasure of Yuba college is in its extensive community service program.

Students who now live in this far-flung district can take courses in their home towns which will satisfy the general education requirements for the first two years of college.

These classes are offered in high school buildings in the towns throughout the district. They are structured so the student need never make the long drive to the Marysville campus.

In addition to the traditional freshman and sophomore year college level courses, Yuba college special education services division offers a grab bag of classes to meet community needs. For instance, the classes offered in Lake county range from ceramics to animal husbandry, sewing on knits, modern dance, and gourmet entertaining. Especially popular are crafts and recreation classes.

The college operated 42 classes in Colusa county this year and plans 60 for this fall. The courses are open to high school seniors providing their school board allows them to attend the classes.

Superintendent Daniel G. Walker said, "given the permission, we could match this in Woodland by September."

This permission hinges on the Yolo county board of education voting to recommend to the electorate that the Woodland, Esparto

and Winters school districts annex into Yuba Community college district.

In a report to Yolo county superintendent Martin Cabalzar, Dr. Walker promised Yolo county that if it joins Yuba community college district, the district will:

Expand board membership or rearrange trustee area boundaries to make sure Yolo county has adequate representation on the Yuba community college board,

Extend a daily free bus route to Yolo county,

Reserve free dormitory space for Yolo county students who live more than 60 miles away from Marysville or are 11 miles from the nearest bus stop,

Charge the same tax rate for Yolo county as the rest of the district is taxed. This is currently 55 cents for every \$100 of assessed property value, plus 17 cents in permissive taxes,

Immediate opening of classes in Yolo county,

Yolo county students would still be free to attend colleges in the Los Rios system (American River, Sacramento city and Consumes River colleges).

Concerning the last point, Dr. Walker said an interdistrict agreement now exists between Yuba and Los Rios districts to allow students to freely register with either district regardless of residence or of classes they are planning to take. He anticipated no change in this agreement unless as political lever, Los Rios trustees would threaten to restrict admission in order to force Yolo county to join the Los Rios district.

Dr. Walker envisions a branch of Yuba college opening in the western section of the Sacramento valley—possibly in Yolo county—if student interest is high. This would not be a separate campus, but would be a center of operations for this section of the district.

He said that eventually a new campus might be built in the western valley, but would not speculate where it would be located except that it would be "central."

Yuba college administrators and trustees have been actively campaigning to convince Yolo county school trustees they should join Yuba district as part of a long range plan to tie Yolo, Glenn, Lake and Colusa counties together in the Yuba district.

Dr. Walker said his plans would have to be altered or reduced if the Yolo county board decides not to join Yuba college district.

For students who opt to actually attend class on the Marysville campus rather than attend one of the community centers, dormitory space is available on a first-come, first-serve basis.

The room and board is free for students living more than 60 miles from campus. If these students prefer to live at home and commute, they will be paid \$1.50 each day for transportation. The fee for students who do not meet the residence requirement but would like to live in the dorm is \$898.

The 170 dormitory rooms are located apartment house style residence halls on campus. Two students live in each room. The dorms are not co-ed. A number of apartment complexes are close to the campus.

Yuba college, founded in 1927, moved to its current 160 acre site in 1962. Most of the 22 buildings are of the common institutional variety—steel girders and cement walls.

Most of the land owned by the college is given over to the agriculture program, including a pasture for cattle. The campus also includes a greenhouse, a machine shop and a nursery.

According to administrative assistant Wilson Dillard, Yuba college has one of the largest nursing programs for a community college in the state. The college includes a complete nursing lab and the program features practical instruction in hospitals.

A program of special pride for Yuba college is the homicide investigation course that this summer is drawing 51 students from 41 law enforcement agencies in California, including two from Yolo county.

"When Los Angeles and Santa Barbara and other very sophisticated police forces want to come to Yuba college you must be doing something right," Dillard commented.

The buildings on the campus are arranged by subject area, with a separate building with a courtyard for each academic field.

The campus features a small library—expansions are planned—an outdoor Greek amphitheater, and a student union with a small snack bar and cafeteria.

About 3,000 students attend Yuba college as day students, but enrollment leaps to about 8,000 when the night students and the students in the community programs are included.

The sports program is experiencing a lack of facilities, as the football team must use the Marysville high school stadium for games and the swimming classes are held at a nearby country club. One of the Yuba track stars is Pete Flores of Woodland, the latest name added to the plaque of record-holders in the Yuba gymnasium.

The college catalog lists most of the traditional college activities like a student council, clubs and homecoming. According to a recent issue of the school newspaper, 52.2 per cent of the students at Yuba college consider themselves political middle of the roaders.

DISASTER RELIEF FOR LIVESTOCK

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, last December 1, the entire State of New Jersey was placed under quarantine in order to prevent the further spread of hog cholera. This of course meant that there could be no movement of swine within the State for any purpose, and included of course, the prohibition of moving swine to slaughter which was permitted under an earlier quarantine of portions of the State.

Of the 10 outbreaks which occurred in my State, 6 were in Gloucester County which is my district. This disaster resulted in the destruction of about 10,000 hogs.

The 50-hog farmers in Gloucester County suffered severe financial losses because of the outbreak. The losses, plus the quarantine making it illegal to bring in replacement stock placed the farmers in a real financial squeeze.

But there was not only the financial burden, but also the said realization that a lifetime of hard work, and personal and financial sacrifice was down the drain. The pens were empty and the countryside was spotted with the graves of thousands of dead hogs. Buried with them were the livelihoods of many livestock farmers.

In the early 1960's there were an estimated 5,000 to 6,000 hog-cholera outbreaks each year in the United States. By comparison, during 1971, the eighth year of the eradication program, 118 confirmed cases of hog cholera were reported. That of course is a plus. But until hog cholera is completely eradicated, there is no conceivable reason why the Congress should turn its back on the needs of the hog farmer.

The measure before us today, the Small Business Act Amendments, is the vehicle we can use to see that the livestock farmer, not only those in New

Jersey, but those in other States too, need not worry when disaster strikes.

I strongly endorse the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. VEXSEY) and urge my colleagues to support them too.

TIME TO PUT DOWN THE CRYING TOWEL

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, in a time when some people dwell upon our Nation's problems, and even express doubt about the future of our Republic, it is especially important to find an article which effectively puts those problems into proper perspective. Such an article appeared during August in the *Journal*, a weekly newspaper located in my district.

While acknowledging that our country faces a number of important issues which require thoughtful attention, this editorial shows that they are no more difficult than at any other period of our history. In fact, things have been much worse, yet seldom have we put such an emphasis on our troubles. As the Vice President said once, we "flog ourselves before the world and despair of our condition."

The editorial from the *Journal of West Columbia, S.C.*, illustrates the fact that America is by far the most desirable country in this world to live, and reminds us that a large majority of the world's citizens would gladly trade places with the most "oppressed," poverty-stricken American. He concludes:

This is another way of saying that we should put down the crying towel. . . . We have much to do and no time for brooding.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues may benefit from the insights of the *Journal's* editorialist, I insert his article in its entirety in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my comments:

TIME TO PUT DOWN THE CRYING TOWEL

One of the news magazines recently quoted a presidential aide as saying that, "Everything we touch turns to mud," or words to that effect. Whether or not such a remark was made, it would seem to express our mood as a nation these days. There is a national keening in the air, a lament for the days when everything we touched turned to gold.

We seem to have made a litany of our troubles, a monotonous chant permeates our society: inflation, taxation, pollution, corruption, devaluation, investigation, assassination, allegation; delinquents, drop-outs, drugs, rip-offs, rapes, muggings; strikes, floods, earthquakes, welfare abuse, consumer fraud, fuel crisis, shoddy goods; Cambodia, MIAs, ABMs, CIA, FBI conspiracies, bugs; traffic jams, dirty movies, jerry-built homes, over crowded schools, recalled cars, and Watergate. Always Watergate. Like Rodney Dangerfield, we get no respect. Lord, how we pity us!

This self-staged wake is disturbing because it is so untypical of Americans. We have been in worse trouble before, but never before have we taken it so hard. We are not a stoic people, but neither are we cry babies. Not until now, that is.

The truth of the matter is we really don't have that much to cry about. Our country has never been and never will be perfect. We had a violent birth and have lived from crisis to crisis ever since. In the process of growing up, we invented a way of life that is the envy of the rest of the world.

We cannot move to a better place because there is no better place. We certainly have no monopoly on national tribulations, nor do we have even one problem that is uniquely ours. As for common problems, they are more severe elsewhere. Taxes are higher in England and inflation is worse. The smog in Peking is deadlier than it is in Los Angeles. Bugging is commonplace in Paris. In the Soviet Union, all consumer goods are in short supply. Violence in Ireland makes our frontier days look tame. Israel is surrounded by armed enemies and her citizens are threatened abroad. Millions of children in dozens of countries are always hungry. Millions never go to school at all.

This is all another way of saying that we should put down the crying towel, stop scouring ourselves, and look around. The rest of the world would settle for our problems in a flash. We may not be at the peak of our form but we are not falling apart, either. We have much to do and no time for brooding.

MIDDLE EAST REFUGEES

HON. M. CALDWELL BUTLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent has called a valuable article appearing in the August 25 *New York Times* to my attention. Written by Amnon Rubinstein, dean of the School of Law of Tel Aviv University, it brings some needed balance to much that we hear concerning the plight of the refugees in the Middle East. In our legitimate concern for the plight of the Palestinians, we often overlook the fact that they were not the only refugees created by the 1948 Arab-Israeli war. The treatment accorded to the refugees who fled into Israel is a startling contrast to that of those who fled into the Arab States, a point we must surely keep in mind as we consider future American policy toward the Middle East.

I believe my colleagues would benefit by the entire article, and I insert it into the *RECORD* at this point:

THE MIDDLE EAST: WORDS, WORDS, WORDS

(By Amnon Rubinstein)

TEL AVIV.—Israel's rash and regrettable decision to intercept the Lebanese airplane has put into sharp focus the Palestinian guerrillas' role in the Middle East conflict. The guerrillas are not capable of affecting the balance of power between Israel and the Arab states, but by their acts have succeeded in dragging Israel into a cloak and dagger war which tarnishes its image and enhances its isolation in the international community. Israel will find it increasingly difficult to explain this new war against what many people regard as desperate Palestinian refugees who have adopted guerrilla tactics in their fight against Israel. In the public imagination, a Palestinian is often conceived as being a refugee and either an actual or potential Arab guerrilla—menaced by both Jordan and Israel. Yet such an image is not supported by facts and, moreover, the three words, guerrilla, Palestinian and refugee, tend to mislead.

Guerrilla has traditionally been used to describe "an irregular war carried on by small bodies of men." This definition, taken from the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* is similar to that given by most dictionaries. The emphasis is on acts of war which though irregular are carried out against a defined enemy. To apply guerrilla to the murder of hostages and the skyjacking and destruction of passenger planes is not only to defy all dictionary and all legal definitions but also to equate true guerrillas—such as Tito's partisans—with persons who commit any crime in order to achieve political goals.

Palestinians are another loaded term. Palestinians are the Arabs of Palestine. Whether they had a separate identity in the past is irrelevant. The important point is that they have developed such an identity, perhaps as a result of the traumatic encounter with Israel, and that this identity has become an important motivating force. It is my view that the Israeli Government has erred—politically and psychologically—by not recognizing this Palestinian identity and by failing to pronounce publicly that the principle of self-determination is applicable to the Palestinians.

But the term Palestinian should be defined carefully. Palestine, as originally defined and delineated by the League of Nations, includes both the east and west banks of the Jordan River. This is not a legal quibble. The population of the East Bank is made up mostly of Palestinians—an estimated 70 per cent—and the bulk of Palestinian business and industry is concentrated east of the Jordan River. It is utterly wrong to imagine a Bedouin-supported monarchy pitched against submissive Palestinian refugees. About one-third of the Jordanian Army is made up of Palestinians and many of them were prominent in the bombardment of the refugee camps in the Black September of 1970. In the new Jordanian Cabinet, nine out of eighteen ministers are Palestinians and the Premier, Zaid Al Rifai, is of Palestinian descent. The civil service, as well as business and trade, is heavily dominated by Palestinians. Palestinian members of Jordan's Parliament travel regularly from the West Bank to Aman where orders and salaries are issued to the civil service in the West Bank. It is wrong to describe the Palestinians as a monolithic body which supports the Palestinian guerrillas and opposes the repressive regime of King Hussein.

Refugees is another misused term. The 1948 Arab-Jewish war, like most modern wars, produced its own refugee problems. But people tend to forget that there were refugees on both sides. While an estimated 750,000 Palestinian Arabs became refugees, most of them fleeing to the West Bank, 600,000 Jews had to leave the Arab countries and fled—usually penniless—to the new State of Israel. Of the 774,000 Jews living in Arab countries in 1948, only 50,000 remain today, including communities which are not permitted to leave their terrorized ghettos. Between the years 1948 and 1952, sordid refugee camps marred the face of Israel. In these camps hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees lived in subhuman conditions, suffering in their tents and shanties from the hazards of climate, malnutrition and unemployment. No United Nations agency was ever created to assist these refugees and Israel, with her then meager resources made an incredible effort to rehabilitate the refugees.

The main difference between the Arab and Jewish refugees of 1948 is that no similar effort was made by the Arab countries. Had Arab riches been directed less toward the hoarding of gold and the acquisition of real estate in Geneva and more toward the improvement of the conditions of their own people, the refugee camps on the Arab side, too, would gradually have vanished. That the refugees are the innocent victims of the Arab-Jewish conflict is beyond dispute.

Israel, too, could have done more in order to rehouse the refugees in the Gaza Strip. But the main share of the blame lies on the Arab host countries.

It is necessary that one should make a distinction between three different types of people who are parties to the present conflict—the Palestinians, who should be given the right of self-determination, the refugees, who deserve their long-awaited rehabilitation, and the small bands of terrorists masquerading as guerrillas who should be treated as a menace to the civilized community.

FORMER POW SPEAKS

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure during the Fourth of July holiday to appear with former prisoner of war, Lt. Cmdr. Joseph Charles "Charlie" Plumb, Jr., at a program which was held in the University of Kansas Memorial Stadium. The annual Fourth of July event, which was sponsored by the Lawrence Junior Chamber of Commerce, drew approximately 18,000 people.

At that ceremony, State Senator Arden Booth introduced the new chancellor of the university, Archie Dykes, and I had the pleasure of introducing Commander Plumb to those assembled to celebrate the anniversary of our independence.

Commander Plumb said what many of us have felt for many years, and I want to share the remarks he made on that occasion with my colleagues in the House. In so doing, I would also like to express my appreciation to KLWN Radio Station in Lawrence for their cooperation in furnishing me with the tapes of Commander Plumb's ad-libbed remarks.

COMMANDER PLUMB'S REMARKS

Isn't it fun to be an American?

It's great to be home, and I do consider this my home. I grew up out in LeCompton, Kansas, and spent many, many enjoyable hours in this town and on this campus. I learned to swim right down here in the Jayhawk Plunge.

When I left Douglas County and moved to the big city, I went from a class of ten students to a class of over 1,000, and that was the first big transition in my life. I left the Kansas City area in 1960 for the Naval Academy in Annapolis, and I returned home that Christmas after seven months of being held captive by the upperclass at Annapolis.

As I flew into Kansas City, I was wondering just what would be my first impression of my hometown. Would it be the skyline, or maybe the confluence of the Kaw and Missouri Rivers? Just what would make me feel at home? As we descended into the airport there in Kansas City, and the pilot dumped the inside cabin pressure and let in the outside air, we were flying right over the stockyards, and I got my first impression of Kansas City. And being home brought tears to my eyes.

Well, I graduated from Annapolis in 1964, pressed on to flight training, and then out to southern California to learn to fly the F-4B Phantom.

On the 19th of May of 1967, I was shot down just south of Hanoi. In that 90 seconds of descent from "King of the Skies" to "scum of the earth," I had several thoughts. First

of all, I bowed my head and said a prayer, and then I tried to evaluate myself and determine just how in the world I was going to make it through this period of captivity. I felt like I was in pretty good physical shape, and I thought they probably weren't going to kill me, but I was quite worried about my mind.

I felt that the Communists would try to twist and contort my mind to make me forget and even despise the great heritage of America which I loved so dearly. And so, I decided at that time, during that descent, that it was going to take a good deal of willpower, a lot of discipline, and a great deal of love for my country to hang in there and resist the attempts of the Communists to indoctrinate me.

Well, the next several years progressed, and the Communists did everything they could to try to convince us that the Communist way was better than our free America. They spared no energy, working 24 hours a day, trying to degrade, to humiliate, to deprive us of our pride in our country. And it did take this willpower, this discipline, and the unity that we had as a group, to hang together and keep our pride in our great nation.

We spent many, many hours going over our heritage, the history of this country, the history of that great flag, and the history of the men who have shed blood, sweat, and tears to give you the opportunity to sit in that stadium seat and give me the opportunity to stand here and tell you what I think. They don't have that opportunity around the world, I can tell you that.

All over North Vietnam, they have speakers, if you can believe, that are bigger than that one, that they can't shut off. These speakers go 'round the clock, and they're not telling you about the weather, or the latest sports activity. They're pumping out propaganda.

I've ridden through those North Vietnamese Communist towns where there was no electricity, there was no water, there was very little to eat—nothing but abject poverty. But they had a brand new speaker, and it was pumping out the Communist Party line.

Well, you don't have to listen to that speaker and I don't either, and that's one—just one—of the many great things about being an American.

I returned home and to this great state on the 4th of March, and I found a great many changes in America, and at first I thought I was going to have a little bit of trouble adjusting, because I found that the face of America had changed.

When I left in 1966, the well-dressed man had short-cropped hair, a thin tie, and a buckle in the back of his trousers. So you can perhaps imagine my dismay at looking out into a crowd and thinking I was looking at a shag rug. I'm sure you can also appreciate my joy in finding out that the same wonderful, warm American heart still beats, and that people are more genuine, more patriotic, more religious, and more wonderful than I can ever remember.

It did take a little while to adjust. I walked into my first department store and started looking at these clothes that looked like clown suits, and there was a sign above these clothes. It said, "Do your thing." Well, I didn't even know what my "thing" was. So I found the prettiest sales girl I could hunt up, and I asked her what my "thing" was. She allowed as how she didn't know either, but being a tightwad, I closed my eyes, gritted my teeth, and handed her a hundred dollars and said, "dress me," and she did.

Well, six years over there is a long time, and I had a lot of time to think. Of course, they deprived us of having anything to do. We had no books, or papers, or pencils, or so much as a stick or a rock to make a game

with. So we just had a lot of chances to just lay back on the boards that we called a bed, and think about home.

The first question that I asked myself was pretty obvious. What am I doing here? Well, the answer was just as obvious as the question. Serving my country. But the answer probably wasn't complete enough to my inquisitive mind, and I said to myself, "Just what is this mystic thing you call your country, that you're ready to come over here to fight, die and lose six years of your youth to defend? What is this 'country' that you love so much?"

Is it the amber waves of grain that you sing about? Is it the Congress that sits up on Capitol Hill and cranks out laws to guide our society? Is it the Declaration of Independence that was written 197 years ago in the sweat and blood of all those patriots?

Well, of course, it's all these things. But my America is a lot more personal than that. My America is the kid that gets up every morning and slings papers at driveways. My America is the girl that stands at the corner with an arm full of books waiting for that school bus. My America is the truck driver that sits in his cab at an intersection and waves me on through with courtesy.

But it all boils down to my deep feeling—My America is you. And I am proud to have served such a wonderful America as you.

1973 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, each year since I was elected in 1966, I have submitted my annual questionnaire to my constituents in order to better ascertain their opinions on issues before the Congress. I submit the results of this to my colleagues so that you may compare the views of my constituents with the views of your own.

In April 1973 I sent out 210,000 questionnaires to the people living in my congressional district—the 12th Congressional District of Florida. I am pleased to state that thus far I have received 36,183 replies. The following is a tabulation of the responses by percentages from those who responded.

1973 BURKE CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. President Nixon has indicated he intends to make substantial cuts in government spending. Do you favor such reductions even if they affect your favorite federal programs?

Yes 85.8
No 14.2

2. Do you think taxes should be increased if this would help balance the budget and curb inflation?

Yes 23.2
No 76.8

3. National Health Insurance will be a topic of discussion in Congress soon. Which of the following would you favor? Select one.

A. A program should be financed by increased taxes and operated by the federal government.

Yes 51.8
No 48.2

B. A federally-operated program should be financed by employer and employee contributions.

Yes 70.8
No 29.2

C. income tax credits should be allowed for those purchasing private health insurance.

Yes ----- 85.8
No ----- 14.2

D. a federally funded insurance program for catastrophic illnesses only.

Yes ----- 75.3
No ----- 24.7

E. no additional federal programs.

Yes ----- 64.2
No ----- 35.8

4. The Supreme Court recently declared most State abortion laws unconstitutional. Would you favor a Constitutional Amendment restricting the practice of abortion?

Yes ----- 36.3
No ----- 63.7

5. Congress must pass highway legislation in this first session of the 93rd Congress. Would you favor taking monies set aside for highway construction in the Highway Trust Fund for use in urban mass transit?

Yes ----- 53.7
No ----- 46.3

6. Do you agree with President Nixon's decision to transfer most of the OEO programs to other agencies and to dismantle and close down the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Yes ----- 84.7
No ----- 15.3

7. According to the peace agreement recently signed, the United States agreed to contribute to the post war reconstruction of North Vietnam. Do you agree with this provision?

Yes ----- 14.1
No ----- 85.9

8. The President has lifted mandatory wage and price controls except on food, health care and construction. He has substituted voluntary controls. Do you agree with this change?

Yes ----- 24.4
No ----- 75.6

9. A. Do you believe the U.S. should withdraw from the United Nations?

Yes ----- 35.1
No ----- 64.9

B. If we do not withdraw, do you believe that there should be further cuts in our contributions?

Yes ----- 89.4
No ----- 10.6

10. In your opinion, should a newspaper reporter have the right to refuse to reveal the name or source of his news story?

Yes ----- 62.9
No ----- 37.1

11. Do you favor diplomatic recognition and economic and cultural trade with:
A. Red China?

Yes ----- 76.9
No ----- 23.1

B. USSR?

Yes ----- 76.2
No ----- 23.8

C. Cuba?

Yes ----- 48.0
No ----- 52.0

12. Do you favor legislation to assist in the development of land-use programs for critical areas? If so, do you favor:

A. Federal legislation to assist the States?

Yes ----- 69.2
No ----- 30.8

B. State laws only?

Yes ----- 70.3
No ----- 29.7

C. Local control?

Yes ----- 72.5
No ----- 27.5

This year in response to several requests from my constituents I provide separate columns for the answers of the husband and wife. The following is a tabulation by percentage of each of their views:

1973 BURKE CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

	Wife		Husband	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. President Nixon has indicated he intends to make substantial cuts in Government spending. Do you favor such reductions, even if they affect your favorite Federal programs?	86.0	14.0	85.7	14.3
2. Do you think taxes should be increased if this would help balance the budget and curb inflation?	22.0	78.0	24.4	75.6
3. National Health Insurance will be a topic of discussion in Congress soon. Which of the following would you favor? Select one.				
(a) A program should be financed by increased taxes and operated by the Federal Government.	50.8	49.2	52.9	47.1
(b) A federally-operated program should be financed by employer and employee contributions.	73.7	26.3	68.2	31.8
(c) Income tax credits should be allowed for those purchasing private health insurance.	87.2	12.8	84.5	15.5
(d) A federally funded insurance program for catastrophic illnesses only.	75.1	24.9	75.6	24.4
(e) No additional Federal programs.	67.7	32.3	60.7	39.3
4. The Supreme Court recently declared most State abortion laws unconstitutional. Would you favor a constitutional amendment restricting the practice of abortion?	36.7	63.3	36.0	64.0
5. Congress must pass highway legislation in this 1st sess. of the 93d Cong. Would you favor taking monies set aside for highway construction in the highway trust fund for use in urban mass transit?	56.0	44.0	51.4	48.6
6. Do you agree with President Nixon's decision to transfer most of the OEO programs to other agencies and to dismantle and close down the Office of Economic Opportunity?	84.9	15.1	84.5	15.5
7. According to the peace agreement recently signed, the United States agreed to contribute to the post war reconstruction of North Vietnam. Do you agree with this provision?	12.9	87.1	15.4	84.6
8. The President has lifted mandatory wage and price controls except on food, health care and construction. He has substituted voluntary controls. Do you agree with this change?	25.0	75.0	23.9	76.1
9. (a) Do you believe the United States should withdraw from the United Nations?	35.8	64.2	34.5	65.5
(b) If we do not withdraw, do you believe that there should be further cuts in our contributions?	91.1	8.9	87.1	12.9
10. In your opinion, should a newspaper reporter have the right to refuse to reveal the name or source of his news story?	64.5	35.5	61.5	38.5
11. Do you favor diplomatic recognition and economic and cultural trade with:				
(a) Red China.	76.8	23.2	77.1	22.9
(b) U.S.S.R.	78.2	21.8	74.2	25.8
(c) Cuba.	48.0	52.0	48.1	51.9
12. Do you favor legislation to assist in the development of land-use programs for critical areas? If so, do you favor:				
(a) Federal legislation to assist the States?	70.9	29.1	67.6	32.4
(b) State laws only?	71.4	28.6	69.3	30.7
(c) Local control?	76.1	23.9	68.8	31.2

THE ELECTION REFORM BILL

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, in all the talk of election reform one aspect of election financing is conspicuous by its absence. That is to say, none of the debate or current proposals under active consideration touch on the financial contributions of our labor unions. Everyone agrees that these are substantial. The Detroit News asked this question in an excellent editorial on August 4, 1973. I

feel my colleagues will find it instructive and I commend it to their attention. The editorial follows:

THE ELECTION REFORM BILL—IT SKIPS LABOR GIFTS

The election campaign reform bill approved this week by the U.S. Senate introduces tough new restrictions on political spending. It also raises a question: Is Congress speeding us toward the day when incumbents and candidates supported by labor will enjoy decisive advantage in contests for public office?

Under the Senate bill, individuals could contribute no more than \$25,000 to all federal candidates. No more than \$9,000 of that sum could be given to any one candidate. If strictly enforced, such a law would effectively curb the influence of big individual con-

tributors. At a glance, that might seem to be everything the doctor ordered.

Actually, the solution carries with it some vexing new possibilities.

Candidates who challenge men already in office need substantial funds. Normally, the advantage lies with the incumbent. He basks in the publicity that goes with public service; he can manipulate that publicity, turning it on and off as desired, for his own benefit. He can use official funds and other resources to promote his reelection.

The challenger overcomes these advantages only by raising the funds required to mount a strong and effective campaign. Yet, the bill passed by the Senate would severely limit his ability to raise those funds.

In the future his best hope apparently will lie in attracting the support of organized labor, which seems to be the one re-

maining force in American society likely to escape serious regulation of its contributions to political campaigns.

Labor unions spend, directly or indirectly, as much as \$60 million on political campaigns in a presidential year. Theoretically, all this money is contributed "voluntarily" by union members and kept separate from union dues and assessments. As any follower of the labor movement knows, "voluntary" in some unions is used as a synonym for "compulsory."

Following the 1968 election, the Wall Street Journal uncovered the incongruous fact that some Japanese and Filipino merchant seamen hired onto American ships had paid "service fees" to union agents and that the money had been contributed to the campaigns of political candidates, mostly Democratic. Aliens had thus worked—unwittingly—through the Seafarers International Union to influence an American election!

One way or another, organized labor manages to pour all the money it wishes into political campaigns. Yet, cash is but a small part of the story.

According to Neil Gilbride, the Associated Press labor writer, the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education (COPE) is generally said to be worth "some \$10 million to a presidential candidate—partly in money, but mostly in the nationwide voluntary manpower of union workers who conduct voter registration drives and help candidates friendly to labor."

Unions yearly invest about \$100 million, in cash and manpower, in political activities. This takes into account the salaries of political professionals who devote much of their time to purely political matters. It covers printing and distributing political propaganda thinly disguised as "education" and fundraising drives for partisan causes.

No proposal now under serious consideration contains any means of bringing such activities under control or making organized labor give an accounting. The reason for this omission is obvious: Incumbent politicians are afraid to antagonize organized labor.

Speaking in idealistic terms, however, how could this problem be solved? We doubt that it can be solved completely, for venal men will always be able to find ways of evading the law. But it would help if, instead of concentrating mainly on the problem of contributions, Congress would pay more attention to the methods by which contributions are reported.

For example, why not require big contributors to describe their contributions in terms of manpower and propaganda activities as well as cash? And why not require those reports to be made before rather than after the election? Under such a system, the voters could form judgments on campaign activities before rather than after they have cast their ballots.

WE NEED STRICT GUN CONTROL LAWS NOW TO REDUCE CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, all handguns, except for police and military use, should be banned by 1983. This is the conclusion reached by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals in its August 9 report after the completion of a 2 year study on crime reduction. The Commission recommended the ban on handguns as the consensus

of the opinions expressed by the many State and local officials consulted across the Nation in the course of the study. Finding that handguns are the principal weapon used in homicide, in one-third of all robberies, and in one-fifth of all aggravated assaults, while the self-protection they allegedly provide is "illusory," the Commission recommended the prohibition of handguns as an important and necessary step to achieve its goal of cutting in half what it termed the "high fear" crimes in the United States by 1983.

I strongly support the Commission's goal of crime-reduction, and I have long advocated strict Federal gun control legislation as the best way to achieve this essential goal. My bill H.R. 678 would prohibit the manufacture and sale of handguns, except for law enforcement, military, and licensed pistol club use. My second bill, H.R. 679, would require registration of all existing firearms, including rifles as well. I believe that firearms other than handguns, not addressed by the Commission, should not go uncontrolled. The passage of Federal laws both to ban sale or purchase of handguns and to require registration of all presently held firearms is in my opinion one of the most effective ways to reduce crime. Federal action, rather than action by each of the individual States as recommended by the Commission is necessary, because gun control must be nationwide to be effective. Otherwise failure to act by any one State could negate the efforts of the rest of the Nation. Presently New York City, for example, has strict laws on registration and licensing of guns, but their impact is minimal due to lack of nationwide gun control.

Rather than wait for all the States to act one by one, Congress as guardian of domestic tranquility should meet its responsibility to reduce crime by enacting strong national gun control legislation now. Strict Federal laws governing the sale and purchase of handguns and requiring registration of all firearms are the best and most effective ways to reduce violent crimes which, in the words of the Commission "threaten the very existence of a humane and civilized society."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in July of this year we observed Captive Nations Week for the 15th year. The officially proclaimed week is over, but the plight of the nations is still with us, and we should not lose sight of it as the time draws closer for more of the much-heralded talks of detente.

July 18, 1973, the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo, N.Y., was privileged to hear an outstanding address by Dr. Mary V. Beck at the Captive Nations' luncheon. Dr. Beck, who received her degree of doctor juris from the University of Pittsburgh Law School in 1932, has a distinguished

record of public service. She was the first woman elected to the Detroit Common Council, and served there from 1950 until 1970.

She also was the first woman to be elected president pro tem of the common council; served as acting mayor of the city of Detroit; served as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the Wayne County Board of Supervisors; served as chairman of the Juvenile Court Committee; and served as chairman of the Wayne County Port Committee.

Although her local public service reputation is well established, it is perhaps from her work for the Captive Nations that her national fame arises. A first generation American of Ukrainian parents, Dr. Beck has devoted many years to the cause of Ukrainian freedom and the Ukrainian heritage in the United States—a service recognized by the many honors and awards she has received.

Dr. Beck is presently executive director of the Ukrainian Information Bureau, and is well qualified to speak on the subject of Captive Nations. Her speech in Buffalo was perceptive and thought-provoking; it is a pleasure to share those remarks with my colleagues today:

LEST WE FORGET

Freedom is an inseparable part of living for those who have always enjoyed its fruits, but who, too often, have taken it for granted. We Americans know this best. But when freedom is whittled away imperceptibly or stamped out forcibly, it is missed, it is mourned; and only then is its worth accurately measured and belatedly treasured, to generate in the end, an unceasing yearning for its blessed return. This truth has never been a part of our American experience, but it has been bitterly validated and tragically implanted into the recent history and existence of the Captive Nations.

The Captive Nations are primarily, the fourteen non-Russian, allegedly independent republics, which constitute the Soviet Union. Ukraine, with the largest population, of some forty seven million people, leads the list and is followed (in sequence of population size) by Kazakh SSR, Uzbek SSR, Byelo-Russian SSR, Azerbaijan SSR, Georgian SSR, Moldavian SSR, Lithuanian SSR, Kirghiz SSR, Tadzhik SSR, Armenian SSR, Latvian SSR, Turkmen SSR and Estonia SSR.

However, the enumerated countries are not in fact republics, for they are neither sovereign nor free. Their short-lived independence, attained for the most part, following the crumbling of the Russian Czarist Empire in 1917, was terminated by the Russian Communists, who conquered and coerced them into the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union too, is not in fact, any union, but an empire, a Russian colonial empire, in which the fictitious republics are actual colonies, absolutely controlled and ruthlessly exploited while their people are held in subjugation with brutal force and terror.

History can now record that the Great Russian Revolution, which was hailed as the liberator of the masses and the eradicator of the classes and which promised a Paradise to the average man, instead, merely substituted one ruling class for another, the latter more vicious, more despotic than the former, thereby casting every man into a veritable inferno. Thus, for more than a half century, some two hundred million people have been and are now enduring endless agony under the yoke of that Russian Communism. Such an unbelievable paradox exists in this modern, enlightened era, when even the most primitive peoples have been encouraged and abetted to strike for their freedom, while nations, whose history is traceable to pre-

Christian days, are enduring enslavement behind the Iron Curtain.

Do my statements sound fanciful and incredible? So it seems, but they embody the undeniable truth, for they are authenticated by countless fool-proof documents. They are corroborated by the testimony of thousands of displaced persons from those captive nations; persons who were fortunate to survive the holocaust of the Second World War and to settle in this, and other countries of the Free World.

Perhaps some of you wonder, why 200 million people don't resist or rebel. But they have, continually, during the past fifty-odd years. Those attempts, however, have all ended with disastrous results. Let me remind you of just a few unforgettable examples: in the Ukraine, in 1933, the year of the great genocide, seven million farmers and landowners were deliberately starved, yes, starved to death because they would not accept collectivization and de-nationalization; in the Kazakhs Republic, in 1930, two million died in a similar famine, because they resisted; in Georgia, in 1924 a mass uprising brought on a purge of patriots, intellectuals and clergy and in 1936 another wave of terror followed; in the Baltic Nations, in 1940 and later, periodically thousands were imprisoned, executed or deported and the fate of many remained unknown; in Turkestan, more than six million died as a result of Russian aggression. And the record goes on and on, with only slight variations in the methods used and the results obtained in each of the enslaved nations. It is an incontrovertible chronicle of a blood-washed trail of barbarism and genocide. It is a shocking tale of unspeakable horror.

But that is only a part of the story, for no mention has yet been made of the European Satellite Nations, which are likewise captive nations. Add therefore, another multitude of people to the list of captives, the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia and East Germany, who either through force or intrigue were thrust behind the Iron Curtain and made "socialistically secure and happy". Did they ever resist? Of course you remember some of their heroic efforts against overwhelming odds, for the world media gave those events extensive coverage; to mention just a few: Berlin in 1953, Polish workers in 1956, Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. But to no avail for the Free World, like an ostrich hid its head in the sand and refused to offer a helping hand. Just as many individuals today, witness the commission of crime on our streets, refusing to come to the aid of the victim, not realizing that tomorrow it may be their turn to be the prey.

Yet despite these futile and abortive attempts, which took a heavy toll of human lives, the will to resist still persists in the gallant captives and manifests itself in diverse and manifold form, both underground and above ground. Especially is this true in the Soviet republics, because for the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union, it is no longer just a matter of political enslavement but a matter of national survival. The Communist rulers are not satisfied with wielding power alone. Their long range plan is to merge the fifteen republics by abolishing the boundaries between them and to fuse their people into one solid, submissive Soviet mass of state puppets, with no right to think or act for themselves, but only to serve obediently, their Russian masters.

For this reason, the Kremlin leaders have initiated a program of russification and de-nationalization. Their aim is to obliterate national identities and to preserve only the Russian identity; by making Russian the primary and official language while discouraging by intimidation the use of the native languages of the non-Russian people; by

progressively devaluating the national individual cultures, fusing them into one Soviet culture; by resettling vast numbers of natives into the far regions of Siberia and the settling of carpet-bagging Russians in each of the republics; by manning the highest positions in the party, the government, the factories and in the institutions of learning with Communist boot-licking bureaucrats. But the most abhorrent method used in the promotion of this policy is the decimation of the ranks of potential leaders and dissidents, mainly the intellectuals and the professional people, by indiscriminate and illegal arrests, secret trials, excessive punishment, commitments to insane asylums, sentencing to labor camps and exiling to Siberia with no chance of return to the cities of their birth.

Is this, my fellow Americans, difficult to comprehend or believe? You believed the reports of the Nazi atrocities, as heinous and incredible as they were. Why, may I ask? Because the world media persistently revealed them to you in all their horror. And the media persistently revealed them to you, because we fought the Nazis. They were our declared enemies. But you heard nothing, or relatively little about the Russian atrocities, during and after World War II, because they were our allies, and it is just too embarrassing to reveal such shameful deeds of your allies. Today we hear less and less of the truth, because we have ended the Cold War and embarked on a quest of permanent peace on the precarious sea of detente in a fragile boat of naivete. So we are warned that nothing must be done to rock that boat or upset that delicate balance of our relationship with Soviets; nothing must be said that might even remotely provoke the Red leaders, even if it is the horrible truth.

Most Americans are only indirectly, if at all, concerned about the victims of Communism and their tragic plight, and certainly are not interested in offering these subjugated peoples any help in their liberation struggles, although these captive nations could become our most effective allies in the fight against Communism. But most Americans are, or at least profess to be, interested in peace and in furthering all endeavors aimed toward the attainment of that peace. And no one can dispute the fact that this is a worthy goal. But peace is not a mere absence of war or a cessation of open hostilities; it is not a cat and mouse game, or a jangling war of nerves. True peace is a feeling of harmony and security born in an atmosphere of trust and friendship. And if we Americans truly want peace, the question arises, as to whether we can expect to gain it, as a result of our government's present policy of detente toward the Soviet Union, a world power second only to the United States, but making unexpected strides in becoming the first.

There are those who believe that we can buy our peace with accommodation or appeasement. There are those who believe that the Russian leaders are mellowing and that by our humane and conciliatory behavior we can convince them of the necessity of the preference for peace to that of a nuclear war and the annihilation of our civilization. What do you believe? That question you must answer for yourself, but only after you have seriously contemplated the facts. Will you accept a few of them, as I know them, from me, together with my hope that they will induce you to probe further and to learn from various authentic sources, "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth"?

Since the end of World War I, when Henry Ford first sent some of his engineers to give the Russians the benefit of American know-how, both through private and public channels, we have been pouring into that country, every conceivable kind of aid and assistance. During World War II alone, eleven bil-

lion dollars worth of lend-lease was dispensed to them with our generous hand and they haven't paid us back a dime. We have been making concessions, one after another, even endangering our own security by cutting back our defense program, unilaterally—for a time at least—desisting from nuclear bomb testing, while the military Russian might keeps growing and reaching superiority. And in all that time, we have not been able to convince them of our peaceful intentions. Because it is not peace that the Kremlin leaders want. Their aim, no matter who is in command, was and continues to be world domination. Thus they are preparing for us Americans and the remainder of the Free World, the same fate that the Captive Nations are experiencing today.

It has been proven that Communists will lie, cheat, exploit and murder (even their own leaders when they have outlived their usefulness). So they don't mind signing a few treaties to gain some time when they need it, since they have no qualms about violating treaties, when it suits their purpose. They don't mind playing the role of Apostles of Peace, because that is good for their image, but at the same time in every corner of the globe they foment war. They don't mind extending the use of their tanks and guns and soldiers to their sister-socialist republics, pretending to have been invited to restore law and order, while actually invading and forcibly preventing their departure from the Communist fold. They don't even mind asking for and accepting help from their "mortal enemies", the foolish Capitalists, whom they openly ridicule and besmirch and whose extinction they secretly and gleefully plan. For to them, the most important thing in the world is to progress toward their goal, by any means, be they the foulest.

The record of Russian treachery and perfidy is well established and a mountain of evidence is available to those who wish to verify it for themselves. You recall how Brezhnev was sweet-talking and peace-talking us during his recent visit. Yet the Communist editors back home were continuing to write about the "uncompromising struggle against bourgeois capitalist ideology". And Mr. Brezhnev said: "There are still too many people who would rather make noises about military preparations and the arms race than discuss . . . peaceful cooperation". Is it possible that he was talking about his own Defense Minister Grechko, who only a few weeks prior asserted that military and patriotic training as well as preparedness now have assumed even greater significance than during the war.

And in his message to the American people, Mr. Brezhnev continued in his self-assured manner, to spew his self-serving prevarications. "We take pride", he boasted, "in having built . . . a most stable and confidently developing society which has assured all our citizens of social justice". Oh, if only the muzzles could be removed from the millions of people enjoying that social justice! What a story they could relate! But even without their testimony, the continuing arrests of intellectuals and other innocents, the secret trials, the innumerable prison camps filled to capacity, the defections, the underground publications, and the like, spell out the reality of the brand of social justice that Brezhnev and his ilk are handing out to their captive subjects.

But we Americans go on nevertheless, naively trying to convince ourselves that we must try to understand; we must keep on helping; we must keep on talking; we must keep on negotiating; we must keep on compromising. And so trustingly, compassionately, we give them almost everything they ask for. The recent wheat sale, for instance, which was alleged to have been such a wonderful deal for us, turned out to be practically another hand-out, for the price was ridiculously low, the credits long-term with

low interest rates and a subsidy from us, the taxpayers, to boot, at the same time causing shortages and the sky-rocketing of prices at home. But the real irony in the whole situation is the fact, that in addition, we shored up their economic bungling, covered up their failures and helped the Communist leaders to save face before their own subjects. Is that not really supporting the system and helping to prolong its existence?

It is my belief, fellow Americans, that in the world of today, it is indispensable to have an exchange between the nations of the world family, through trade and other channels, for their mutual benefit. But this exchange must be on an equal basis with a certain amount of give and take. But with Russia we are dealing on unequal terms, for it seems that we always give and they only take. And as if this was not enough, they are asking to have the status of a most-favored nation in our trade dealings with them.

Perhaps I am lacking in compassion. Perhaps we ought to feed the Soviets, whatever may be the cost to us. Perhaps we ought to cancel their war debt and supply them gratuitously or at a low cost, with everything they claim to need. After all, they do have more important uses for their money. They need it for more sophisticated weapons for their "liberation wars", for more generous aid and comfort to their allies and our enemies, for bigger and better propaganda mills and for more extensive and effective subversion programs. Perhaps I am also pessimistic about peaceful co-existence. But the words: peaceful co-existence immediately bring to mind what Khrushchev was preparing for us in Cuba, although even prior to that, it was fairly plain to me that co-existence in the Russian parlance was a one-way street and that meant, according to their every demand and going down the road to eventual and complete capitulation.

Can you believe that a lamb could bed down with a bear and survive? Then how can you believe that we are entering upon a new century of peace? Communism has claimed more than 85 million victims as it progressed during the past fifty years to cast its shadow over one-third of the surface of our earth, while the Free World is shrinking in size. Russians loudly clamor for peace and cooperation, as they are now doing at the European Conference for Security and Cooperation. But it is they who are maintaining a colonial empire long after other powers have given up theirs; it is they who refuse to renounce the Brezhnev Doctrine, reserving the right to use force when they deem it necessary; it is they who are maintaining the Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain and refusing the free flow of information, ideas, products and people; it is they who are seeking to hold in their iron grip forever the Captive Nations by asking for a ratification of existing boundaries and precluding any change in the future; it is they who are deliberately and flagrantly violating the provisions of the Declaration of Human Rights to which they were a signatory, by depriving their captive subjects, not only of political rights and civil rights, but of all human rights. Their deeds belie their words. Can co-existence or peace be built and flourish on such shifting sands?

A vulture does not become a dove, though he masks himself with the plumage of a dove and pretends to coo like a dove. And if past and current events have not made us perceptive enough to discern the truth, then we are increasingly conditioning ourselves for our eventual loss of freedom and preparing our own burial. You may laugh, you may sneer, you may even jeer. But serious-minded people, who are truly concerned not only about the present but about the future as well, are beginning to realize that the Soviet Union and its imperialism cloaked with its communism is a clear and continuing danger to the United States and the present

policy of detente will not reduce the hazard. On the contrary, it will only serve to further the totalitarianism of the Kremlin bosses.

This concern, on the part of an increasing number of Americans, is translating itself into equally serious consideration of the means by which to halt Communism and eventually, to eradicate it. But, many of you will say, we had the policy of containment and we had the policy of a Cold war. What did they achieve? True . . . we proclaimed those policies but we pursued them, not wholeheartedly, but superficially and those superficial efforts brought only superficial results. We ended up with two Chinas, two Koreas, two Vietnams, and now, with two Germany. Perhaps tomorrow it will be two Europes and eventually two North Americas. Is it not obvious then that peace cannot be attained and reign in a world half slave and half free? So it is in the interest of peace that we should strive to liberate that part of the world that is not free.

The first step toward that goal . . . is to begin to fight communism, or perhaps more accurately, in order to free the European Captive Nations, to fight the imperialism of Russian Communism. Does it appear to be an impossible task? No, because empires have crumbled before. But more importantly, we must remember that where there is a will, there is always a way. May I humbly offer a few broad and basic suggestions?

1. First and foremost; let us persuade our representatives in Congress that the U.S. should attain and maintain a superior military posture, not only for our own security and defense but as an effective deterrent to nuclear war. For superior strength is the only force the Russians will respect and fear.

2. Let us promote the liberation struggles of the Captive Nations by lending them our moral and political support and utilize these captive peoples as needed allies in our mutual endeavors to counteract Communism and Russian imperialism. In effect, are we not so committed, by the Congressional Act of 1959, which created the Captive Nations Week, which we are now observing?

3. Let us further the cause of human freedom by asking our government to recognize the governments-in-exile of the Captive Nations and to press for the admittance of their delegates to the United Nations, so that free elections under the supervision of the United Nations could be held in the Captive Nations and allowing the people to decide what form of government shall be theirs.

4. Let us conduct a massive ideological and psychological offensive for that same cause of human freedom, utilizing truth as our weapon. Consequently, instead of reducing or abolishing the facilities we now have in the form of the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty etc. let us expand them and use them to the fullest measure to reveal to the world the nefarious deeds of the Communists both within and without their borders.

5. Let us seek in every situation and in every dealing with the USSR concessions to alleviate the plight of the captive peoples, just as Congress imposed a condition, the elimination of the immigration tax on Jewish emigres, as a prerequisite to the trade treaty with the Soviet Union.

6. Let us, as readers and subscribers of our press and periodicals, and as listeners and viewers of radio and television, demand more frequent and extensive coverage of this vital issue, and not just with straight discussions and the like, in order to inform and enlighten greater numbers of the American public about this issue of communism vs. freedom and related matters.

7. And let us, re-awaken in America, a strong and genuine feeling of love and pride in our freedom, creating thereby an impregnable bulwark against communism and re-establishing our vigilance, so that we may

never lose our freedom and yet, propelled by our innate sense of justice, strive likewise to regain it for others who have lost it.

Lest we forget, fellow Americans, freedom is a priceless possession and an essential ingredient of living, without which man cannot live indefinitely, without his soul withering and his will shriveling, reducing him to the level of vegetative existence. That is why history is replete with the names of heroes and martyrs, who fought and died to win liberty for themselves or to liberate others who were oppressed by tyrants.

A short time separates us from the moment of the 200th birthday of our nation. Committees throughout our country are working feverishly to evolve appropriate programs of celebration. But some are suggesting frivolous and costly gala events. Do we need to exploit such an historic event for another swinging, smashing, stupendous party?

For those who truly cherish freedom, a simple yet sincere, a symbolic yet dramatic gesture of appreciation would serve as the finest opportunity for expressing thankfulness. An excellent example was set by our Prisoners of War recently returning home. Were you not stirred by the unconstrained feeling that overwhelmed these men, who knew from their own tragic experience what it meant to live without freedom, and some of them, upon regaining it, gratefully fell to their knees, unashamedly kissed the soil of this free American Land and humbly thanked God for their safe return to a free home.

Why couldn't we be equally grateful and magnificently humble, and not only in 1973, but on every 4th of July, at a given moment, throughout our free land, starting with the President and including every American—all 204 million of us—descend upon our knees, reverently touching with lips or hands, the ground made hallow by the blood of our freedom fighting forefathers and pouring out a majestic chorus of thanksgiving that we are not a captive nation. And to that thanksgiving add an ardent prayer, that not only we, but that all men, now captive, might walk this earth equally free. But to that prayer let us add effort and let us not wait to fight until we are doomed to die, but fight now, to preserve freedom and live, live to see its onward march prepare the path for peace.

IN PRAISE OF WARREN GRIMES

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on September 26, Mr. Warren Grimes of Urbana, Ohio, and Delray Beach, Fla., will celebrate both his 75th birthday and the 40th anniversary of the founding of the company which bears his name, the Grimes Manufacturing Co. At this time, I wish to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives a brief review of Warren Grimes' life and company.

From very humble beginnings in a Tiffin, Ohio, orphanage, Warren Grimes has become one of the leaders of this Nation's aviation industry. For almost a half century Grimes Manufacturing Co. has produced lighting and electronic instrumentation equipment for aircraft—from the Ford trimotor to the Apollo space series. In the early 1930's in a rented garage in Urbana, Ohio, Warren Grimes founded the company that now

bears his name. In doing so he fulfilled a childhood ambition to contribute to aviation development born when he watched the earliest flights of the Wright brothers in Dayton, Ohio.

One of his first endeavors at the Urbana plant was the development and production of red and green navigation lights that still blink on the wings of aircraft. With Federal approval for his design, his business expanded rapidly, and he soon became the city's largest employer. In the hectic World War II years, his company was a winner of the coveted Army-Navy "E" award, and he was always proud that wartime aircraft production was never delayed because of a lack of Grimes' lighting.

Today Grimes Manufacturing Co. is an acknowledged leader in the field of specialized transportation lighting equipment and related electronic systems, and for almost 40 years has been a widely recognized designer, developer, and producer of lighting equipment for military, commercial, and general aviation aircraft. Indeed, Grimes lighting and instrumentation has most recently gone to the Moon in the American Apollo space series. In recent years, the company has also diversified to serve marine, automotive, railroad, and other specialty lighting markets.

With main offices and manufacturing plants in Urbana, Ohio, Grimes Manufacturing Co.'s 1,000 employees produce over 6,000 different lighting and integrated electronic items for a worldwide market. The company also has U.S. sales and technical representatives across this country and a sophisticated research and development center in Delray Beach Fla., where long-range programs involving advanced lighting concepts are studied and perfected. With the establishment of a branch plant in France, Grimes Manufacturing has become a multinational company.

But there is more to Warren Grimes than just his company. Having become a licensed pilot as a young man, Warren saw the need for adequate area airport facilities, and early presented Urbana with its own municipal airport, Grimes Field. He also served his community as mayor and later the State of Ohio as a member of various commissions, including the chairmanship of the State aviation board. In 1961, Warren Grimes was honored by the American Schools and Colleges Association, Inc., when he received the Horatio Alger award granted by the association to leaders whose careers typify the results of individual initiative, hard work and honesty, and adherence to traditional American ideals. In being so honored, he took his place among such distinguished Americans as Dwight D. Eisenhower, Herbert Hoover, and Dr. Norman Vincent Peale. During that same year, Mr. Grimes was voted Urbana's man of the year by that city's chamber of commerce. He also holds an honorary degree of doctor of engineering in aeronautics from Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

Warren Grimes is also a philanthropist, having endowed perpetual scholarships at the Ohio State University for students from each graduating class at

Urbana High School. He spearheaded the fund-raising drive for, and has been one of the largest contributors to, the fine Urbana Mercy Memorial Hospital, and has contributed to many other community projects in both Ohio and Florida.

I am proud to call Warren Grimes a friend, and know that I join with his many other friends and associates across this Nation in wishing Warren the best on his 75th birthday, and health and happiness in the years to come.

THE GREAT RURAL RIPOFF

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, during the August congressional recess a hearing was held in my district by a Civil Aeronautics Board administrative law judge on an application by Hughes Air West to delete scheduled air service to the community of Apple Valley. This case is only the latest in a long list of attempts to eliminate rural air service throughout the United States. I know other Members of the House have had similar hearings held in their districts and are as concerned as I over the growing trend toward what I call The Great Rural Rip-off.

Today I am submitting for my colleagues' attention a copy of the statement which I introduced at the CAB hearing. I testified because I believe it is important for citizens and their elected representatives to speak out in all forums on this issue. It is imperative that we insure against the need for rural air service being ignored by the Federal and State planners who develop master plans of aviation. If we do not act now, in a few years there will be virtually no passenger air service to nonurban areas.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

I would like first to thank you for coming to Victorville and hearing this case. All too often these days, decisions which affect thousands of people are made back in Washington by officials who have no concept of the conditions of the area about which their decision is concerned.

I should like to mention that among the jobs I held prior to my election to Congress I was a commercial airline pilot—and I am still a member of the Airline Pilots Association, AFL-CIO—as well as being a vice president of one of the nation's largest trunk airlines. This causes me to be especially interested in the Apple Valley case now pending before you.

As one considers the various positions presented in this case it is important to put them within a context which is in many ways larger than the case alone. Let me explain: our country has at various times made it a matter of national policy "... to encourage and foster a balanced national development that provides opportunities for increased numbers of Americans to work and enjoy a high quality of life dispersed throughout our Nation ..." (quoted from the Rural Development Act of 1972, P.L. 92-419). To meet this national goal, it is obvious that rural communities must develop and maintain a viable economic base, which in turn requires the existence of conditions which draw in-

dustrial, new jobs and families. It goes without saying that transportation, including reliable air service, is essential to such a rural development program.

The federal government has not always shown itself to be very sensitive to many of the real needs of rural areas. In such areas as housing, health care, water and sewage treatment facilities or transportation, to name only a few areas, rural communities lag far behind their urban counterparts. An average of 800,000 people annually move from rural areas. This shows how vital it is for federal regulatory agencies to consider the national commitment as stated in the Rural Development Act, for example, when making decisions and that they give support to those rural communities which, like Apple Valley, are successfully running against the current tide of rural to urban migration and rural economic stagnation.

The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (P.L. 85-726), states that as part of the policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Board "shall consider ... in accordance with the public convenience and necessity ... (c) The promotion of adequate, economical and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competition."

There have been some C.A.B. decisions, such as *Piedmont Aviation (Deletion of Elizabeth City)*, Order 72-4-96, April 18, 1972, which have focused on the plight of rural air service. I am not aware of any decision in which the Board has clarified what "adequate" service is for rural areas. The result of this has been that within the past three years alone, Hughes Air West has applied for and been granted approval to suspend and/or delete service to 10 communities in Oregon, California and Arizona. Deletion of service was recommended for another California community, Paso Robles, just last month. The problems of rural air service have become so severe nationwide that one of Ralph Nader's organizations has filed a petition and complaint with the C.A.B. on the declining rural air service.

My friends here will focus in great detail on certain technical aspects of this case. The pattern of poor service and almost nonexistent promotion activities is clear enough. I believe, to demonstrate that Air West has only with the greatest reluctance provided what little service it has given. The airline, in its effort to become a regional and then perhaps a national carrier, seems to have forgotten the conditions under which it originally took over the service to Apple Valley. The previously inadequate airport facilities in Apple Valley have been up-to-date competitive practices. ...

The public need for air service has increased, not decreased, since the time the predecessor of Hughes Air West first began services to Apple Valley. Yet, Air West seems not to have noticed. The entire High Desert depends upon this air service. The population of the area is 119,529 (approx) people, who are dispersed over 6,256.2+ square miles. Obviously the area cannot support airline service in the way a metropolitan area can. Our needs are not such that we insist we be served by the largest jets in Air West's inventory. Indeed, just as in the case in other rural areas previously served by Air West, we can support reasonable, scheduled service utilizing smaller planes which the company has. All we ask is that a level of service be made available as provided under Section 404(a) of the Federal Aviation Act.

For the people of the desert, what is their access to air service right now? The largest community in the area, Barstow, is 35 miles from Apple Valley. Needles is 167 miles from Apple Valley and about 100 miles from the Las Vegas airport, while various smaller communities, such as Trona and Baker, are over 100 miles from Apple Valley. Should

service to the Apple Valley Airport be discontinued, citizens will have to go to Ontario International Airport, which is about 75 miles further away, or over to Las Vegas, which is even further away in many cases. Without air service the people of the California desert area will have to spend many hours and travel many miles to catch a plane to complete their business or pleasure trips. By way of contrast, it should be noted that citizens in metropolitan Los Angeles are served by four airports which bring the convenience of air service close at hand.

The future of our rural communities will be dark indeed if airlines are in effect rewarded by the C.A.B. for failing to meet their responsibilities to the area they serve with a favorable action on applications such as the one before us today. Rural communities are anxious to attract industry and new citizens who are perhaps retired or who just want to escape from the pressures and unhealthy conditions of the urban areas. Needless to say, in these fast moving times of ours, scheduled air transportation is a big drawing card for industry, as well as a guarantee to the public in the area that a fast, efficient mode of travel is available for emergencies or to ease the travel of visitors, grandchildren perhaps, or a badly needed piece of equipment, perhaps a new motor for an air conditioner.

I have on various occasions spoken with and written to the Civil Aeronautics Board on behalf of Apple Valley. This public hearing is one of the last steps before the Board makes its decision. I believe it will be clear to all that continued regular service is of vital importance to Apple Valley and the entire California High Desert. It is also clear that a great disservice will be done to the citizens of our community and, by extension, to millions of other Americans living in other rural areas if service is denied.

The Board should compel Air West to fulfill its obligation to Apple Valley. I hope that the pending application will be rejected and that the Apple Valley case will stand as a milestone to our federal government's looking at the needs of rural people as well as the airline bank books.

THE MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Congress has approved a minimum wage bill despite a strong threat of Presidential veto. Contrary to the administration's contention that the proposed legislation "will only fuel" our inflationary economy, I believe that the minimum wage proposal is must legislation, not only for the wage earners directly affected, but for the Nation as a whole.

Sylvia Porter's column appearing in the New York Post on August 20, 1973, clearly reveals the fallacies of the administration's rationale, and puts into perspective the benefits to be achieved through this legislation. The column follows:

MINIMUM WAGE HIKE VERSUS INFLATION (By Sylvia Porter)

If President Nixon vetoes the minimum wage hike passed by Congress early this month, it will be on the basis that the increase would throw even more fuel on our

fiery inflation and would lead to massive firing of marginal workers.

So strong is the threat of a Nixon veto that Congressional leaders have delayed sending the measure to the White House until this coming Saturday, Aug. 25—so Congress would have a chance when it reconvenes Sept. 5 to try to override a turnaround. (Had Congress sent the bill to the President and then gone on vacation, the President could have killed it merely by a pocket veto and Congress would have had no comeback.)

The bill would raise the minimum wage from \$1.60 to \$2.20 an hour within one to three years, depending on the occupational category and, among other things, also would expand our wage-hour laws to include 7 million to 8 million additional workers. It is indeed a liberal measure.

Would it, then, accelerate our wage-price spiral? Would it swell our jobless and welfare rolls?

The answer is not a simple yes or no, as Nixon almost surely will argue if he does veto the bill.

For instance, against a minimum wage hike now is the fact that summer '73 is hardly the right time to spur a new round of wage increases starting at the bottom and fanning out and up.

It is quite possible that against today's horrible economic background, a major minimum wage boost would set off a "ripple" effect, with the increases at the bottom leading to increases at the next level and then on and up to the top of the line.

There is the danger that businessmen would try to offset the extra labor costs by firing their older, less productive workers—thereby shifting them from the working poor to the welfare rolls.

But supporting a minimum wage increase are Labor Dept. studies of wage trends before and after past minimum wage hikes showing only a short-term wage spurt right after the change in the minimum wage—but no wage "ripple" upward through the pay ranks.

The story is similar for prices. Said former Labor Secretary James Hodgson after the massive 1966 minimum wage boosts: "The wage increases granted to 1,600,000 workers to meet the \$1.600 minimum wage standard had no discernible adverse effect on overall employment levels and on overall wage or price levels."

But, to me, these statistical arguments miss the two central points.

The first and overwhelmingly significant of these points is simply: How dare we ask the very lowest paid workers among us to stand in the first line of defense against an inflation fueled by the buying and borrowing of the affluent?

How can we possibly justify asking those already being pinched the hardest to accept an even stiffer pinch "for the national good"?

What sort of distorted economics translates price pressures resulting from a worldwide boom and its soaring demands for goods and services into a wage curb on those who don't even earn enough to have normal, much less "soaring," demands for anything?

The second point is implicit in the first: 1973's inflation is being caused by excessive demands for goods and services, not by excessive costs of labor.

And if we now leapfrog back into a cost-push inflation after this dreadful demand-pull inflation, the reason will be today's price spiral, not any increases in the pay of the lowest-rung workers.

Let's get some facts into perspective in these last days before Nixon gets the minimum wage bill and decides on a veto:

It would take an immediate hike to \$2.16 an hour just to cover price rises since the last minimum wage boost. It would take an immediate raise to \$2.21 an hour just to maintain the 1968 ratio of minimum wage earnings to the earnings of manufacturing workers (55 per cent). At this moment, auto

workers are getting an average of \$5.12 an hour, plus extra for overtime and fringe benefits.

The average yearly wage of a migrant farm worker in 1972 was \$1,830; of a hired farm worker, \$3,170; of a full-time domestic worker, about \$1,200.

Nearly 25 million Americans live in poverty today, many because the work they do doesn't even command the minimum wage. And those who get the \$1.60 hourly minimum wage are actually earning only \$64 for a five-day, 40-hour week.

METRIC CONVERSION BILL NEEDED NOW

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is timely for us to recall that the Bureau of Standards completed a 3-year study—in July 1971, on the subject of a conversion of our Nation to the metric system of weight and measures.

The report recommended that a national program should be established for an overall conversion to the metric system over a 10-year period.

Mr. Speaker, some 20 colleagues have joined me in the introduction of H.R. 2351 which would establish a Metric Conversion Coordinating Commission which would be able to act in conjunction with advisory committees and other private organizations throughout the Nation in order to coordinate a conversion to the metric system in our industries, businesses, educational institutions, and elsewhere throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, ours is the last great Nation which has not converted to the metric system—or is not in the process of such a conversion program. We should act promptly to utilize the metric system as our sole or predominant system of weights and measures. However, unless we establish a national program and coordinate our efforts, a haphazard and confused changeover will occur in our Nation which can be most detrimental to our educational, economic, and other interests.

Mr. Speaker, the confusion and disorder that can result is revealed in a recent editorial which appeared in the Sunday, September 2, issue of the Washington Star-News entitled "Going Metric." This editorial calls attention to a plan adopted by the Maryland State Board of Education to begin a 6-year transition to the metric system in the State's public schools. Obviously if other educational systems and business organizations are continuing to utilize our existing system of weights and measures after the Maryland schools have discontinued teaching the present system, confusion would be bound to follow.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial which I am attaching to these remarks provides a potent argument in favor of early action by the Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Congress for passage of H.R. 2351 or some other comparable measure which will establish a national

policy as well as a Federal mechanism for effectively coordinating a conversion of our entire Nation to the metric system—with a target date 10 years hence.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Star-News, Sept. 2, 1973]

GOING METRIC

Meeting in Ocean City the other day, the State Board of Education reportedly ordered a plan under which Maryland teachers, starting next fall, would begin a six-year transition to make the metric system the basic standard of measurement to be used in all types of classroom instruction.

Well, that's an interesting goal. And our first, firm reaction is that the board would be well advised to move toward it in inches, not meters.

It's not that we are emotionally committed to the only (non-metric) system we know, or that we oppose advance planning. The United States, as most people are aware by now, is about the only major non-metric nation left. A lot of bills that are pending in Congress would make the switch as a matter of national policy. The administration seems inclined to support the idea. There are some sound economic reasons why we should join the rest of the world, and our guess is that the changeover, in time, will occur.

Still, the decision to change hasn't been made yet, and in that light the state board's apparent determination to shove Maryland's schools in front of everyone else with a total commitment to the metric system is premature.

A substantially greater degree of classroom exposure to the metric system—along with the mysteries of the inch and the ounce—makes a lot of sense, starting right now. And in the event the entire nation does go metric, the merit of having a standby plan to cope with the immense problems of textbook replacement and teacher retraining is perfectly obvious.

But next year for certain—and quite possibly six years from now—all the rest of us will still be measuring tomatoes in pounds and first-downs in yards. Unless and until everyone changes, that is also the language in which Maryland school kids will have to measure.

THE A-7D IN COMBAT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the August 1973 issue of Air Force magazine carried an article by Mr. John Frisbee in which he has vividly related the story of the A-7D airplane in combat in Southeast Asia. The A-7D is made by the LTV Corp. located in Dallas, Tex., and has been the mainstay of the Air Force for a number of years, to say nothing of their performance for the Navy.

The article follows:

HOW THE A-7D REWROTE THE BOOK IN SEA
(By John L. Frisbee)

In the closing weeks of the Vietnam War, USAF sent the 354th TFW and its A-7Ds to Southeast Asia. During those ten weeks, the Little Hummer flew some 4,000 sorties—interdiction, close support, SAR, escort, Linebacker II. The wing lost only two aircraft in combat ops. Its accuracy with iron bombs set a new standard for tac fighters.

"When our flight of three A-7s got to the target area in Laos, three F-4s were working it with laser-guided bombs. They were going

after a bridge and had damaged it extensively before their fuel ran low and they had to leave.

"Then the FAC put us on the bridge. One of our pilots was a first lieutenant on his second mission in SEA—the second time he had ever dropped bombs in combat. We destroyed that bridge with three bombs.

"Next, the FAC gave us a bypass bridge about 100 meters down the river. We dropped it with two bombs and went over to a ferry crossing on another river. With three bombs, we destroyed the ferry cable, the dock, and the ferry.

"'Okay,' the FAC said, 'I've got only one more bridge.' We went down to that bridge and destroyed it with three bombs. Fantastic!"

The A-7D mission that Capt. Buddy Sizemore—a pilot of the 354th Tac Fighter Wing out of Myrtle Beach AFB, S.C.—described may not have been exactly typical, but it wasn't all that untypical of the wing's experience in Southeast Asia, either. And Captain Sizemore's "Fantastic!" is the judgment of a pilot who had been there before. Earlier in the war he flew a tour in F-4s, based at Phu Cat.

HIGH ACCURACY, LOW LOSSES

If you didn't know that USAF had an A-7D wing in SEA during the closing months of the Vietnam War, you're forgiven. Despite the remarkable record of the 354th TFW and its A-7D "Little Hummer," they got scant notice in the press. But they were there, all right.

The wing, then commanded by Col. Thomas M. Knoles, arrived at Korat Royal Thai AFB in mid-October 1972. Its seventy-two birds flew some 4,000 sorties between October 16 and the end of December, when the Linebacker II bombing campaign ended US participation in the Vietnam War. A squadron of the 354th is still there, along with one squadron from the 355th TFW, Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz., both under Col. William D. Curry, now the 354th Wing Commander.

Although neither Guinness nor anybody else keeps record books on tactical fighter wing achievements, the 354th TFW must have set a lot of new marks. Its deployment from Myrtle Beach to Korat set the tone for the entire operation. Col. John Rhemann—then Wing Deputy for Operations and now Wing Commander Rear, back from SEA and running the show at Myrtle Beach—said, "This was one of the few times in Air Force history that a wing of fighter aircraft departed the US and arrived at its overseas destination with all aircraft on schedule."

During its ten weeks of combat in 1972, the wing—operating at a 0.87 frag rate for its seventy-two aircraft, which comes out to sixty-two sorties a day—dropped nearly 25,000 bombs, most of them Mark 82 500-pounders. According to FACs and other interested observers of bombing accuracy, they probably had an average miss distance of about ten meters.

Capt. Harry G. Rodman is a FAC who worked the 354th A-7s, mostly against interdiction targets. He's now stationed at Hurlburt Field, Fla., with the 549th Tactical Air Support Training Squadron. Captain Rodman says that the A-7D "was tremendously accurate. You could depend on the weapon system to put an iron bomb exactly where you wanted it—an unguided system that could be used with confidence against point targets. When all its systems were operating, it was nearly as accurate as guided bombs."

Against all kinds of targets—trucks, storage sites, ammunition caches—the wing averaged close to twenty-five percent secondary explosions, significantly higher by estimates of experienced pilots than normally scored by other tactical fighters.

The A-7D proved to be reliable and easy to maintain. It had a ground abort rate

of 0.3 percent and an air abort rate of 0.5 percent. Tactical Air Command's "acceptable" rate is 5.0 percent.

Perhaps most remarkable of all was the A-7D's combat loss rate. The 354th was fringed against all kinds of targets in South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, with emphasis on generally well-defended interdiction targets. During Linebacker II, they supplied the bulk of the daytime strike force, hitting undisclosed targets—some of them near downtown Hanoi—requiring extreme accuracy. The wing lost only two aircraft in its combat operations. One of the pilots was captured and subsequently returned when the POW's were released by North Vietnam. The other, regrettably, was killed.

THE A-7D'S SMARTS

What accounts for the 354th TFW's unprecedented accuracy in delivering unguided bombs and for its combat loss rate, which must be the lowest in the history of tactical fighter operations? Ask any A-7D pilot, and he'll tell you it was the airplane—not the pilots.

Even though fighter pilots are not noted for their modesty, we'll discount that statement. With two or three exceptions, all of the 354th pilots who flew in SEA were old hands. Most of them had at least one previous SEA tour in F-100s, F-105s, or F-4s. The same goes for the rated members of the wing staff and the squadron commanders who led missions. And they all had a good bit of A-7 time in the States. You don't write off that kind of experience as a neutral factor.

Nevertheless, a large share of the credit must go to the bird itself. Its electronic systems were described in some detail by Capt. Tom Ryan, a 354th pilot, in an article, "A-7D—That Super-Accurate SLUF," published in our March 1972 issue. The systems include forward-looking radar, Doppler, an Inertial Measurement System, and a radar altimeter. The information supplied by these systems is digested by a tactical computer and displayed on a Projected Map Display System (a map in the cockpit on which the aircraft's precise position is continuously indicated) and on a Head-Up Display (HUD) projected on the windscreen, which gives the pilot all information he needs to control the aircraft and deliver bombs or 20-mm shells on target. The systems can be used for accurate straight-and-level bombing from medium altitude, radar offset bombing, computed gunfire, and for dive-bombing—the most accurate bomb delivery mode.

One of the beautiful things about the Little Hummer's systems is the flexibility they give a pilot in his dive-bombing run. After the navigation systems have led him to the target area, all he has to do is identify the target, then, looking through the Head-Up Display on his windscreen, put the HUD's aiming symbol on the target and press a "designator" button on the stick. The computer almost instantaneously figures out the point in space where bombs must be released to hit the target. The pilot can take evasive action all the way down the chute until the aiming symbol meets the target. At that point, he levels his wings for "about three seconds," picks the bomb, and pulls off the target. Bull's-eye or a near miss! No more worries about parameters of airspeed, dive angle, release altitude, which have always demanded so much of a pilot's attention, kept his head in the cockpit, and made him a predictable target for enemy gunners.

STAY HIGH, STAY SAFE

Except in cases where they had to go low in order to identify a target, the 354th pilots released from altitudes between 5,000 and 7,000 feet—well above the effective range of small-arms fire and most enemy AAA. So the A-7D's electronic systems in the hands of competent pilots came up with unequalled accuracy and survivability.

Here's how Lt. Col. Charlie Copin, Commander of the wing's 356th Squadron, put it: "My job as a squadron commander was to make sure that targets were hit and that the airplanes came back so they could be used again the next day. It was damned nice to be able to put a 3,000-foot-above-the-ground minimum altitude restriction on my pilots, knowing that they could hit the target without getting down in the weeds. It was the airplane, not the pilots, that allowed us to do that."

The A-7's accuracy did create an educating job for the pilots. "We had to get the FACs to not talk in general terms," Captain Sizemore said. "They would say, 'Okay, fifty meters west of my smoke.' You'd drop a bomb and the FAC would say, 'Now ten meters east.' We had to tell them, 'Hey, wait a minute. I see a tree on a rocky point. Where do you want it in relation to that?' We had to educate them to use specific points."

Should the A-7 be modified to carry laser or electro-optical guided bombs? Capt. Don Cornell doesn't think so. "To be realistic, LGBs are more accurate than the A-7's iron bombs. The difference in accuracy isn't great, and it's not going to cost you as much to destroy a given target with the A-7 as with guided bombs."

Another virtue of the A-7D's systems was pointed out by Capt. Dave Sawyer. "The tac computer allows you to come in on a target from any direction, dive angle, and airspeed. With several A-7s working a target, each with different parameters, you really can keep the defenders busy. And you don't have to waste any time finding the target. All pilots know where it is from their systems. You can hit it and get out fast."

When operating on long missions, as they did in SEA, and for deployment, the A-7D's navigation system is a real boon. Captain Cornell said that occasionally, during the deployment to Korat, the KC-135s that refueled them over the Pacific would update their navigation systems from his. "I was less than a mile off course between Hawaii and Wake Island. This was entirely on the Inertial Measuring System, and without the Doppler, since we were over water."

LITTLE BIRD—LONG LEGS

Another plus for the A-7D—and for Seventh Air Force planners—was the length of the airplane's legs. Colonel Rhemann has a bunch of charts in his briefing room at Myrtle Beach AFB, centered on Korat RTAFB. They show the areas in which combat-loaded A-7Ds could operate without refueling from tankers—essentially all of Southeast Asia.

A typical configuration was for a mission with a 350-nautical-mile radius. That radius takes in all of western South Vietnam, North Vietnam to within about ninety miles of Hanoi, Cambodia, and Laos except for the extreme northern tip. Carrying two 300-gallon wing tanks, eight Mark 82 bombs, and 1,000 rounds of 20-mm ammunition, the bird had thirty minutes in the target area and 2,300 pounds of fuel reserve on return to Korat. By cutting the fuel reserve to 1,500 pounds, combat radius was increased to 480 nautical miles—well beyond Hanoi and Haiphong, without refueling.

Often a pilot was fragged against a target in southern South Vietnam, diverted to one in north Laos, and was still able to give the FAC twenty to thirty minutes in the target area without refueling. Some Linebacker II missions were flown without tanker support; on others, external tanks were left off in order to increase the A-7's bomb load, and tankers were used.

The A-7D's range came in handy in two other missions assigned to the 354th: search and rescue (more about that later), and night escort for the AC-130 Spectre gunships. Maj. Jack Terry believes that the A-7 was the best aircraft in SEA for gunship escort "because we could stay with them so long—

about an hour and a half. When escorting the Spectres, we did flak suppression on the big guns," which was never a real fun job.

Did the wing do much night work? "No," said Lt. Col. Dave Eknes, the 355th Squadron Commander. "The A-7 is well adapted to night operations because of the precision of its systems, but we were limited by the number of aircraft we had over there. They wanted us in the daytime."

SEARCH AND RESCUE

When the 354th went to SEA, they expected to be flying interdiction and close support. It turned out to be more interdiction than close support, largely because of the nature of the conflict at that time. Very few US ground forces were involved, and, during late 1972, there were fewer troops in contact, so the number of true, "close-support" sorties was considerably less than in previous years. Then they flew some bombing missions that could be classified as strategic during Linebacker II.

The big surprise, however, was being given the Sandy role in search and rescue (SAR) operations—locating and protecting downed airmen, covering the rescue helicopters, and coordinating action in the pickup area. That happened three weeks after their arrival at Korat, because the A-1s that had done the Sandy job throughout the Vietnam War were being turned over to the South Vietnamese Air Force.

"There was considerable skepticism about the A-7's suitability for the Sandy mission," Colonel Rhemann recalled. "We went into an extensive training program to develop new tactics. By comparison to the A-1, the A-7 is a relatively fast, high-performance aircraft. Tactics had to be changed significantly. We had a couple of pilots who had flown A-1 Sandys in SEA, and that helped."

"A week after taking over the Sandy job, our pilots participated in the pickup of two F-105 pilots near Thanh Hoa in some very marginal weather. It was a difficult mission, and, after that, there was little doubt that the A-7 was not just an adequate replacement for the A-1. It was far superior in that role."

Before the air war ended eight weeks later, 354th Sandy pilots had taken part in the rescue of twenty-two downed flyers. The "difficult mission" Colonel Rhemann spoke about was certainly among the classics of the SAR business. Here is how it went:

An F-105 Wild Weasel had been hit by a SAM in the vicinity of Thanh Hoa, on the coast, some ninety miles south of Hanoi. The Weasel crew bailed out at about 11:00 p.m., landing at the base of the first ridge line west of the city. The following day, three of the 354th Sandys went up in very bad weather and got the survivors located, part way up the ridge line, but separated from each other.

A SAR force of about seventy-five aircraft was put together late that day and during the night by the Joint Rescue Coordination Center at Tan Son Nhut Air Base, near Saigon. It included F-105 Wild Weasels to suppress the SAMs around Thanh Hoa, F-4 Wolf FACs and F-4 MIG CAP aircraft, tankers, an HC-130 Kingbird (the mission coordinator), H-53 Jolly Green rescue helicopters, A-7Ds with smoke for screening purposes, and three 354th TFW Sandys. Pickup was set for first light the following day, with takeoff for the Sandys at 0430.

Maj. Colin A. "Arnie" Clarke, who was operations officer of the 35th TFW's SAR organization, led the Sandys. He has been awarded the Air Force Cross for his part in the show.

The Sandys rendezvoused with the Jolly Greens above a solid overcast along the Laos-North Vietnam border. While the Jollys held in orbit, Major Clarke and his wingmen worked east from the Plaine des Jarres in Laos, looking for a break in the overcast through which a chopper could let down. Ap-

proach from the Gulf of Tonkin seemed out of the question. The Thanh Hoa area was heavily defended by antiaircraft guns and SAMs, while just north of the town was a MIG field.

INTO THE VALLEY

Major Clarke told his wingmen to hold while he let down several times into narrow valleys, trusting to the accuracy of his Projected Map Display and radar altimeter. Each time he broke out under very low ceilings, the valley proved too narrow to turn in, and ahead the clouds closed down over rises in the ground.

Giving up on the valleys, Clarke climbed up on top, flew east, and let down over the Gulf to see if there was any way to work in a Jolly through the enemy defenses along the coast. There wasn't. He did get the survivors pinpointed and marked on his Projected Map Display so both men on the ground could be found immediately on return.

Clarke now went back over the Gulf, picked up his wingmen and the smoke-carrying A-7s, and took them in to see where the survivors were. The A-7s took several .51-caliber hits. But weather in the pickup area had improved somewhat—2,500-foot ceiling with lower broken clouds, rain, and three miles' visibility. It was still too low for the supporting F-4s to use their delay-fuzed CBU antipersonnel bomblets against enemy gun positions. To the west, the only approach route for the choppers, it was still down in the valleys.

Everything pointed to an aborted mission. But Major Clarke "knew that the weather wouldn't be any better for days. The survivors couldn't last that long." Having been shot down himself on an earlier tour as an F-100 Misty FAC, he knew that it was now or never.

Going back west again, Major Clarke let down on instruments in a valley wide enough to turn in. While he orbited just above the ground, one of the Jollys did a DF letdown on him, but ran low on fuel, climbed back through the clouds, and headed for home.

The mission now was six hours old.

Two more Jollys came up from Nakhon Phanom and held while Clarke went out to a tanker for a rest and fuel. At that point, he set a pickup time for the SAR force. Going back west, he once more let down on instruments into a valley "wide enough to hold a two-G turn" and a chopper DFed down on his position—about forty-five miles west of the survivors.

Flying ahead and doing 360-degree turns to stay with the chopper, Clarke led it to near the pickup area, where he told the Jolly to hold while he went in to get the survivors alerted and suppress fire from enemy guns.

Clarke now discovered a .51-caliber gun position on the ridge, just above one survivor, who was hiding in tall brush. "A guy could have thrown a hand grenade from the gun pits onto the survivor." He and his wingmen, Captains Sawyer and Cornell, kept fire on the guns while the A-7 smoke birds laid down a screen.

By this time, there was a lot of lead flying around and a lot of chatter on the radio. The Jolly Green pilot decided to come in, unaware of the gun position close to one survivor. Miraculously, he made both pickups, then headed west, directly past the .51-gun pits.

Clarke made "a very low pass" on the guns to protect the Jolly and took a hit "by something that felt like a 57-mm." He lost all his systems and pulled up into the clouds "with what I hoped was wings level. About that time a SAM radar picked me up, and things didn't look too good." The SAM apparently didn't fire.

Clarke broke out on top, joined up with a couple of A-7s, and made an IFR landing at Da Nang, flying the wing of one A-7 Mission time: about nine hours.

The "57-mm hit" turned out to have been a .51-cal tracer that exploded one of his empty wing tanks, blowing in the side of the fuselage and bowing the underside of the wing.

That was one to remember.

MANY PLUSES—A FEW MINUSES

The 354th Tactical Fighter Wing was the first to try out the A-7D in combat. They went to Korat to fly interdiction and close support. That they did, and gunship night escort, search and rescue, helicopter escort—and Linebacker II daytime strike missions in and around Hanoi. They did a lot of things that no tactical fighters have done before, and some things that other fighters haven't done as well.

No one in the 354th had mouths the A-7D. Not the pilots, who came from F-100, F-105, and F-4 units. Not the ground crews or support people.

Like every airplane, the A-7D has its faults—like its ground-loving tendency on a hot, 105-degree runway with a full load—but they're few compared to its virtues. And, so far as runway length is concerned, Charlie Copin pointed out that "where you don't have to fly as far to target as we did in SEA, you can leave off the wing tanks, carry the same bomb load, and reduce take-off roll by 3,000 feet."

If they could redesign the A-7D, how would they change it? More power? Of course. Every pilot wants that in any airplane. A bigger gun? Maybe, but if you can hit a tank with bombs on the first pass, do you really need a bigger gun?

Anything else?

After a long pause, Capt. Don Cornell replied, "I guess about the only thing I'd do would be to make it a little prettier."

And that just about sums up the 354th Tactical Fighter Wing's feeling of affection for its Little Hummer.

VEYSEY URGES CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR LIVESTOCK DISEASE DISASTER AID

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration legislation which we are considering today contains a provision of major importance to the Nation's farmers and in particular to the economy of Southern California. It would make livestock farmers eligible for SBA loans when they are stricken with epidemic diseases such as we have seen in the past several years in poultry, hogs, cattle, and horses.

In California, some 30 to 40 percent of our egg production has been wiped out during the past 18 months due to exotic Newcastle disease in our laying hens. Eight counties were quarantined and nearly 10 million laying hens were eradicated by Federal order.

Literally thousands of poultry producers have been wrecked economically simply because the Government compensation for chickens condemned and destroyed by the Department of Agriculture has not been sufficient to allow re-investment.

This is a clear-cut case of the Government systematically eliminating the livelihood of thousands of individual businessmen, necessarily and in the public interest of course, but without providing

sufficient help to allow those individuals to get back on their feet.

This bill we are considering would clearly make poultry farmers stricken by disease eligible for SBA loans under the livestock disaster provision.

Today, the dreaded Newcastle disease is virtually under control, but the egg producing industry is still reeling from the blow. Producers were paid at a maximum rate of \$2 for each bird killed, but are finding that replacement costs averaged \$2.39 per bird, and that their creditors eat up their reimbursement payments.

Including turkeys, broilers, and other species, as well as laying hens, some 11½ million birds have been destroyed in the past 18 months in southern California. And while some of the larger producers are able to find the capital or credit to replace their flocks, the great majority of the producers who lost their laying hens are small family farmers. It is imperative that we afford them this loan assistance through the SBA, to allow them to meet the requirements to re-establish their businesses. They are efficient, vitally needed cogs in our agricultural production chain. They have already made great personal sacrifices to protect the poultry industry nationwide from Newcastle disease. And it is not only our moral responsibility to provide them this assistance, but it is an economic must to protect the poultry industry at a time when supplies of meat and eggs are falling short of demand.

There are other severe situations where this legislation will be an important asset. For instance, many producers who lost their flocks could not collect Government repayments because the USDA did not actually destroy their birds. Yet, because they were within the area quarantined, they were prevented from selling their animals or animal products on their regular markets. In such situations, they were forced to destroy the birds or sell them at great losses. Specifically, a number of turkey producers in my district were affected in this way, and their direct losses averaged several hundred thousand dollars apiece. Those growers were not huge corporations—they were family farmers and they have lost their life's investment and their capacity to earn a living.

Throughout the country, we have seen other examples during the past few years. In New Jersey and Indiana, hog cholera destroyed family farmers. In Texas, it was Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis. And in several areas, the disease has been brucellosis in cattle.

In each case, under the livestock disaster provision of this SBA legislation, the help so critically needed will be made available.

WATERGATE IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of one of my constituents, I am submitting the following article, written

by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Believing that all points of view should be heard, I hope Mr. Hearst's comments will be noted by readers of the RECORD.

The article follows:

WATERGATE IN PERSPECTIVE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Readers of this column know that whoever holds the man-killing job of President of the United States has my automatic sympathy, and automatically gets all the support that honestly can be extended here. This rule has prevailed ever since these writings began back in the early '50s.

There was no need whatever to consciously apply the rule last Wednesday while watching President Nixon on the tube at his remarkable press conference in San Clemente. Unless you are one of those who are convinced he has hooves, Mr. Nixon's performance absolutely compelled your sympathetic respect, and in most cases, I think, your admiration.

For 50 minutes he stood exposed to a merciless sun and a merciless inquisition the like of which no other president has ever had to face. Every question on Watergate, many painfully antagonistic and some actually insulting, was immediately and forcefully answered. He was in total charge of himself and the situation.

Even the reporters who had been trying to trap him, who had privately been hoping he would fall on his face, were forced to admit admiration. Which makes you wonder why a man who can handle himself so well under incredible pressure waited as long as he did to undergo an inevitable confrontation.

By making himself a veritable Howard Hughes-type hermit for more than five months, Mr. Nixon did himself a grave disservice. Maybe, hopefully, the favorable public response to his performance at San Clemente will lead to regular and frequent press conferences in the future. It should—for his benefit and the welfare of the nation.

The President's replies, of course, did not halt the hue and cry of the forces determined to wreck him and his administration. They are going to continue to lambaste him at whatever cost to national stability, and despite the sickening irrationality of magnifying the negative and minimizing the positive.

I, for one, have always felt that Watergate essentially is a great flap about very little. So do a lot of other people who appreciate what the President has done for peace in Hanoi, Moscow and Peking.

To help restore the perspective on Watergate which has been turned upside-down by months of partisan uproar—a restoration which the President naturally is striving for—I want to offer here today some comments by a witty and astute British writer.

He is A. J. P. Taylor, an erudite and veteran observer of world affairs for the London Daily Express, the major newspaper property of the late Lord Beaverbrook. This paper, which is anything but reactionary, is now being run by his son who is my best friend in the field of English journalism, Sir Max Aitken.

With the permission of United Features Syndicate, which acts as agent for the Express in this country, the following comments on Watergate by Mr. Taylor are recommended for your consideration. Remember they were written for an audience of completely objective Britishers.

I do not want to read another word about Watergate. Scandals involving politicians are always enjoyable, far more so than scandals about, say, literary men. But they must be real scandals—scandals about vast financial coups or fantastic and unlikely sexual activities.

But what is Watergate about? So far as I can understand, nothing at all. Certainly

not about anything that shocks or even amuses me.

Some hired men of the Republican Party proposed to listen in to the affairs of the Democrats' National Committee. They therefore bugged a room in the Watergate Hotel.

That is all. You don't believe it? You must. It is true. In a sense this redounds to the credit of the American people. If they can get really worked up over Watergate and the whole affair is not a fabrication of imaginative journalists, the Americans must be extremely innocent.

Suppose the Watergate affair had happened in this country? Who would have cared? As Watergate drags on its weary way I have been waiting to be told what the buggers learned or hoped to learn. There has never been the slightest hint that they ever learned anything or that there was anything to learn.

If Labour headquarters were permanently wired to Conservative headquarters and the other way around it would not make the slightest difference to our political life except that it would be a relief for each party to listen to each other's bores instead of to their own.

So far as I am concerned the congressional committee can go droning on and on. Witnesses can produce their allegedly sensational evidence. Senator Ervin, aged 76, can make still more foolish blunders. But it is all a dead story without life or interest.

Yet there is a serious point involved. The United States of America count for a great deal in the world. Despite some ambitious rivals, such as Russia and China, they are still the greatest power in the world and the one that offers the greatest promise for the future.

What is more, the U.S. have a damned good President, or had until recently. Nixon has done things that were beyond the much praised John Kennedy and certainly beyond the late Lyndon B. Johnson.

Who showed that the Cold War was nonsense? Who ended its more than 20 years by his personal initiative? None other than Richard Nixon. And he did not play off China against Soviet Russia. He secured friendship and reconciliation with both.

Look around on the statesmen of the past half century and ask: Who has done most for the peace of the world? There is a clear answer: Richard Nixon.

And this is the man who has to be smeared and pilloried because some junior Republican officials, maybe with his consent, were curious to know what went on at Democratic meetings.

I say to all Americans, including those many academics who write high minded letters to the New York Times: "Pack it in." We have really had enough. We do not care who bugged whom at Watergate. We do not care who knew and who didn't.

President Nixon himself cannot escape the American atmosphere. Even he takes Watergate seriously and is upset by it. But let him take heart. No one outside America cares about Watergate in the slightest.

If you want a real juicy scandal, rejoice that you are an Englishman. When it comes to scandal, we are still the tops.

And that's the message for today.

Thank you, Mr. Taylor, for helping correct a perspective on Watergate which has been cockeyed for far too long a time in our country.

As President Nixon keeps repeating, this nation must now press ahead on matters which are really important to its future—and to the future of humanity itself.

MORE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF AIM

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, on April 10 of this year I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story by Mr. John E. Peterson on the activities of the organization AIM and its financing by the Office of Economic Opportunity. A recent column by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones summarizing the latest activities of AIM as it supposedly tries to help the American Indian was printed in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on August 19, 1973. In my view, it is an instructive article on the activities of this group and how it is financed. The column follows:

THE IMPOVERISHED FREEDOM FIGHTERS
HANDED OUT \$2,000 IN WAR DANCE
PRIZES . . .

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The world is going to have to wait for a few more days for the "Tomahawk Statement," promised at the end of the recent American Indian Movement (AIM) convention at White Oak, Okla.

The Tomahawk Statement is supposed to contain the specific demands which must be met if AIM is not to go to war against the rest of the Americans. But confusion at the convention apparently delayed its writing, and the convention had an exportable surplus of confusion.

Billed as the "largest gathering of American Indians in history," with expected attendance of from 5,000 to 7,000, the convention got under way July 25 with about 200, including a carpetbagging professor from the University of Paris.

In the meantime, AIM had managed to scrounge food for 750 persons for six days out of a government allowance for needy children in summer camps. When state welfare officials arrived the next day to check on "the children," they were refused admission on the grounds that the powwow was being held on private property and, besides, the food was all gone.

Simultaneously, Vernon Bellecourt, AIM national director, arrived in Chicago by plane from Europe where he said he had obtained pledges of \$100,000 to help AIM leaders fight court actions arising from their takeover last Feb. 27 of the village of Wounded Knee.

He had complained bitterly of "excessive bail"; yet federal officials allowed him to travel on after he had put up just one-tenth of the court-ordered \$10,000 bond.

The AIM activities have been useful in that they have pointed out the extent of deprivation and underprivilege suffered by some Americans. These Americans, of course, are taxpaying non-revolutionaries.

The AIM revolutionaries did \$300,000 worth of damage last fall to the Washington headquarters of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They were not only unpunished for this but given \$66,000 in tax money to go away.

In January, AIM members invaded the campus of the University of Grand Forks in North Dakota and proceeded to tear up the annual "King Kold Carnival" and beat up student defenders. AIM declared itself incensed because Indian figures were carved out of snow. The university calls its football team "The Sioux."

A university vice president lectured the students for "needing a greater awareness for the sensitivities involved."

The next month, AIM took over Wounded Knee, breaking into houses, desecrating the two little churches and holding citizens as terrorized hostages. The raiders proudly posed with Russian-made AK-47 assault rifles.

If any other group of Americans had seized—let's say—a village in New Jersey, retribution would have been swift. But at Wounded Knee the U.S. government contented itself with mounting a countersiege that cost the taxpayers \$50,000 a day for over a month.

AIM has been given \$400,000 by the Office of Economic Opportunity, another \$238,000 by the Lutherans and uncounted support from the National Council of Churches. Not bad for an outfit founded by two convicted robbers, the Bellecourt brothers, and a parolee burglar, Dennis Banks.

The aim at Wounded Knee? It was to topple the elected government of the Oglala Sioux, not by another election but just by topple.

But Oklahomans took the White Oak fiasco with monumental calm, although AIM braves charged around vowing to defend themselves to the death. A gaggle of preachers had 20 volunteers manning a "rumor center" in nearby Vinita in order to prevent bloodshed; but no one called, and it went out of business early.

The meet ended three days ahead of schedule and reached its peak attendance of about 800 at the final powwow at which the impoverished freedom fighters handed out \$2,000 in war dance prizes. A remnant roared off to a sun dance in South Dakota, vowing to give the governors of Kansas and Nebraska "a real jolt" as they passed through.

Still upcoming is the Tomahawk Statement.

Vernon Bellecourt says it will demand that the 60 per cent of South Dakota lying west of the Missouri River be reprieved by the 13,000 Oglala Sioux in accordance with an 1869 treaty.

That will make a quarter of a million self-supporting, tax-contributing, dawn-to-dusk working farmers and ranchers suddenly landless. Maybe they can get some help from leaders of the Lutherans and the National Council of Churches, all of whom live on land that once belonged to Indians.

THE CASE AGAINST THE BUDGET COMMITTEE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee is now considering legislation which would create new budget committees in the House and Senate. In testimony before the committee on August 2, I urged rejection of this legislative proposal.

My statement to the committee is reprinted below:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN DONALD M. FRASER

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

Thank you for letting me appear today. I appear both as National Chairman Americans for Democratic Action and as a member of the House of Representatives.

I urge you not to report the bill which would create another formal layer of decision-making with respect to the budget. Adding a Committee on the Budget in each House of Congress would diminish the capacity of Congress to efficiently deal with the problems relating to the revenues and expenditures.

The case for this proposal is based on fictions rather than facts.

Fiction number one—Federal expenditures are getting out of hand and we must somehow regain control over burgeoning expenditures.

Fact—The federal outlay budget for fiscal year 1974 represents about 20.8% of the GNP, which is very nearly the same as ten years ago when it was 19.4% of GNP.

If we exclude social security, unemployment compensation and medicare which are self-financing social insurance systems, then in 1974 the remaining federal outlays are 14.4% of GNP and compared with 15.8% ten years ago.

But state and local government expenditures have been rising. From 1960 to 1970, state and local expenditures rose from 11.8% of GNP to 15% of GNP. Increases in federal grant-in-aid accounted for only 1% of this increased spending, with the rest representing revenue growth and tax increases. The burdens on state and local government with their limited tax resources are rising much more rapidly than federal expenditures. They need help.

(See the tables attached at the end).

Fiction number two—That the Appropriations Committee in voting appropriations needs constraints to be imposed by another committee.

Fact—An examination of last year's Appropriations Committee actions shows remarkably little variance from the President's budget. In the total appropriation action, outlays were reduced by \$2 billion. The ten major appropriations bills enacted compare with the President's budget requests as follows:

ESTIMATED OUTLAYS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Requested	Enacted
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary.....	\$4,288,068	\$4,260,068
Housing and Urban Development.....	19,091,965	19,125,965
Transportation and related agencies.....	8,504,457	8,456,457
Labor, Health, Education and Welfare.....	29,664,305	29,586,305
Interior and related agencies.....	2,533,657	2,543,657
Treasury, Postal Service and general.....	5,184,244	5,147,744
Public Works and Atomic Energy.....	5,703,840	5,737,549
Agriculture and Environmental and Conservation.....	12,270,420	12,520,420
Department of Defense.....	73,804,284	72,054,284
Foreign assistance and related agencies.....	3,483,594	3,218,594

Source: 1973 Budget Scorekeeping Report, p. 10.

What the Appropriations Committee needs, if anything, are larger staff resources to be able to do its work more effectively and thus exercise greater discretion than they are now able to do.

The last thing that the Appropriations Committee needs is more restraints on its work.

Fiction number three—That a new committee will provide new insights and keener perception about our national needs and the adjustments needed in the budget to meet them.

Fact—Deciding where our revenue should be spent is a political judgment made in the first instance by the President in his budget submission. Departures from the President's budget tend to result from external pressures. One of the strengths of a national legislature is the opportunity afforded citizens to seek redress from presi-

dential decisions they regard as unwise. This is done in hearings, by lobbying, and constituent communications. The result may not always be neat and orderly, but it is an open process which accommodates to changing views about our nation and its problems.

A new layer of committee decision-making inserted early in the congressional process will add another layer designed to insulate congressional decisions from the public. We'll become less, rather than more, responsive to public concerns.

Fiction number four—That we lack an adequate means of regulating the gap between revenues and expenditures and thus are contributing to economic instability.

Fact—We in the House have the Ways and Means Committee, and in the Senate the Finance Committee.

At the end of each appropriations season, these committees have both the responsibility and the authority to report to the floor the needed tax adjustments—either up or down.

Why don't they do it? You might ask them to answer that question. I will be glad to join in any rule, resolution or bill which will require them to do this.

I conclude with these observations: The most serious problem facing Congress is its own unwillingness to adjust tax rates to regulate the impact of federal activities on the economy of the nation. We are paying dearly today for the failure of Congress to promptly enact a tax increase to pay for the increasing costs of the Vietnam war. That failure, and the failures in succeeding years which it typified, have caused enormous damage to our country and its citizens, including sustained inflation, loss of overseas trade, devaluation of the dollar, and substantial unemployment. Except for the temporary 10% surtax which came too late and has since expired, we have steadily reduced taxes over the last dozen years so that we collect today \$50 million less each year than we would under the tax rate existing in the early '60's. (I exclude from this calculation social security taxes which have gone up.)

Every other level of government faces the tax problem more forthrightly than do we, I urge the Committee to address itself directly to this problem.

Our second major problem is our inability to more wisely spend where our real needs are—which is at home. Our national defense budget is \$15 to \$20 billion too high.

Our third major problem is our inability to make our tax system fairer. It is estimated that \$60-\$70 billion is lost each year in tax avoidance or tax reduction provisions—which are, in effect, subsidies going mostly to the wealthy. It has been suggested that we should treat these as appropriations.

These three problems can be solved by making the necessary hard political choices. The use of the party caucus and steering committee together with an augmented staff for the leadership could help to make these political judgments. The overview of our revenues and expenditures is also a leadership responsibility. Responsible committee action, of course, also helps.

I am not satisfied with the present performance of our committees. I hope the Boling Committee will look carefully at the present distribution of authority between the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing committees. Rotation of membership on committees might help.

These problems can be solved with solid, carefully thought-out initiatives backed up with firm support from the members. But we do not need another Committee which I fear with its short timetables and complex procedures will increase our inability to deal with the real problems facing the United States.

FEDERAL OUTLAYS

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—	
	1964	1974
Defense.....	53.6	81.1
International affairs.....	4.1	3.8
Space.....	4.2	3.1
Agriculture and rural development.....	5.2	5.6
Natural resources and environment.....	2.0	3.7
Commerce and transportation.....	6.5	11.6
Community development and housing.....	—2	5.0
Education and manpower.....	1.7	10.1
Health (excluding medicare).....	1.7	13.6
Public assistance.....	3.1	10.7
Veterans benefits.....	5.7	11.7
General government.....	2.0	6.0
Revenue sharing.....	0	6.0
Interest on national debt.....	9.8	24.7
Undistributed intragovernmental trans.....	—2.9	—9.1
Subtotal.....	\$96.5	\$187.6
Retirement, social insurance, and medicare.....	22.0	83.4
Total.....	\$118.5	\$271.0

¹ 15.8 percent of gross national product.

² 14.4 percent of gross national product.

³ 19.4 percent of gross national product.

⁴ 20.8 percent of gross national product.

Note: National debt as percent of gross national product: 51.7 percent in 1964; 39.1 percent in 1973.

Source: U.S. Budget in Brief, fiscal year 1974, pt. 5.

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL SPENDING AS PERCENT OF GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

	1960	1970
Federal direct spending (excluding grants-in-aid to State and local government).....	18.1	19.0
State and local expenditures (including Federal grants-in-aid).....	11.8	15.0
Federal grants-in-aid to State and local government.....	1.4	2.4

Source: Fried, Rivlin, Schultze, and Teeters, "Setting National Priorities, The 1974 Budget," p. 8 (Brookings Institution 1973).

TRIBUTE

HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADDEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, first pointing out that I, too, seek and yearn for that day when we will all be brothers and sisters:

EDITORIAL—THAT LITTLE JAP

The reference of John Wilson, Watergate attorney, to Senator Daniel Inouye as "that little Jap" may have reverberations that Wilson never intended.

The Democratic Senator from Hawaii is of Japanese origin but he is also a much decorated veteran of World War II. He served in the European Theatre of Operations and suffered a wound that resulted in the loss of his right arm.

Senator Inouye has conducted himself in a courteous manner during the Watergate hearings. His questioning of witnesses has been orderly and intelligent but very penetrating. His voice is low-keyed and he displays no outward sign of being upset if he

receives a response from a witness that he believes to be inaccurate or evasive.

Wilson's remark has focused as much attention on Senator Inouye as the Senator's slip of the tongue, heard over the mike, in using a descriptive word about the veracity of John Ehrlichman. Members of the Senate from both sides of the aisle have made it a point to laud Senator Inouye, his patriotism, his dedication and his ability.

Mr. Wilson may be the catalyst who brings sufficient national attention to the Senator that he will be even more prominently in the limelight that so often results in being selected for a position on a National ticket. The Democrats are looking for new faces. They could do worse than having Senator Inouye on their ticket in 1976, the 200th birthday of the nation "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

RECLAMATION AND THE NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks you have heard many comments both pro and con relative to the 232 recommendations which were proposed in the final report of the National Water Commission. I must say that I, too, have some reservations about the report and share in the concerns expressed by many of my fellow Californians.

As we look at this report it is important that we consider all views and comments, and especially those of persons who have been working with the water resource programs for many years. There is no one more qualified to comment on the report and its impact upon the water resources of the Nation than the newly appointed Commissioner of Reclamation, Gil Stamm.

Mr. Speaker, I felt it most important that all of us who will be reviewing the report should have the benefit of viewing the evaluation given to this report by Commissioner Stamm. Therefore, I request that his comments on Reclamation Overview of the National Water Commission Report, presented during the recess to the California Water Resources Association meeting in Coronado, Calif., be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The comments follow:

RECLAMATION OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION REPORT

Any organization, be it private or public, profit oriented or service oriented, must constantly monitor its programs to assure that it has well-defined goals that are responsive to the needs and wants of its clients and that it is following policies that foster those goals. This is particularly applicable, as well as difficult, for a Governmental agency where goals and objectives are often hard to define to the satisfaction of diverse, often conflicting, special interest groups which are concerned or affected.

The Bureau of Reclamation, along with other public water resources agencies, currently is updating its programs to assure that it is responsive to current national priorities. Such changes are not new to our

agency. Except for periodic major updating of legislative authority, the changes are more evolutionary than revolutionary.

The rate of change, however, is getting progressively more rapid as the future telescopes into the present.

I need not recount in detail to this organization the great history of Federal Reclamation accomplishment nor to defend the role water resources development has played in the economic and social progress in the West. The Reclamation program was begun in 1902 to foster the settlement and economic development of the West through irrigated agriculture. The program has broadened over the years in response to popular needs, changing public preferences, and advances in technology. Functions added include hydropower, municipal and industrial water, flood control, recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement, and water quality.

Program accomplishments to benefit people ought to speak for themselves and not need defending. However, memories are short. We must recognize that past accomplishments resulted from recognition of priorities and values of the day—that has been the key to success. The program of any government or private entity must be dynamic, and responsive to currently popular needs if it is to survive the tests of time.

In 1968, partly in recognition of the fact that there appeared to be no clearly defined National water policy, the Congress directed the President to establish a National Water Commission. The Commission was to make a 5-year comprehensive study of the adequacy of water supplies to meet requirements and to make policy recommendations to assure that the Nation's water requirement could be met.

The final report of the National Water Commission was published in June. A review draft was released in November 1972, and it received intensive review and comment by both public and private groups and individuals.

Many of the report's 232 numbered recommendations are sound and widely accepted; others are proving to be highly controversial. Regardless of your personal opinion on the merits of the report, one item is self-evident: The Commission has poignantly concluded that substantial changes are needed in National water policy, and it has attempted to outline what such changes should be. Many of the Commission's recommendations would require Congressional and State legislation for adoption and implementation. The remainder depend on Executive approval and State and local cooperation.

I expect that not all the Commission's proposals will be accepted immediately and some are likely never to be accepted and implemented. Indeed, the sheer number and complexity of many of them would preclude early implementation. Nevertheless, just like the preceding 20 or 30 Congressional or Presidential Commissions that studied water administration over the past 70 years, many of the recommendations will eventually become law or policy. The Commission has "bitten the bullet" and established strong positions on most major water policy issues, many of which have been with us for years without definitive action.

This 5-year study can have a major impact upon the organization, financing, evaluation, and management of water programs. In my opinion, the Commission properly assessed the mood of the Nation and the need for (1) improvements in institutions, (2) increased non-Federal cost-sharing, (3) strengthening of local and State units of Government, (4) improvement in resource management, (5) recognition of greater environmental concerns, and (6) need for improvements in existing water law. These enumerated needs reflect desirable trends and as such no one can take exception. We may

differ with the Commission as to the degree of change that is appropriate in these areas. We may disagree in several specific areas.

The Commission's recommendation for a strengthened independent Water Resources Council is not consistent with President Nixon's Executive Reorganization Proposal that envisions a Department of Energy and Natural Resources with the WRC a part of it.

The National Water Commission's proposal for recovery of all costs, including interest from direct beneficiaries, is controversial and is one with which I personally do not fully agree. It is my experience that the direct beneficiaries are not the only beneficiaries and may not even be the principal ones, therefore they should not bear the full cost. Manufacturers, processors, service industries, professional people all gain from economic spinoff from the multiple functions of water projects. One appropriate method of sharing costs among all beneficiaries is through conservancy districts with ad valorem taxing authority.

Even with the sharing of costs through ad valorem taxation, the need for increased repayment from direct beneficiaries is appropriate in many cases. The legislative policy for repayment is set forth primarily in the 1939 Reclamation Project Act which was enacted toward the end of the country's greatest economic depression. The 1939 Act reflects this. As our water resources become more scarce and therefore more precious, this scarcity should be reflected in pricing policies. With increasing diligence water must be managed to meet human needs in perpetuity.

The Administration intends to develop legislative proposals with respect to the Commission's recommendations on cost-sharing. Secretary Morton, as Chairman of the Water Resources Council, recently set in motion a special interagency task force, formed under the direction of Assistant Secretary Jack Horton, to develop policy proposals for greater cost-sharing. Assistant Commissioner Fairchild was assigned chairmanship of the task force and its recommendations are currently being considered in the Department.

The Commission's emphasis upon efficiency criteria for evaluation should be broadened to give greater recognition for social and environmental factors and regional and local goals. Environmental analysis needs greater precision. The Commission has made good proposals for improved management of existing water supplies. Further consideration needs to be given to the nature of Federal action programs which cannot be done at the State or local level.

If I read the National Water Commission Report correctly, it acknowledges that past water policies were adequate for needs and values when they were promulgated but they need updating to come in tune with the times. In other words, traditional programs—to be of enduring value—must be flexible and capable of serving evolutionary goals.

Flexibility in policies and programs is the planner's greatest challenge. Recognizing this, I am concerned because many of the National Water Commission's conclusions and proposals appear to be inflexible. They merely substitute new inflexibility for past inflexibility.

I agree with the Commission that we should not necessarily plan for the worst possible contingency—that is, to use a "crisis scenario" of accumulated worst possible conditions occurring simultaneously. However, our problem is to carry on a program of water resource development and management in a setting of uncertainty. Extension of lines on graph paper to show what would happen if past trends should continue into the future is not enough—for the lines are changing unpredictably. There have been some indications for example, that electric power consumption may increase at a slower rate than the recent past. Proper evaluation of

this short-term trend requires a look at not one but several sets of possible future conditions. With a declining birth rate, how should we evaluate the difference between the Census Bureau's high population projection of 300 million people in the United States for the year 2000 and its low projection of 250 million? The difference of 50 million people can profoundly affect future requirements for the use of water resources. Can we plan with enough flexibility to meet either condition?

The National Water Commission's report is not sufficiently flexible with respect to future requirements for food and fiber. It assumes that agricultural water shortage will not be a problem before the year 2000, that consumptive water use in agriculture will decrease, and that transfer of water from agriculture to other uses will not restrict food supplies or export possibilities. The Commission therefore concludes that there is no longer any need for federally assisted agricultural water development.

This conclusion is based on one computer model study of limited scope which predicted transfer of much of the agricultural production from the West to other areas of the Nation. It failed to identify where the lands to be converted to cropland are located nor the social, economic, and environmental consequences of such a shift. In my opinion, one of the major deficiencies in the Commission's Report is that it did not attempt to test the impact of its recommendations. This Nation's and the world's food and fiber situation in the mid- and long-term is not so clear cut that we can place all decision-making on the results of one computer model.

Even in the short period since completion of the model, the Nation's agriculture picture has changed dramatically. Of the approximately 61 million acres retired from production under various agricultural programs in 1972, it is estimated that only 12 million acres will remain idle for the 1973 growing season. And those acres are undoubtedly the most marginal in productivity. Moreover, opportunities in the export market may be a dominant factor in the future of U.S. agriculture. This entire impact was largely ignored by the Commission's studies. Devaluation of the dollar makes American products more attractive for export and this is particularly true of agricultural products.

Everywhere we turn we find production pushing the limits of capacity. Agricultural markets are strange and complex phenomena. And I am not suggesting that we are entering into a permanent period where our agriculture production capacity is unequal to the demands to be placed upon it. However, we should not ignore the strong signals of events of the past two growing seasons. World demand for food and fiber is strong and likely to remain so.

We are the leading and most efficient producer of food and fiber. For instance, foreign market experts have stated we could sell, for hard currency, as many soybeans as could be grown. Moreover, in a reversal of historic roles, other Nations which demand our raw foodstuffs have developed a competitive advantage in manufacture of goods and in sources of energy. We may need our agriculture economic power to finance our increasing imports of manufactured goods.

There are a few in high places who believe that these are not long-term trends, and that an early reversal back to more traditional world market conditions will occur. However, even if a reversal were to occur it would be folly not to develop contingency plans for an expanded agriculture.

Water planning should place increased emphasis on the interrelationships between land use and water use. In the past, water planning has been based largely on projected economic and population trends. We have tended to use projections of population and

economic activity as synonymous with public goals. As a result, planning decisions have tended to become when, where, and how a project can be built to meet future needs. Projections to some extent became self-fulfilling prophecies.

Such planning may have been appropriate in a period of territorial settlement, rapid population growth, and unquestioned economic expansion. However, we now need to plan for the possibility of a stable population and to consider issues such as wild and scenic river designations, preservation of ecological and historic sites, open spaces and housing, and flood plain and estuarine protection. Land use and water planning must be integrated. Planning should become a positive force for desirable change rather than a reaction to uncontrolled growth.

The Bureau of Reclamation's responses to emerging new priorities have been numerous. We have not been sitting idly by waiting for others, such as the National Water Commission, to determine relevant directions for our future programs.

A major redirection in the planning programs of the Bureau has been evident for sometime. Highest priority is being given to (1) meeting the near-term needs of people and (2) improved management of existing supplies. A few years ago, the irrigation function made up as much as two-thirds of the envisioned construction costs of projects being investigated. However, in fiscal year 1974, Reclamation's new planning starts will be for projects where approximately 80 percent of the costs of implementation would be related to municipal and industrial water supply.

Meeting the Nation's energy requirements, enhancement of environmental quality, and assisting in the development of Indian land and water resources are also receiving high priority. Until we can assess the new trends of demand for food and fiber, investigations featuring the irrigation of new lands for near- and mid-term requirements have a relatively low priority.

However, in selected areas, irrigation may be an extremely important objective in regional development.

Consistent with these priorities the Northern Great Plains, an area which consists of large segments of Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota and South Dakota, has been the focus of increasing attention because the area is a potential source for vast amounts of relatively low-sulfur coal. Interest in the development of the Northern Great Plains coal resources stems primarily from the continuing growth of the national energy consumption and increasing emphasis on improved urban air quality. The possibility of large-scale development of the coal reserves has, at the same time, heightened regional concern for effective land use and resource planning, including such issues as environmental quality, mined-area restoration, competition for scarce water resources, development of other mineral resources, and potential effects on the people and economies of the Northern Great Plains States.

Of obvious concern to Reclamation's program is the \$6.2 billion backlog of authorized but unconstructed Reclamation projects. The level of annual funding for construction under current Administration budgetary policies and priorities is not sufficient even to match the increase in the dollar backlog due to escalating construction costs. Over the past 5 years, the annual increase in construction costs due to rising construction cost indexes has been 7 percent. Applied to a \$6.2 billion backlog, this represents an annual increase of over \$420 million. With a \$300 million annual construction program, the dollar backlog continues to rise.

To bring this backlog to manageable proportions without a significant increase in annual construction funding will require: (1) elimination of backlog projects or fea-

tures of projects that, in light of current priorities, are unlikely ever to be constructed, (2) reformulation of projects to reduce costs and meet updated priorities where possible, (3) turn to the States and local interests for financial assistance in project funding either by non-Federal construction of projects or features or by contributions toward construction from whatever sources are available, and (4) postpone construction of project features through staging until such time as they can be accommodated under national budgetary constraints.

The backlog is being studied from two angles. One is an in-house review of every project in the backlog to evaluate the extent to which each might be delayed or modified pursuant to the guidelines outlined herein. The other is a policy review by an advisory team of non-Interior experts in appropriate fields of engineering, agriculture and economics.

The key to the future water resources development lies with the Congress. The Congress will establish future policy through legislation, it will authorize new works pursuant thereto, and only the Congress can deauthorize the works it previously has authorized. The extent to which policy changes become revolutionary or merely evolutionary will depend on action of the Congress. Thus it behooves all of us to give very thorough attention to delineation of the best future cause for the maximum benefit of mankind and the nation. That cause should be supported vigorously before the appropriate committees of the Congress. We need each other's help and cooperation in this regard.

Creating a responsive planning organization has been of high priority. Centrally located staffs have been strengthened by the addition of specialists in new fields such as environmental analysis, operations research and social science. In the future, we plan to work more closely with other Federal and State agencies in interagency, interdisciplinary teams of limited duration that will be created to deal with specific problems. We are available to provide special technical services to States. State study teams, composed of Federal and State members from many different agencies which were established during our Western U.S. Water Plan Study, have proved to be an effective planning device.

Meaningful public involvement at early stages in plan formulation is a key element in our planning procedures for the future. Instead of presenting plans for public reaction, we hope to involve people with different, sometimes conflicting, objectives directly in the planning process. This should not only speed the planning process by avoiding costly delays in the review process but result in better plans.

One of Reclamation's recent programs is the Western U.S. Water Plan, established under the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968. This study will provide a critical analysis of water-related problems in the 11 Western States and provide recommendations for future studies. It will provide important insights for the Administration's reassessment of the Federal role in water planning, development, and management. The study has recently been accelerated, with completion set for June 30, 1974, to make information available for urgent decisions on the Administration's land and water study priorities.

Your organization will be especially interested in an important study we have underway on the Colorado River salinity problem. The objective of this 10-year program is to evolve plans to control the rise in salinity concentrations in the lower main stem of the river as the Upper Basin continues to develop uses for its compact-apportioned waters. The Bureau and Department are exploring other approaches to resolving the many interrelated problems of the Colorado River. Physical works to implement this pro-

gram have not been recommended to or by the Secretary of the Interior or approved by the Executive Branch. These approaches will look at programs which emphasize environmental and economic objectives and relate to priority items of land use, energy, and municipal and industrial water supply.

Our Division of Atmospheric Water Resources Management is conducting an extensive program of weather modification research. These studies are known as Project Skywater. They include computer studies to devise practical field models for identifying seedable clouds, field seeding experiments, and evaluation of the results of cloud seeding. Pilot programs include large-scale testing and verification of techniques.

Operational-type activities in precipitation management have been limited to emergency drought situations in Arizona, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. Coordination with State and local groups has been an essential part of these projects. Although no solid scientific evaluation was possible under emergency conditions, the drought was "broken" during the period of "cloud seeding." The first major operational use of cloud seeding will probably occur in the water-short river basins of the Western States.

Geothermal water development offers another exciting new source of water. The Bureau of Reclamation has drilled two test wells in the Imperial Valley of California, which is underlain by more than 1 billion acre-feet of recoverable hot saline liquids. Pilot plants are presently being operated at the site to test desalting processes.

We are interested in both water and power aspects of Geothermal Development. However, we are confining our activity to water and are leaving the power aspect to non-Federal entities for exploration.

All of these new activities require a greater depth of perception and broader viewpoint in the analysis of water resources. They underscore our concept of water policy which is total water management—the examination of all aspects of water viewed as a complete system. This new concept is being tested in two areas: the Central Valley of California and the Rio Grande Valley between San Marcial, New Mexico, and Fort Quitman, Texas. The principal objective of these studies is to achieve better conservation, management, and utilization of existing supplies.

The Reclamation program is advancing on many fronts despite the uncertainties in a time of change. New challenges continually arise requiring innovative responses, but we believe that they can be met successfully by intelligent and diligent effort. Many of the significant recommendations of the National Water Commission have been foreseen and are in various stages of implementation by Federal water agencies. We face the future with confidence that National and regional water problems can be solved, and we welcome positive guidance on policies to be followed.

CONSTITUENT'S LETTER ABOUT LACK OF GOVERNMENT FISCAL DISCIPLINE

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, occasionally an ordinary American will sum up the basic facts of a national issue with greater force and clarity than all of the debates and arguments which we are privileged to hear in this Chamber.

I would like our colleagues to read the following letter from a young man, earn-

ing a reasonable income, but faced with an increasingly difficult task in coping with the inflation which our lack of governmental fiscal discipline has imposed on him and his family.

His words should give us renewed determination to finally balance our expenditures against tax revenues and thus end our own contribution to the inflation which is so obviously attacking not only the dignity of life but the greatest asset of our Nation—the faith of our citizens in our very system of government.

The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCLOSKEY: I received your letter a couple of days ago and I appreciated it, but I am sorry to say that because of a great struggle to survive I have paid very little attention to the questions in your questionnaire. I realize, Congressman McCloskey, that your eyes will probably never read this letter, that it will be read by some aide and filed in a trash can, but things have been building up and I feel a need to get it off my mind. I would like to assure you that I am not a crackpot or some kind of radical. I have never drawn a cent of unemployment or welfare. I am just a tired, ticked-off hard-working American.

I am tired of the Supreme Court trying to legislate what kind of movies I can go see, or what kind of books I can buy on magazine stands. I am a rational human being, Mr. McCloskey, and I sincerely believe that I can decide what is right or wrong for my eyes. I read now where the state legislature is going to start giving tickets to cars without all of the new smog control devices on them. I am afraid when some innocent cop tries to give me a ticket I am going to make him eat that ticket, gift wrap him and mail him to our great white father. I have had two estimates as to what it would cost to get my car fixed to meet state standards. How about 400 dollars. Mr. McCloskey, I can't afford to put out 400 dollars on my work car.

A couple of months ago my wife passed out at work, so they fired her. I took her to the doctor, he couldn't find out what was wrong. It cost me 250 dollars for him to tell me he couldn't find out what was wrong. On her regular trip to the gynecologist she found out she was pregnant, and that was her whole problem. So now I am faced with a 1000 dollar bill for a baby. Why does everything cost so much, Mr. McCloskey? I make \$9 an hour as a sheet rock hanger and I have one heck of a time making ends meet. I don't feel I over spend. I live in a simple \$140 a month apartment, I have one suit I bought in my senior year of high school, one 3 year old sport jacket, and I wear levis and t-shirts to work. I have a 1973 car for my wife, but it was the first new car we've had in four years, and I drive a 1962 Buick to work. I was to get a raise the first of August, but the Cost of Living Council tells me I can't have it. I can't have a raise, but food prices soar, gas prices soar, rent is going up, and now I have to start working 6 and sometimes 7 days a week just to get by. Groceries used to run me and my wife about \$80 a month, now we are lucky to get by for \$130. I used to have steak once a week, I can't remember when the last time I had steak was. I pity the man who makes \$5 or \$6 an hour and has children to feed.

I am a very tired American Mr. McCloskey. I am tired of paying ungodly amounts of taxes. I recently read where the four largest corporations in California netted over \$400 million last year and did not pay a cent in state or federal taxes. This really ticks me off, Mr. McCloskey. Why do the people who make so little pay so much and those who make so much pay nothing? I do not ask that they pay an outrageous 50 percent, for that would keep companies from growing and expanding, but I do ask that they pay

as great a percentage as I do and lift some of the burden off my back.

I will probably never write another letter to you or anyone else because the government is so big and I am so small and I realize this is a futile attempt to tell someone of the frustration that the working American puts up with. I realize I am doomed to spend the rest of my life working and paying taxes, but I hope my children do not have to suffer the same fate. I just pray to God that someone who gives a damn reads this letter.

MONTY R. FAULKNER.

INTERIOR SECRETARY ROGERS MORTON SPEAKS ON OUR NATIONAL POLICY ON PARKS AND RECREATION

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently Interior Secretary Rogers Morton spoke to the Greater Los Angeles Recreation and Parks Board meeting in Montebello, Calif.

I thought his remarks on that occasion would be of particular interest to all Members of Congress and to everyone who is interested in our national policy on parks and recreation.

Secretary Morton's speech follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
ROGERS C. B. MORTON

History and, I suspect, the State of California broadly demonstrate that a culture of sorts can be derived from the most bizarre and improbable lifestyles. California culture continues to occupy and even dominate a major portion of the American Dream. For over a century, California has captured the vision and experience of the American character. The state is a microcosm of national promise, of achievement and regrettable error.

Decades ago, after the popularity of Margaret Mead's magnificent study of the South Seas, anthropology graduate students sought out the South Pacific Isles. Today the students are most likely to board a plane for L.A. International.

California epitomizes the limit of our national aspiration. Failure here—especially in meeting environmental needs—could mean failure elsewhere.

As a State, California has more per capita leisure and recreational opportunities than any state in the nation. Yet these opportunities have resulted in an incredible mix of ironies:

California's splendid weather means that most parks are available throughout the year, while the majority of our National Parks have a largely seasonal use. This, however, has resulted in massive overuse of your parks.

California's superb highway systems provide magnificent access to recreation and leisure, as well as to jobs. This, however, has spawned incredible air pollution problems. California's staggering population and economic growth, especially in Southern California, has meant growing interest in parks and recreation. Much of the State's growing has taken place in the absence of sound land use planning, or an effort to preserve the integrity of the environment.

With the increase in urbanization and the emergence of regional development patterns, the need for recreation and parks has transcended the era of sandlots, a bandstand, and swing sets. Recreation is big business—not just in the private sector—but in govern-

ment. In the history of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, for example, the five greater Los Angeles Counties—Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Ventura, Orange and Riverside Counties—have received over \$25.6 million in matching grants!

I am especially honored this evening to formally announce an additional \$1.4 million federal grant for the acquisition of the 57 acre Abalone Cove Beach Project in L.A. County. I would further like to add that Congressman Alphonzo Bell has done an absolutely splendid job in Washington to support the park and recreation needs, not just of his own district, but of all Californians. Congressman Bell, needless to say, had a major influence in securing this grant as expeditiously as possible.

In addition to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, President Nixon has carried out one of the most ambitious parks programs in our history. To date over 325 surplus federal properties, totaling almost 54,000 acres, at a market value of almost \$150 million, have been transferred to state and local governments—most of them in urban areas—through the Legacy of Parks program.

The primary role we are seeking for the federal government is to provide technical assistance, funding, and in the case of the Legacy of Parks program, actual acreage for parks and recreation opportunities.

This November the Interior Department and its Bureau of Outdoor Recreation will be delivering the first Nationwide Recreation Plan to the President and the Congress. Although many recommendations are still under consideration, the Nationwide Plan will contain major recommendations for expanding recreation opportunities provided by Federal, State, local and private interests.

We have lived too long with the attitude that Washington knows best . . . and that Washington has not only the means . . . but ability to respond to all regional and local recreation needs.

Let's be frank, the great majority of the nation's parks and recreation sites have regional focus and a regional use, with the exception, of course, of our major National Parks like California's Yosemite and Sequoia-Kings Canyon, and others such as Grand Canyon, Yellowstone or Grand Teton.

It is critical, not only to sound park management practice, but to the park experience itself that we have input and control at a local level of our recreation sites. BOR Director Jim Watt and the other managers at Interior have consistently sought to reorient our services around the needs and demands of state and local officials.

I am convinced that this effort has already begun to produce dramatic new concepts in park and recreation management. BOR, for example, is currently experimenting with a program to convert strip mined land areas into recreation areas and parks. We have already accepted a site here in nearby Santa Ana that will restore a sand and gravel pit to a second generation of land use. This is just one illustration of the exciting possibilities awaiting us.

In the meantime, there is still much to do. There is, for example, a growing need to set aside recreation and parklands near our major urban centers.

Within the last year the President signed into law legislation creating the two Gateway Parks in New York and San Francisco, in addition to bills that will preserve fragile wetlands areas, like the 22,000 acre South San Francisco Bay Wildlife Refuge.

There is a limit, however, to the amount of federal funding that the Congress will be willing to authorize for National Park acquisitions. In the nearby Santa Monica Mountains, for example, there are almost 200,000 acres of land adjacent to one of our largest urban complexes. Much of that land is undeveloped and undisturbed. While further study is indeed necessary, it would appear that the best means to safeguard much

of this area for parks and recreation would be through a concerted effort at the State and local level to acquire land and, to insure that sound land use planning is enforced to preserve the integrity of this spectacular area.

The challenges in park and recreation management are matched by the opportunities before us to meet America's environmental needs in the future. How you and your colleagues meet that challenge in the next years will have an immense effect, not just on the future of California parks—but on the future of our nation's parks.

THE NEED FOR EQUAL CREDIT LEGISLATION

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, at its hearings in May 1972, the Commission on Consumer Credit was presented with numerous documented accounts of the difficulties women face in obtaining both consumer and commercial credit. To deal with this problem MARGARET HECKLER and I have introduced legislation prohibiting discrimination in credit applications on the basis of sex or marital status. Recently WPIX in New York did an editorial describing the problem and the legislation, and the response to that editorial was so overwhelmingly in favor of congressional action on this issue that WPIX ran a second editorial report. As an indication of the broad support this legislation would have, I am appending these two editorials:

EQUAL CREDIT ACT

Credit policies can be as simple as the sign over the cash register which says, "In God we trust, all others pay cash," and as complicated as the legal document in which the small type takes away what the big type gives.

But the one thing that they should be, according to Representative Ed Koch is fair, and make no distinction because the applicant for credit happens to be a woman. Because there is considerable evidence that women are being discriminated against in credit policies, Representative Koch has introduced a bill called "The Equal Credit Act." It would apply directly to all credit transactions and prohibit discrimination on account of sex or marital status against individuals seeking credit.

Last summer, the Commission on Consumer Finance established that single women have more trouble obtaining credit, especially mortgage credit, than single men. They also found that creditors are often unwilling to count the wife's income when a married couple applies for credit. And, finally, they found that women who are divorced or widowed have trouble reestablishing their credit.

The people who oppose the bill tend to fall into two groups. There are those who could be called male chauvinists, who think that women should not be treated equally with men, particularly where money is involved. They rely heavily on the stereotype of Dumb-Dora never being able to get her checkbook straight.

The other group must be taken more seriously because it holds that an individual or a firm, in extending credit is in fact loaning money and should have the right to establish standards without interference

from the government or anyone else except insofar as rates of interest are concerned.

After considering the matter, the Management of WPIX favors the Koch legislation. We agree that lenders should be able to set standards on which they will make loan or credit decisions, but we believe that basing those decisions on the sex of the applicant is clearly unfair. Women constitute 40% of the work force, and, it is said, control some 80% of the money. Clearly, they should be treated equally.

We see Representative Koch's legislation as filling a particularly sensitive need, and we hope that it becomes the law of the land. What's your opinion? We'd like to know.

EDITORIAL FEEDBACK

This is Editorial Feedback when we present excerpts of comments which viewers have sent to us about WPIX editorials. A recent WPIX editorial favored the proposed Equal Credit Act, which would prohibit discrimination in credit transactions on account of sex or marital status.

Almost all of the viewers who wrote to us about this editorial support the Equal Credit Act.

Carole De Saram of the New York City Chapter of the National Organization for Women sent along these thoughts . . . quote: "Women are 52% of the population and are 40% of the work force. To deny women credit is to say that they are not first class citizens. It is next to impossible for a woman to obtain a mortgage or even obtain a business loan even with excellent credit references. If this country is to call itself a democracy, then it cannot deny equal opportunity to 52% of the population to share in its wealth."

M.O. of Manhattan wrote with this . . . quote: "Bravo the WPIX editorial on Koch's bill for equal rights with credit. It's especially close to my heart since I badly want to buy a house one of these years and the mortgage problem for single women is neigh onto impossible. I'm a stable, hard-working professional writer. I am already earning more than the average family. When I have my downpayment saved and can swing that house, it'll be very hard to swing just because I'm capable of bearing a child. That's simply not fair."

A dissenting note from T.B. of Brooklyn declares, and I quote: "The decisions of finance companies are based purely on economic considerations. I am sure that they would loan money to a platypus if they felt that it was economically sound. I realize that equal rights is a fad of our days; however, like any movement it is too often carried into the realm of the ridiculous."

Those are some of the comments our viewers have made about the proposed Equal Credit Act. We present them to you because we think you should know what your neighbors are thinking, and we urge you to continue to write to us about WPIX editorials.

KENTUCKY DERBY FESTIVAL "THEY'RE OFF" LUNCHEON

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to obtain a copy of the invocation delivered by the Reverend Kent Pieper this year at the Kentucky Derby Festival "They're Off" luncheon held in my district—Louisville, Ky.

Father Pieper has, I think, captured the spirit and essence of what the Kentucky Derby at Churchill Downs is all about, and what it is like to be in Louis-

ville during this exciting period of its growth and development.

I hope that all our colleagues may at some time know the thrill of being at the Downs at post time on derby day.

In the meantime, I would like to share with them Reverend Pieper's thoughts:

INVOCATION AT KENTUCKY DERBY FESTIVAL
"THEY'RE OFF" LUNCHEON

God, Our Father, we thank you for giving us Derby Week—

Look upon our city as you once looked upon the world and saw that it was good. We thank you for giving us Kentucky, and Louisville as our home.

We open wide the gates of our great city, and the doors of our hearts,

To welcome your children from all parts of the world.

May our city be the playground of your world this week.

May the joy, the merriment, the happiness and the love in our hearts

Be a sign to all the world that you take delight in your children.

Watch over our city, its citizens and its guests, and keep us from harm.

May no one leave our city disappointed, or thinking less of us.

We thank you for everything that makes Louisville beautiful this week:

Flowers, trees,

Its new buildings, Belvedere

For our River and its Belle,

For Broadway and its Pegasus,

For balloons ascending into your blue skies

For Churchill Downs and its thoroughbreds

that delight and thrill our hearts.

But, most of all, we thank you for giving us one another.

May the smiles and laughter of this week prove to all your children that you are truly a God of Love.

Bless now our food and those who prepared it.

All praise to you now and forever.

DIFFICULTIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, shortly after Israeli Air Force planes forced down an Iraqi airliner in a search for terrorist leaders, WGN Continental Broadcasting Co. in Chicago commented editorially on the subject.

In line with WGN's policy of providing time for responsible comments on their editorials, the Honorable Shaul Ramati, consul-general of Israel, responded to the subject in a statement broadcast Monday, August 27, by WGN.

This event aroused predictable debate. I believe it is especially important for the public to understand the nature of the terrorists actions. At this point, I insert the remarks of Consul General Ramati since I believe it to be a very effective presentation of the Israel Government viewpoint of which the understanding is essential to public appreciation of the difficulties in the Middle East:

DIFFICULTIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(WGN Continental Broadcasting Company recently commented editorially on the forcing down of an Iraqi airliner by Israeli fighter planes. Following is a reply to that editorial delivered by the Honorable Shaul Ramati, Consul-General of Israel:)

It is unreasonable to equate Israel's defense against Arab terrorism with terrorist

attacks. The Arabs kill indiscriminately, hold hostages or aircraft to ransom, blow up planes on the ground and in mid-air. Their aim is to disrupt civil aviation. There was nothing random about the detention of the Iraq Airways jet. The step was taken on the basis of intelligence, which Dr. Habash later confirmed as correct. Every precaution was taken not to endanger the passengers, who were treated with every courtesy, whilst the confessed mass murderers were being sought. Among exploits of which Dr. Habash boasts are the killing of 12 and the wounding of over 50 in a crowded market place in Jerusalem, exploding a Swissair and Air Austria plane in flight killing 47, hijacking and blowing up TWA, Swissair, BOAC and Pan Am jets setting off a civil war in Jordan in which thousands died. He also boasts of training and programming three Japanese who killed 28 and wounded 70 persons at Lod Airport, and most recently killing four and wounding 55 at Athens, and blowing up a Japanese jumbo jet.

In short, the whole world would have sighed a sigh of relief and given a quiet cheer had Habash been on that plane as had been intended. The world might have frowned for the record, but would know it had been spared much horror and senseless tragedy.

Arab and Communist states actively support this terrorism, and the United Nations encourages it as long as it is carried out under acceptable slogans. The rest of the world, with the honorable exception of the United States, tries to buy off these thugs by appeasement and avoids, as far as possible, their arrest, prosecution or punishment.

Israel thus has no choice but to protect the lives of her citizens and her institutions on her own. With memories of the holocaust and of the ineffectiveness of world public opinion in preventing massacres and blood-baths in other parts of the world, Israel's primary concern will remain the saving of human lives rather than the desire to avoid criticism. Law is intended to protect the public. It is not there to protect international outlaws engaged in indiscriminate carnage from being hunted down and put away where they can do no more harm.

NCJW NATIONAL RESOLUTIONS: A GUIDE FOR THE FUTURE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to congratulate the National Council of Jewish Women on the adoption of their national resolutions 1973-75. These fine principles, with their emphasis on freedom and human dignity as the underlying bases of contemporary democratic society, should be a basis for Congress to act upon. The text of the resolution follows:

NATIONAL RESOLUTIONS 1973-1975

I. INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The National Council of Jewish Women believes that the freedom, dignity and security of the individual are basic to American democracy, that individual liberty and rights guaranteed by the Constitution are keystones of a free society, and that any erosion of these liberties or discrimination against any person undermines that society.

It Therefore Resolves:

1. To work for the adoption and strengthening of federal, state and local laws to protect civil rights, individual liberties, personal security and to support vigorous enforcement, implementation and funding of these laws.

2. To identify those social and economic problems which lead to the denial of civil rights or liberties and to work toward their just solution.

3. To work for and encourage programs in the community which will promote understanding and acceptance of civil rights and responsibilities of every person.

4. To work for public understanding and protection of civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States including:

(a) The right to dissent.

(b) The right to seek redress of grievances.

(c) The right to privacy.

(d) The right to freedom of the press, including all means of mass communication.

(e) The right to equal protection under the law.

5. To work for and promote the adoption of federal, state and local laws that protect the legal rights of children, and to encourage the adoption of uniform laws relating to juveniles.

6. To work for and support measures which ensure equal opportunity and legal equal rights for women.

7. To work for and encourage public understanding that abortion is an individual right, and to work for the elimination of legal obstacles that limit this right.

8. To work for public acceptance and vigorous enforcement of legislation which guarantees the right of individuals to live wherever they choose.

9. To work for and support legislation at all levels of government to regulate the manufacture, importation, sale, licensing and registration of hand guns, other firearms, ammunition and explosives, and to encourage public understanding of the need for such laws.

10. To ensure the principle of equal opportunity for all by opposing quota systems at any level.

11. To work for and support measures which will in a spirit of reconciliation, provide Amnesty for all who have been put in legal jeopardy by their resistance to the war in Indo-China.

II. HEALTH AND WELFARE

The National Council of Jewish Women believes that a healthy community, sound family life and individual welfare are interdependent and thrive when barriers of poverty and discrimination are removed. It believes, therefore, that our democratic society must give priority to programs which meet the economic, social, physical and psychological needs of all people, and that the public and private sectors must work together to help individuals function successfully and independently in a changing society.

It Therefore Resolves:

1. To work for a program of income maintenance and supportive services which protects and respects the rights and dignity of recipients and provides at least the minimum national standard of living for every individual.

2. To work for a social security program which will reflect the cost of living index and wage levels and which will provide:

(a) Insurance coverage for all working people and their dependents to assure basic protection against loss of income.

(b) Flexibility in the social security system which does not penalize recipients who wish to remain in the work force.

3. To work for and support a comprehensive national health insurance program.

4. To support programs aimed at improving the health care delivery system, including:

(a) Preventive medicine

(b) Expansion of medical training

(c) Health care facilities

(d) Medical research

(e) Dental care

(f) Mental Health services

(g) Genetic counselling

5. To work for the expansion, development

and adequate financing of quality comprehensive child care programs available to all children.

6. To promote programs and services for the care and rehabilitation of families and individuals with special needs, and to encourage research into the causes which create these special needs.

7. To support programs to meet the needs of the elderly.

8. To work for public understanding that drug and alcohol abuse and addiction are medical and social problems, and:

(a) To support programs of education, research, prevention, treatment and rehabilitation.

(b) To work for reform of existing laws regarding the possession, use and sale of drugs.

9. To endorse uniform laws relating to marriage, divorce, adoption, child protection and child support.

10. To support and promote programs for birth control including research, education and clinical services for all.

11. To promote programs and services to eradicate venereal disease.

12. To promote the welfare and rehabilitation of juveniles and adults under court jurisdiction including special services to them and their families.

13. To support an adequate system of social services for children in need of supervision.

14. To promote programs for the development of trained professionals, professional aide and volunteer personnel for work in the fields of health, welfare and public safety, and to encourage new and effective working relationships among them.

III. PUBLIC EDUCATION

The National Council of Jewish Women believes that American democracy depends on a strong system of public education to develop the highest potential of the individual. Equal access to quality educational services is a fundamental right for all individuals.

It Therefore Resolves:

1. To work for increased public understanding of the basic role of public education in our changing society and to support greater community participation in educational affairs.

2. To promote highest possible educational standards and expanded educational opportunities through:

(a) Early childhood education and education continuing through life.

(b) Guidance and counselling at all levels including health, diagnostic and referral services.

(c) Programs for children and adults with special educational needs.

(d) Expanded and improved school and public library programs and facilities.

(e) Vocational and technical education related to job opportunities.

(f) Programs dealing with family life and sex education.

(g) Opportunity for greater involvement of the family in the education of the child.

(h) Maximum year-round coordinated use of all educational facilities and services.

(i) Continuing evaluation of goals, curriculum, structure, methods and school personnel.

(j) Innovative educational programs.

(k) Integration into the curriculum of programs dealing with the cultures of all peoples.

(l) Programs dealing with drug and alcohol abuse.

3. To promote improved teacher education programs including inservice training.

4. To promote programs for the development of trained professional, professional aide and volunteer personnel in the field of education, and to encourage new and effective working relationships among them.

5. To work for a higher level of financial support for public education:

(a) By supporting adequate state and local funding.

(b) By supporting federal aid to public education.

(c) By urging reappraisal of the basis of financing public education.

6. To protect the principle of separation of church and state which is basic to our system of public education.

7. To protect public funds from being diverted to non-public elementary and secondary education and to oppose any form of reimbursement or tax credits to parents for non-public school tuition.

8. To support increased opportunities for higher education and vocational and technical training through expanded scholarship and loan programs.

9. To continue to work for successful integration in the public schools of pupils, teachers, non-teaching staff and administrative personnel.

10. To support the concept that freedom of inquiry and expression are indispensable to education in a democracy.

11. To promote and support measures to provide free school lunches to all students in elementary and secondary schools, as well as breakfasts and other nutritional programs in communities where there is a need.

12. To promote programs in human relations training for all school personnel including administrators, teachers, other school employees, parents and students.

IV. JEWISH AFFAIRS

The National Council of Jewish Women believes that Judaism has bequeathed to every Jew a rich inheritance of moral and religious values and a strong sense of personal and communal responsibility. Transmitting this heritage through education and implementing its principles strengthens Jewish identity, enriches our Jewish communities, and reinforces our commitments to Jews throughout the world.

It Therefore Resolves:

1. To aid in the development, strengthening and enrichment of Jewish community life through NCJW programs and cooperation with other groups.

2. To foster the study and learning of Judaism by:

(a) Promoting the highest possible educational standards for religious schools.

(b) Working for training programs to alleviate the shortage of qualified teachers.

(c) Encouraging adult and family oriented education and activities.

(d) Promoting and providing programs for children and adults with special needs.

(e) Promoting programs on college campuses.

(f) Encouraging Jewish community support of Jewish education without dependence on public funds.

3. To support, promote and practise measures designed to strengthen and preserve Jewish faith and culture.

4. To work for the attainment of religious and cultural freedom, justice and human rights of Jews wherever these are denied or abridged, with special attention to the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union and other countries where Jews are oppressed.

5. To promote the growth and development of the International Council of Jewish Women in countries throughout the world.

6. To urge rabbinical reinterpretation which will eliminate difficulties suffered by women under Jewish law.

V. ISRAEL

The National Council of Jewish Women believes that the survival and development of Israel are central elements of Jewish identity based upon our mutual heritage as Jews. Israel enhances the stature and dignity of Jews throughout the world. It is making a significant contribution to democracy and social progress by building a nation where a life of dignity and independence is possible

for its people. We believe it deserves the support of all countries.

It Therefore Resolves:

1. To urge the United States and the United Nations to support Israel in its efforts to:

(a) Establish a just and permanent peace.

(b) Insure its continuation as an independent nation within secure boundaries.

2. To urge the United States to continue to make available economic assistance and military equipment to Israel.

3. To continue our support of the social, educational, economic and cultural development of Israel.

VI. ECONOMIC POLICY

The National Council of Jewish Women believes that the economic priorities, policies and programs at all levels of government should be designed to develop our full human, social and economic potential.

It Therefore Resolves:

1. To urge formulation and implementation of government programs, policies and legislation which will:

(a) Encourage growth and ensure expanded economic opportunities.

(b) Ensure full employment with safeguards against inflationary pressures.

(c) Promote equal employment opportunities.

(d) Include continuing examination of national priorities for government spending.

2. To work for measures which:

(a) Ensure for the total work force, including migratory workers and household employees, coverage under minimum wage and maximum hour standards, workmen's compensation and similar benefits, and safe and sanitary working conditions.

(b) Ensure free and full collective bargaining and such other machinery as may be necessary to aid in the peaceful settlement of labor disputes.

(c) Support and promote state and federal laws which regulate and protect private governmental and union pension funds, and protect the rights of those enrolled in private pension funds.

(d) Assure equal pay for equal work.

(e) Promote, within the framework of adequate child labor legislation, training programs and employment opportunities for youth.

(f) Provide training for available job opportunities, and create new job opportunities for the untrained, the underemployed, the elderly, the handicapped, and those unemployed as a result of technological development and other changes in the economy.

(g) Permit persons to accept job training and employment by providing adequately funded child care services.

3. To support measures which:

(a) Protect the public in the production, marketing and servicing of all consumer goods, including adequate regulation of testing, licensing, detailed labeling and dating of food and cosmetics as well as generic labeling of drugs.

(b) Establish a consumer protection agency with enforcement powers.

(c) Protect the public against misleading information and unethical practices in lending and credit transactions and consumer services.

(d) Eliminate economic discrimination against women.

(e) Guarantee fair insurance practices.

(f) Promote consumer education programs.

4. To work for tax reforms and to support measures for the assessment, collection and expenditure of funds at all levels of government which will strengthen the basic services endorsed in these resolutions.

5. To work for the acceptance and recognition of the value of time contributed by the volunteer by supporting tax benefit legislation.

VII. GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

The National Council of Jewish Women believes that the increasing complexity of

the processes of government demands a strengthened adherence to governmental checks and balances as specified in the Constitution of the United States, and the development of safeguards to insure democratic enactment, implementation and enforcement of laws at all levels.

It Therefore Resolves:

1. To urge legislative bodies to adopt rules and procedures which will:

(a) Define and limit the authority of investigating committees and safeguard the rights of all parties concerned in hearings.

(b) Establish effective machinery to insure the opportunity to consider and vote on proposed legislation.

(c) Open to the public all legislative meetings except those dealing with national security.

(d) Ensure the selection of committee leadership on a more democratic basis rather than solely on the basis of seniority.

2. To promote policies which will guarantee that administrative departments and regulatory agencies function effectively and act in the public interest.

3. To promote a sound and comprehensive civil service system at all levels of government.

4. To support and promote effective reform in federal, state and local government.

5. To support development of an independent authority at all levels of government and provide an opportunity to redress grievances.

6. To support measures which will insure the validity of the vote of every citizen including:

(a) Districting for equitable representation.

(b) Elimination of all impediments to the free exercise of the franchise except those requirements necessary to prevent fraudulent voting.

7. To support measures granting voting representation in Congress and self-government to the citizens of the United States residing in the District of Columbia.

8. To promote and support measures for reform in:

(a) Nomination and election of the President and the Vice President to insure their selection by popular vote.

(b) The nominating process which will make it responsive to the electorate.

(c) Regulation, limitation and disclosure of campaign expenditures.

(d) Methods of campaign financing.

9. To work for complete financial disclosure by public officials at all levels.

10. To work for the public disclosure of sources of financial support for paid lobbyists at all levels of government.

11. To reaffirm our belief in an independent judiciary and to oppose measures which would undermine or curtail the authority of the Supreme Court.

12. To promote a judicial system designed to achieve equitable and expeditious administration of justice for juveniles and adults:

(a) Establishing high qualifications for judges.

(b) Promoting significant reforms in the processing of pending court cases which will insure the rights of the individual.

(c) Eliminating lengthy pre-trial detention.

(d) Supporting measures that aid victims of crime and their families.

(e) Working to remove victimless crimes from the jurisdiction of the criminal courts.

(f) Assuring the provision of legal services for those in need.

13. To support measures which will promote significant penal reforms for juveniles and adults by emphasizing rehabilitation, establishing high qualifications and necessary training for all personnel and providing salaries commensurate with qualifications and responsibilities.

14. To support the abolition of capital punishment.

15. To support improvement of law enforcement agencies by:

(a) Providing adequate training for all personnel which will recognize the human relations aspects of their role as primary social agents.

(b) Providing salaries commensurate with those of comparable professions.

16. To work for a more equitable military service system.

VIII. FOREIGN POLICY

The National Council of Jewish Women believes that United States foreign policy should be directed toward developing the conditions for world peace wherein human beings can live their lives in dignity with the greatest measure of economic, social, religious and political freedom. We believe that the United States in cooperation with all nations should pursue every possible alternative to military action as a means of resolving international disputes.

It Therefore Resolves:

1. To strengthen and work through the United Nations and its specialized agencies and the International Court of Justice as important media through which the conditions of peace will be achieved by the adjustment of the national interests of the member nations.

2. To promote the inclusion as member nations in the United Nations of all governments petitioning membership who pledge adherence to the U.N. charter.

3. To continue to strive for international peace and security:

(a) By the immediate and total cessation of all U.S. military intervention in Indochina.

(b) Through international agreement on general disarmament, including effective inspection.

(c) Through enforcement and extension of the treaty to ban nuclear weapons testing and provide for inspection essential for effective control.

(d) Through support by international agreements of all peaceful means of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(e) Through international agreements to outlaw chemical and bacteriological warfare and the production of such weapons.

(f) Through the creation and maintenance of a strong and flexible United Nations permanent force to maintain peace.

(g) By accepting the responsibility of mutual defense and cooperation with other nations as provided for in the United Nations charter.

(h) Through the creation and maintenance of international agreements to secure the neutrality of outer space and underseas.

4. To support economic development and expansion of economic opportunity throughout the world:

(a) Through assistance programs to developing countries so that they may achieve economic, social, educational and health standards necessary for maintaining independence and effective self-government, and by providing such aid through multilateral channels where possible.

(b) Through the pursuit of an effective international monetary policy which will encourage worldwide economic growth, cooperation and stability.

(c) By the expansion of inter-American trade, cultural and economic cooperation.

(d) By continuing to develop trade agreements on a reciprocal basis and supporting international agreements for the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to the free flow of trade.

5. To protect, preserve, and restore the world environmental balance:

(a) By cooperation in international measures pertaining to world ecological problems.

(b) By supporting programs dealing with world population problems.

(c) Through continued international cooperation in developing the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

(d) Through international agreements concerning underseas and outerspace exploration, research and development.

6. To support the promotion of human rights and freedom throughout the world by:

(a) Fully implementing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(b) Ratifying the Human Rights Conventions.

(c) Creating expanded opportunities for international study, work and travel, and for cultural exchange.

(d) Insuring the right of individuals to emigrate without penalty or harassment.

7. To support agreements to protect the safety of international travel by imposing penalties on nations which aid, encourage, abet and give asylum to hijackers and perpetrators of international acts of violence against individuals or groups.

8. To promote vigorous enforcement of international agreements for the prevention of the illegal flow of drugs.

IX. ENVIRONMENT AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE

The National Council of Jewish Women believes that the future of our democratic society and the quality of human life depend on the solution of problems intensified by the nature of a massive urban society and concurrent technological developments. Inherent in the solution is recognition by the public and the private sectors of their mutual responsibilities.

It Therefore Resolves:

1. To work and actively support effective programs and vigorous enforcement of measures for the protection and conservation of our environment, including adequate financing of programs which establish national standards and increase research.

2. To promote plans and programs, with adequate financing, for metropolitan, regional, and rural development which will provide coordinated facilities and services. In order to achieve sound, healthy communities, individuals affected by these programs should participate in the planning.

3. To promote public understanding of the necessity for demographic planning.

4. To create a better climate for acceptance of public housing through community education and participation, to support public and private programs to meet the housing needs of low and middle income individuals and families without discriminatory housing restrictions, and to oppose measures which tend to perpetuate existing discriminatory housing patterns.

5. To support proposals on the local, regional and national levels which will provide safe, adequate and efficient mass transportation facilities.

6. To support programs on local, regional and national levels which deal with the causes and prevention of violence with special emphasis on the urban environment.

X. IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The National Council of Jewish Women believes that the contribution of strength and diversity resulting from the immigration of peoples from all over the world is vital to the development of American democracy and culture. It also believes that an equitable and humane immigration policy is an effective instrument of international good will.

It Therefore Resolves:

1. To support revisions of United States Immigration Laws so that:

(a) The total immigration quota be increased and consideration be given to the pressing needs of refugees and displaced persons.

(b) The total immigration quota, subject to periodic review, be distributed without discrimination.

(c) Persons of foreign birth shall receive protection under the law equal to that extended to the native-born.

(d) The United States support the acceptance of a definition of the term "refugee"

to include those who wish to flee their countries as well as those who have fled.

2. To promote and support programs to assist in the resettlement of immigrants.

MARVIN LEIBSTONE STRESSES CAR-POOLING AS MEANS OF REDUCING POLLUTION AND CONSERVING ENERGY

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, each morning, thousands upon thousands of automobiles stream into the District of Columbia, and each evening they return in the direction of the residential areas of the city and the suburbs. These automobiles, often carrying only a driver, clog the streets and bridges, pollute the air, and consume energy at a tremendous rate.

The same scene is duplicated daily in every major city. Traffic congestion obviously ranks high on every list of major urban problems. Americans are responding to the challenge with better highways, improved transit systems, and innovative experiments to find new methods of transportation.

Each of these steps is necessary to cope with today's traffic, but, as is often the case with any problem of major proportions, there are a few simple actions that each individual can undertake to ease the burden. In a statement to the members of the Joint Committee on Transportation of the Federal City Council on July 11, 1973, Marvin Leibstone, regional representative for the Highway Users Federation for Safety and Mobility, spoke of car pools as one such step. Mr. Leibstone's statement cites some of the advantages of carpooling and describes some of the methods used by Federal agencies and businesses to encourage commuters to travel together. I am pleased to bring this statement to the attention of the Members of the House:

While it would take several transportation modes to reduce the Washington area's traffic congestion and air pollution, the mode which stands out as the most economic and easiest to plan and implement is "carpooling".

The private automobile, with only one driver in the car, is the most expensive transportation mode available to the community. The cost of a 10-mile work trip downtown in areas of over one million people averages out at \$2.64 for the one driver. But if the driver car-pools with three other persons the cost of the same 10-mile work trip is reduced to .66 cents for each passenger. Further, a 6-passenger car-pool would bring the passenger cost down to .44 cents. Car-pooling, then, offers a maximum monthly individual savings of around \$44.00 per passenger.

As for traffic relief and air quality improvement, if car occupancy could go from 1.6 persons to 2.0, there would be a 20 percent reduction in traffic during peak hours.

During the week of July 9, 1973, and on eight separate occasions in 1972, the District of Columbia and its surrounding counties and cities were declared to have hazardous air conditions. To meet the nation's air quality standards, the region's Air Quality Planning Committee, in concert with the staff and members of the area's Council of Governments, has had to recommend transporta-

tion control strategies which include some distasteful disincentives. The degree to which these disincentives will appear attractive to planners can be reduced considerably by strong evidence of public and private intensity and support applied to car-pooling.

Each time that air pollution alerts are declared officially for the Washington region by the Council of Governments, the Council recommends that commuters car-pool the following day. This recommendation is announced to the Washington area population through the major daily newspapers and radio and television stations. But the following morning, one can still look down lines of cars on major roadways and find little evidence of increases in car-pooling.

Car-pooling, then, has not yet been identified by commuters as one of a set of favorable ways to get to and from work. The public needs to know more about the benefits of car-pooling. If the public can view car-pooling as a package of incentives, then perhaps there will be less reluctance to utilize the mode and a 20 percent traffic reduction can be reached.

To encourage car-pooling some government agencies and many large companies are actively coordinating the formation of convenient share-the-ride groups.

Everything from computers to coffee-ketchers are being used to get employees together and car-pools started.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration in Washington, D.C., is typical of government agencies which maintain grid maps showing the location of active and potential carpools. NASA's program, initiated in 1964, has increased car occupancy among employees to an average 3.85 persons per car.

In St. Louis, McDonnell Douglas Corporation promoted car-pooling for the firm's 47,000 employees when parking became critical. The program has increased car occupancy among workers to an average of 2.8 persons, double the former rate.

At California State College in San Bernardino, several hundred computer-matched students and teachers are sharing the ride. And in Pasadena, 500 employees of Burroughs Corporation, are successfully involved in a ride-sharing effort.

In Hartford, Connecticut, Travelers Insurance Company includes a no-charge listing in its weekly newspaper of "riders available and riders wanted" as part of the community's general plan to promote car-pooling and stagger work hours.

In many agencies and companies, car-pool drivers are rewarded with preferred parking spaces in covered garages close to office or factory entrances.

On the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, car-pools of three or more persons can cross for a reduced toll rate. They are also provided with special lanes to speed them through the toll plaza and onto the bridge.

Other cities are considering letting car-pools of four or more persons use exclusive bus lanes.

The application of car-pooling may have favorable dimensions that have not been identified yet, especially in the area of economic savings and financial profit for business and industry. Because any undiscovered potential should be tapped, and because of the urgency of the problems created by traffic congestion and air pollution, it is hereby recommended that the Joint Committee on Transportation of the Federal City Council decide to act as a catalyst in forming a special study committee of prominent area business executives for the purpose of identifying new economic savings and profits which could be engendered by the establishment of job-rooted car-pool programs. It may be that the cost of an adequate car-pool public education program for the Washington area population could only be absorbed by the business community and could, in turn, have an effective pay-off for its membership as well as the car-pooling commuter.

SOME POINTED QUESTIONS FOR KISSINGER HEARINGS—PART I

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the politically minded weekly, *Human Events*, this week featured some pointed observations which could be useful in the upcoming hearings on the nomination of Mr. Henry Kissinger as the new Secretary of State. Quoting from a new biography, "Kissinger: Portrait of a Mind," by Prof. Stephen R. Graubard, a friend and former colleague of Mr. Kissinger at Harvard, *Human Events* points out that Mr. Kissinger no longer considers the U.S.S.R. and Red China as "revolutionary" states. If this analysis of Mr. Kissinger's views is correct, exploration of this area during the hearings should prove interesting.

I insert at this point the item "Some Pointed Questions for Kissinger Hearings" which appeared in the September 8, 1973, issue of *Human Events*.

SOME POINTED QUESTIONS FOR KISSINGER HEARINGS

President Nixon's decision to tap Henry Kissinger as secretary of state provides the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with a unique opportunity to probe the Administration's policy of warming up relations with the two Communist superpowers. But whether the committee will question Kissinger as to the success of *détente* is still very much up in the air.

Chaired by Sen. J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), the committee, which will hold hearings on the Kissinger nomination shortly, is packed with both doves and Administration apologists. The doves will be trying to maneuver Kissinger into committing the Administration to a softer policy than it is already pursuing in regard to the Soviet Union and Red China, while Republican apologists will be eager to cover up any flaws in the Nixon-Kissinger diplomacy. Few on the committee can be expected to voice the concern of the more hawkish elements of the diplomatic and military community in Washington.

But there is some hope that a few of the more independent-minded committee members, such as John Sparkman (D-Ala.), Gale McGee (D-Wyo.), Robert Griffin (R-Mich.), and even Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn.), will be willing to press Kissinger hard on the Administration's accommodation policies.

What many tough-minded diplomats would like the senators to ask Kissinger, for instance, is how he can justify his apparent belief that the Soviet Union and Red China are no longer revolutionary powers.

In a fascinating new biography called *Kissinger: Portrait of a Mind*, Prof. Stephen R. Graubard makes some highly interesting observations on Kissinger's perception of "revolutionary" states.

Prof. Graubard, an admirer and friend of his former Harvard colleague, writes that Kissinger developed a concept about world affairs that he never abandoned in any of his writings. Kissinger contrasted two types of international order, one as "legitimate" and the other as "revolutionary." States that accepted a particular international order as legitimate could negotiate their differences.

When, however, a "state maintained that the international order was illegitimate, diplomacy was excluded. Such a state was revolutionary; in challenging the established order, it was asking, in effect, for the existing order to be set aside and for another to be put in its place."

Kissinger's concept is clearly pivotal to his views on how a nation conducts its foreign policy. In his now famous work, *A World Restored*, Kissinger viewed Napoleon as a revolutionary who could not be appeased by normal give-and-take diplomacy. He believed that the 19th Century Austrian diplomat Prince Klemens von Metternich, in Graubard's words, "had one profound insight: he knew Napoleon to be a 'revolutionary,' and realized that it was impossible to satisfy such a national leader. Nothing—neither compromise, concession nor alliance—would satiate Napoleon's hunger. . . ."

"Believing that Napoleon could not be bought off—that no alliance with France would serve to protect Austria's integrity—Metternich set out on a course [which Kissinger believed was correct] to achieve two results: the defeat of Napoleonic France and the survival of Imperial Austria."

"In theory," writes Graubard, "Kissinger was writing about problems that confronted European statesmen early in the 19th Century; in fact, he was probing the nature of the international system of the mid-20th Century. Together with many others, he was asking whether the Soviet Union should be viewed as a 'revolutionary' power. That, for Kissinger, was the one question that could not be safely ignored. Did the Soviet Union accept the 'legitimacy' of the existing international system or did it hope to replace that system?"

According to Graubard, Kissinger has now resolved this problem—in favor of both the Soviet Union and Red China. "As he had made quite evident in speeches prepared for Nelson Rockefeller a few months before he entered the White House, Kissinger believed that the times were propitious for new initiatives to be taken vis-a-vis both the Soviet Union and Communist China. The Americans and the Soviets accepted the fact that a strategic balance existed between them; the Communist bloc seemed irrevocably split; both the Soviet Union and Communist China had ceased to be 'revolutionary' states."

So there was no mistaking what Kissinger meant, Graubard stressed: "That term [revolutionary] had a very special meaning in Kissinger's lexicon. Since he had always believed that an international order demanded a certain acceptance by all of its members, the existence of any state pledged to its destruction created a serious hazard to world peace. *It mattered very much, in Kissinger's mind, that neither Moscow nor Peking appeared any longer to entertain such ambitions*" (Italics added).

Thus a key question many international affairs experts would like the senators to put to Kissinger is: On what grounds can one come to the conclusion that Peking and Moscow have relinquished their dreams of world conquest? Can Kissinger prove that the ambitions of Peking and Moscow are somehow less hazardous to world peace than were the ambitions of Napoleon?

So far, according to students of communism, there is no evidence that either the Soviets or the Red Chinese are in the process of softening their ideology or cutting off aid to a worldwide network of revolutionary Communist organizations. Hence the desire to hear Kissinger explain his views on the matter.

These "hard-liners"—realists, they would call themselves—would also like to hear Kissinger's response to these questions as well:

In recent weeks, the press has reported a spiraling wave of repressive tactics employed against dissidents within the Soviet Union, tactics vigorously condemned by such leading Russian intellectuals as Andrei Sakharov, the Soviet scientist who helped develop the Russian H-bomb, and novelist Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who last week expressed fears that the Soviet secret police might do him in. Doesn't this suggest that the Administra-

tion's détente policies have actually led to more repression in the Soviet Union?

Why is the Nixon Administration opposed to the Jackson amendment on East-West trade—which would foreclose U.S. trade credits to the Soviets unless they established a free emigration policy—when Sakharov, Taruski and other Soviet dissidents say legislation along these lines is essential for promoting freedom within Russia?

A recent study conducted by economists at the Library of Congress for the House Foreign Affairs Committee stated that the economic advantages to the United States from trade with the Soviet Union will necessarily be small in the foreseeable future. If the economic benefits are likely to be small for us (but not, apparently, for the Soviet Union), what political benefits from this trade will accrue to the United States that justify the buildup of Soviet economic potential by American technology?

In its ratification of the ABM Treaty and the Executive Agreement on Offensive Weapons last year, the Congress expressed the view that any permanent agreement on strategic arms would provide for parity between the United States and the Soviet Union. What steps will Kissinger take to ensure that our negotiating posture is consistent with the will of Congress?

In the fall of 1971, following Taiwan's expulsion from the United Nations, the Congress considered and rejected the nullification of the 1958 Formosa Resolution, thus reinforcing once again the congressional determination to maintain the integrity and credibility of U.S. treaty commitments. What steps would Kissinger recommend with regard to our defense commitment to Taiwan that would leave no doubt in anyone's mind as to our intentions to prevent the absorption of Taiwan by Communist China by force?

In the negotiations concerning troop withdrawals in Europe, the United States has previously insisted that the Soviets would have to withdraw a larger number of troops for two major reasons: (a) the American force in Europe is smaller; and (b) some U.S. troops, in order to be withdrawn, would have to return some 6,000 miles to American shores. Soviet troops, on the other hand, could "withdraw" from Europe by moving a few hundred miles back to Russia proper.

The insistence on an unequal percentage cut was considered part of our "mutual and balanced force reduction" posture. Why, however, are we now backing away from this position? Why did Defense Secretary James Schlesinger indicate last week that we would no longer demand larger Soviet troop cuts?

These are just a few of the questions that many hard-liners hope members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will ask Kissinger when he appears before them for confirmation in his new post.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 348— THE QUIET AMERICANS BILL

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, in February, I introduced House Joint Resolution 348 proposing an amendment to the Constitution which, when ratified, will protect the rights of all citizens to voluntarily pledge allegiance to our flag, and will give Congress the power to regulate the display and handling of the flag and to protect it from desecration.

This bill was inspired by a group of residents within my congressional district who call themselves "The Quiet Americans." I am proud to represent these fine men and women who hold a deep and abiding faith in patriotism and the national spirit embodied by our Flag. In an age when it is considered "smart" to be cynical about traditional values and emotions, it is the millions of "Quiet Americans" from coast to coast who hold the fabric of our country together.

I commend "The Quiet Americans" for their caring strength and hope my colleagues will join me in my efforts on behalf of House Joint Resolution 348—which is truly their bill.

REPRESENTATIVE CRANE AP- PLAUDS PRESIDENT NIXON'S COMMENTS ON AMERICAN ECON- OMY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in praise of President Nixon's comments on the question of restoring health to our economy in yesterday's press conference. For the past months the news media, Members of Congress, and the public have been preoccupied with the Watergate proceedings. The serious business of our country has been overlooked and superseded by this news-making spectacular, and I commend the President for his effort to call us all back to the realities of our everyday responsibilities.

In the President's own words:

First is the very high priority area of fighting inflation.

The battle will be waged on three fronts.

First, a new set of economic controls will be imposed as of September 13. On this point I must take issue with the President, as I have consistently done in the past. Additional controls will attack symptoms and not causes. This problem of inflation consists mainly in the Federal Government borrowing from commercial banks and also in an increase in the money supply. The Government finances its deficit spending through inflation. This brings us to the second area in which initiatives will be taken.

The President advised us that the Federal Reserve will tighten up on the money supply. In doing so, we will attack one of the root causes of inflation, and I applaud this decision.

Third, the President announced that:

We are moving in the supply front, particularly in the field of agriculture, so that we can eventually look forward to halting the rise in food prices and we trust in eventually lowering them.

We must make every effort to help the President in this area by moving to eliminate agricultural subsidies, and to encourage our farmers to produce. I have consistently voted to eliminate these sub-

sides and I urge my colleagues to join me. In addition, let me point out that wheat sales to foreign nations subsidized by the taxpayer have seriously reduced our domestic supply and resulted in increased prices for the American consumer.

I was pleased to note that President Nixon called once again on the Congress to exercise restraint and to work for a balanced budget. Until Congress takes the initiative in reducing Federal expenditures, inflation will grow. The President has promised to veto all "budget busting" proposals passed by Congress, and I shall continue to support him in this action. I particularly laud the President for his promised veto of the minimum wage bill recently enacted by Congress. I opposed the bill when it was before the House of Representatives as a pernicious piece of legislation which would aggravate prices and unemployment and would have an especially deleterious effect on the young and minorities. As the President pointed out, this legislation would increase the minimum wage by 38 percent.

Lastly, I wholeheartedly agree with the President's observation that it is difficult to disassociate the questions of economic health and our national defense. In reply to suggestions that we cut vital areas of our defense budget to increase spending on the domestic front, the President commented that:

This would be a fatal mistake because we can have the finest domestic programs in the world and it isn't going to make any difference if we don't have our freedom and if we're not around to enjoy them.

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY BABE RUTH LEAGUE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Prince Georges County Boys' Clubs Babe Ruth All Stars won the 13- to 15-year-old Babe Ruth World Series which was held in Manchester, N.H., August 18 through August 25. This was the first time in the 22-year history of the tournament that a team from Washington's greater metropolitan area ever achieved this success.

The Prince Georges team, which has won the State title 3 years in a row and were in the world semifinals last year, won the World Series by winning four straight games defeating Anaheim, Calif. in the final game 11 to 6.

When Mayor Dupris of Manchester, presented the Maryland team with the key to the city after the championship game he remarked that the youngsters from Prince Georges were champions on the field and that they had behaved as champions off the field by conducting themselves as real gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the accomplishments these young men have achieved and I would like to insert the names of those players in the RECORD at this point:

OXIX—1818—Part 22

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY BABE RUTH LEAGUE

NAME AND AGE

Glover, Danny, 15.
Howell, Michael, 15.
Johnson, Ken, 15.
Kirchiro, Mike, 15.
Kowalski, Curt, 15.
Krahling, Thomas, 15.
Malambri, Mark, 15.
Matthews, Mike, 14.
Molnar, Gary, 15.
Palmer, Danny, 14.
Poore, Richard, 15.
Shughrue, Mike, 15.
Smith, Ronald, 15.
Waldow, Richard, 15.
Wright, Mike, 15.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF MINIMUM WAGE BILL

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the ill-conceived action of the President in vetoing the minimum wage legislation can only be interpreted as a standing affront to the American worker. This unconscionable move is a clear indication of Mr. Nixon's grossly distorted priorities and his misdirected, hollow economic policies. By this repressive step Mr. Nixon has condemned millions of American men, women, and children to continue to endure the vicious cycle of poverty which the Congress had hoped to break by finally enacting the minimum wage bill.

The goal of the Fair Labor Standards Act when it was first adopted in 1935 was to insure that this Nation's lowest-paid workers and their families would not have to live in poverty. Unfortunately, this remains a constantly elusive goal. Certainly the present \$1.60 per hour minimum wage falls far short of this commitment. In fact, today's minimum wage buys less than \$1.25 bought when the Fair Labor Standards Act was last amended in 1966.

During the 7 years since the last minimum wage increase this country has experienced an almost limitless inflationary spiral, skyrocketing prices, soaring taxes, and a persistent unemployment crisis. The dollar's purchasing power, especially in light of devaluation and the administration's ineffective economic programs, has been very seriously eroded. Simple economic facts alone require the minimum wage to be raised to the basic \$2.20 per hour level.

Quite frankly, as I have mentioned on previous occasions, I seriously doubt whether \$2.20 per hour will be sufficient. A full-time worker earning this salary will be grossing just barely more than the poverty level of approximately \$4,200 for a family of four. Once you deduct taxes and social security, it is most likely that many workers will again fall below the poverty level.

How in good conscience can the President justify vetoing this long overdue, urgently required legislation? Not only is

it not inflationary as Mr. Nixon and his advisers claim, but the basically inadequate figure of \$2.20 per hour is required simply to catch up with the rising cost of living. Further, in view of the fact that this bill does more than just raise the minimum wage, how can Mr. Nixon justify the continuation of labor conditions which are certainly detrimental to maintaining a minimum living standard? Millions of workers are denied the basic protections of the Fair Labor Standards Act, but the President would allow this situation to persist.

By what poorly considered logic can Mr. Nixon claim that the minimum wage bill before him would deny employment opportunities to unskilled and younger workers? He fails to back up this specious claim with any facts, because there are simply no facts which support this preposterous position.

Mr. Speaker, our course is clear. We must move promptly and decisively to override the veto. Once again the administration has shirked its responsibility and has shown nothing more than a callous disregard for the plight of millions of American working men and women. The Congress must now take the initiative—as it did originally in this instance—and move to enact this desperately needed minimum wage measure. We just cannot expect the millions of workers covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act—including those additional workers to whom protection is extended under the bill we passed—to cope with 1973 prices at 1970 or 1971 wages. The narrow, special interests which this administration courts and appeases will surely not suffer, but it seems rather obvious that Mr. Nixon could care less about those millions who work at the minimum wage. It appears that this administration chooses to ignore the fact that almost two-thirds of the 24 million poor in this country are members of families headed by a worker in the labor force and that approximately one quarter of the poor and more than 30 percent of the children growing up in poverty are in families headed by a full-time, year-round worker whose wages are so low that the family is impoverished. This situation is clearly unacceptable and we cannot allow it to continue. We must take affirmative steps to reject Mr. Nixon's veto and move toward fulfilling the commitment made to the American worker almost four decades ago.

NATIONAL CANCER DAY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Judiciary Committee for reporting out my resolution, House Joint Resolution 111 to establish September 8, as National Cancer Day.

Today, cancer is the second leading killer in the United States after heart disease. This year alone there will be

more than 650,000 new cases of cancer diagnosed and more than 350,000 deaths from the disease. The tragic fact is that between 25 and 30 percent of those who will die, could have been saved if their cancer had been diagnosed at an earlier stage.

I hope that the passage of this legislation today serves a two-pronged purpose. First, I hope it signals a national commitment to the eventual eradication of all forms of cancer. The National Cancer Institute published a plan in August calling on the Federal Government to spend \$852 million for cancer research by fiscal year 1978 and \$1.7 billion by fiscal year 1982. This would allow them to employ more than 11,000 researchers to find the causes and cures of the various forms of cancer. For this fiscal year the House recently passed an appropriation of \$522 million for cancer research.

I think the goals set by the National Cancer Institute are reasonable ones and I hope the passage of this resolution signals a congressional intent to expend funding for this worthwhile program.

Second, I hope the passage of this resolution will spur the people of this country to seek cancer preventive check-ups with their doctors. We are told that one person out of four in the United States is likely to contract a form of cancer. More than 1.5 million people have been cured and are now living normal lives, because they sought medical attention before the disease was advanced. I hope the passage of this resolution will bring about a similar effect for thousands more who have the disease and who do not realize it.

OIL AND COAL AND AIR POLLUTION

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that among the many issues facing this country today, few have both the long and short range ramifications that confront us in the growing struggle between meeting our energy requirements which at the same time preserving our environment. One aspect of this problem that grows more acute each day is the effect of all pollution regulations on our power generating utilities.

At a time when crude oil is becoming less plentiful, more and more utilities are being forced by rigid air pollution standards to abandon the use of coal and convert their generators to fuel oil. Both Government and industry are fully aware that this conversion process cannot continue because there is just not enough fuel oil to meet our power generating requirements and all of our other needs.

For this reason, it is essential that better technology be developed that will allow industry to use coal and at the same time meet reasonable air pollution requirements.

So that my colleagues may be better informed about the many facets of this

particular dilemma, I urge them to read the following editorial on this subject that appeared recently in the *Wheeling Intelligencer*, a newspaper in my district:

While debate continues about how best to meet the nation's energy needs, one of the most abundant fuels in the land is finding itself more and more in the role of unwanted stepchild.

Coal received scant attention in President Nixon's recent energy message to Congress. And, even though coal can provide natural gas and fuel oil through gasification and liquefaction techniques, comparatively few dollars have been set aside for research and development of such processes.

Now comes the president of the American Mining Congress, J. Allen Overton, who believes environmentalists and coal interests are on a collision course of a magnitude which could further erode use of coal as a practical fuel. The chief culprit in the impending collision is, in Mr. Overton's eyes, the federal Environmental Protection Agency.

According to Mr. Overton the EPA is demanding standards for which there is no technology. He says such extremism must be removed from the policy-making picture. He pointed out that rules governing sulphur dioxide emissions are seriously harming markets for the coal industry and cited requests to the EPA from the governors of West Virginia, Ohio and Pennsylvania for a two-year variance from the 1975 deadline for meeting emission standards.

While the EPA and environmentalists claim technology does exist for controlling sulphur dioxide emission, a recent invitation to 129 manufacturers to bid on installation of such a system at the Ohio Power Co. Kammer Plant near Moundsville resulted in responses from only three firms, none of which met specifications of the bid. In short, the firms were not prepared to install equipment to meet the emission standards under the specified operating conditions.

Strip mining, which is overhauling underground production as the chief source of coal, also remains a prime target of environmental considerations. Mr. Overton said that despite development of sophisticated land reclamation techniques and advance planning which have reduced land scarring, severe mining restrictions have limited production of strip coal.

Mr. Overton sees approaching a day of decision on the question of community needs for energy versus a theoretical goal of environmental attainment. We hope a more reasonable resolution of the conflict is reached before that day arrives. We need no such confrontation if the energy interests and environmental concerns stop blaming each other for the nation's ills and agree on practical steps to obtain a large measure of the objectives of each.

CRUEL TREATMENT TO EXPATRIATES

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the tragic case of a Romanian-born resident of New York City was recently brought to my attention; it is a fitting example of the cruel treatment given by Communist-bloc nations to expatriates and their families.

Virgil Popescu fled from Romania to the West in 1972, settling in Brooklyn,

N.Y., where he went to work for a mechanical systems firm. His father, Gheorghe Popescu, a Romanian Orthodox priest, had been assassinated by the Communists in 1953, and his brother and sister were, in his words, "subject to all kinds of persecution and deprived of every possibility of higher education."

Since his escape, Popescu has repeatedly petitioned the Romanian Government to allow his wife, a woman of German origin, to join him in the United States. Such appeals have proved futile, however, and Popescu reports that:

She is persecuted and intimidated by the Romanian Secret Police and asked to divorce me. She was forced to leave her job and be without any means of existence.

Because of this treatment, Popescu began a hunger strike on August 19 of this year. He plans to continue the strike until he is assured that his wife may be free to join him. He writes:

My life has no meaning, since an innocent victim, as my wife, is suffering for me. But I will hold the Government of Romania responsible if this action of mine has a fatal end.

Although he is now a resident of this free country of ours, Virgil Popescu ironically finds himself still at the mercy of the Communist government of Romania, which holds his life and happiness in its hands thousands of miles away.

WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there follows the September issue of my Washington News Notes prepared and circulated for the information of my constituency:

CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER'S WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

Safe Streets.—There's reason to believe that the streets of America's cities can be made safer. In fact, progress has already begun. Don Santarelli, a hard-driving young (36) former Federal prosecutor, has been named head of the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which provides funds and expert counsel dealing with street crime. Santarelli was behind the recent anti-crime drive in Washington, D.C. which slashed the rate of serious crime there by 50 percent. Now he is attacking the problem nation-wide.

Hosmer Vitamin Bill.—Even though the Food and Drug Administration has issued its controversial regulations making vitamins and some food supplements hard to get and more costly, Craig Hosmer believes his bill restricting FDA's dictatorial authority may yet prevail. Hosmer's bill would not prevent FDA from policing vitamins or any other food shown to be harmful when taken in excessive amounts. But it would stop FDA from banning vitamins never shown to be injurious in any quantity. Hosmer is much encouraged by copious mail from every state supporting his "freedom of choice" legislation.

East Long Beach Neighborhood Center.—A letter from Mrs. Nancy Henderson offers her thanks for help in getting a \$7,000 HEW grant and help from the city of Long Beach

to finance the summer session at the city's Neighborhood Center. The center provides schooling for Chicano youngsters. Mrs. Henderson, active in getting the center started, visited Washington to enlist Congressman Hosmer's help with the project.

Tax Incentive for Carpools.—Craig Hosmer has introduced a bill to give a tax incentive for the use of carpools. His bill offers deductions for unreimbursed auto operating costs and parking fees. The measure is identical to the present Treasury's practice of allowances based on the business mileage traveled during the tax year by people using their cars for business. "The proposal would not only be an effective fuel conservation measure, but would also greatly reduce air pollution," says Craig.

Annual Duck Stamp Contest.—The Interior Department's Fish and Wildlife Service announces that artists should submit entries in the Department's annual Duck Stamp contest by November 15. The winning design will be reproduced on the 1974-75 Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp. Waterfowl hunters age 16 and above must buy the \$5 stamps annually. Proceeds are used to buy land for national wildlife refuges. Write the Office of Public Affairs, Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240, for the rules for the 1974-75 Duck Stamp Design Contest.

Rally Behind Nixon.—Congressman Craig Hosmer reports that 64 former Republican members of Congress have voiced their confidence in President Nixon's integrity, praised the record of his Administration and agreed the Senate Watergate Committee hearings should be terminated to enable the courts to prosecute the case against the Watergate defendants.

Law of Averages.—Government economists are noted for their reliance on statistics and averages in explaining national economic conditions. Washington bureaucrats now tell the story of the 6 foot 4 inch economist who drowned when he waded into a stream averaging four feet deep.

What You Can Do (Every Litter Bit Hurts Department).—The American Bicentennial Commission's Johnny Horizon '76 program designates September 15 to October 15 as National Clean Up American Month. Schools, businesses, civic and youth groups and government agencies are urged to sponsor and participate in community cleanup campaigns, beautification projects and related activities to help beautify America for her 200th birthday. For information and materials, write to Johnny Horizon '76 Program Office, Washington, D.C. 20240.

PRODUCTIVITY PROJECT IN NASSAU COUNTY, N.Y.

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, it would be appreciated if the following excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Vincent J. Macri, project director, Nassau County multimunicipal productivity project, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, June 20, 1973, would be inserted in the RECORD:

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY

I am the Project Director of a multi-municipal productivity project in a county with a population of 1.5 million persons, including the largest town in the United States with a population of over 800,000. We understand that this Hearing has to do with the authorization of an appropriation to extend the life of the National Commission on Productivity.

The Productivity Project in our County involves four municipalities, approximately 30,000 civil servants, and a combined annual payroll for this work force in excess of \$280 million. The project is a research and development effort to improve the productivity of municipal service through the collective bargaining process.

It is a multi-municipal project to improve productivity, not a single municipal enterprise. It is a joint and fully collaborative labor and management effort.

The Project involves three programs all relating to the improvement of productivity among the 30,000 member work force. The three programs are as follows: The first has to do with productivity improvement, labor-management relations and productivity bargaining. The second is a survey program designed to obtain the opinions and attitudes of employees who are directly delivering "front-line" municipal services to the public. The survey will provide for full involvement in the project by all employees and will also provide valid problem identification since data will be drawn from all levels of the work force. The third is a personnel survey program to obtain baseline data on the existing work force structure, including the kinds of jobs, titles and rates of pay within each municipality.

It has a deliberate program of action which includes an attempt to effect productivity improvements in four to eight micro study units within County and Town governmental departments.

At the end of calendar year '74, contracts with all the municipal employees in the four municipalities will expire. Accordingly, negotiations for approximately 30,000 union members will commence on or about September of 1974. The project intends to develop by early 1974 a decentralized approach to productivity improvements. This means that we hope to have stimulated enough interest in the departments of Town and County government to effect productivity improvements among approximately all 30,000 civil servants.

MASS TRANSIT

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, in testimony before the Urban Mass Transportation Subcommittee on July 31 of this year Mayor Pete Wilson of San Diego, Calif. made a convincing case on the need for Federal operating assistance to the Nation's mass transit systems.

If we as a nation are ever to cope effectively with the problems of pollution, congestion, land use, and the energy crisis, the Federal Government must assume a partnership role with the States and localities in working for convenient, cheap, and attractive mass transit.

I commend Mayor Wilson's fine testimony to the attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE PETE WILSON

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is Pete Wilson. I am the Mayor of San Diego, California, and I am speaking here today on behalf of the National League of Cities and the United States Conference of Mayors. I am a member of the United States Conference of Mayors Community Development Committee. I am also a member of the Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality and chairman of the

League of California Cities Committee on Land Use and Environmental Quality.

The National League of Cities consists of, and is a national spokesman for, approximately 15,000 municipal governments in all fifty states and Puerto Rico. The United States Conference of Mayors includes virtually all cities with a population in excess of 30,000. Member cities are represented by their elected chief executives—the Mayors.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before the House Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Urban Mass Transportation to present our views on the impact upon the nation's cities both of the Environmental Protection Agency's air pollution control strategies and of the energy shortage.

When Congress passed the Clean Air Act of 1970, it mandated that each state adopt and submit to EPA "a plan which provides for implementation, maintenance, and enforcement (of air quality standards) in each air quality control region (or portion thereof) within such state." The implementation plans were required to include controls on stationary and mobile sources of air pollution. Where such stationary source controls are inadequate to insure attainment or maintenance of the requisite air quality standard, the implementation plan is to include land use and transportation controls. EPA has determined, with major prodding from the courts, that land use and transportation controls are necessary, and that many of the proposed state implementation plans are inadequate.

EPA, therefore, has promulgated two sets of regulations. The first requires the control of "complex sources" facilities, the access to which is exclusively or primarily by automobile and which therefore generate automobile traffic. The second set of regulations would directly and severely restrict the use of the automobile and substitute mass transit as the alternative.

We do not quarrel with the objectives of the EPA's actions. To the contrary, we are heartily in support of the goal.

But we cannot help but be concerned about the substantial procedural and practical problems we will face in meeting their stringent requirements. We are concerned about the economic and social consequences of these requirements—consequences the Environmental Protection Agency acknowledges are unknown.

The hoped for effect of the proposed transportation control plans will be an immediate reduction in the use of the automobile in the nation's cities, accompanied by a marked improvement in air quality. Mass transit is expected to provide the alternative to the automobile. If that expectation is to be more than a pious hope, we dare not fail to recognize that its achievement will require far greater infusions of dollars than at present. The necessity for massive Federal support for urban mass public transportation systems—for both capital and operating expenses—is the natural and direct consequence of these regulations.

It is almost impossible to offer an accurate estimate of how much additional assistance will be necessary. We do know that mass transit in this country is now subsidized by more than \$500 million annually from local and state sources. It is obvious that forcing cities to provide significantly expanded transit service, particularly in the peak hours, must escalate the need for operating assistance. Local transit systems are faced with overwhelming deficits and the prospect of increased fares and decreased ridership. We cannot continue to bear this burden alone. Federal operating assistance will be necessary to achieve the EPA goal of substituting the bus for the auto as the vehicle of the commuter.

As you are well aware, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration is faced with a backlog of pending capital grant applica-

tions which seek approximately \$4.5 billion apart from the Clean Air Act requirements. This Committee has made positive efforts in support of mass transit. We strongly urge that as you consider the level of contract authority of UMTA, you assure adequate funds to meet not only existing demands but also the additional costs required to implement the Clean Air Act.

Cities will be forced to undertake a number of steps to promote car pooling, eliminate or reduce the available parking, and substantially increase mass transit ridership. They will have to plan and implement exclusive bus lanes, significantly increase TOPICS-type programs for control of traffic and other such costly and long-term measures. While the cities have long supported such measures, they also recognize the necessity of weighing the impact in social and economic terms.

The City of San Diego is committed to meet air standards essential to the maintenance of a high quality of life for our people.

During the past year the quality of air in this region showed improvement. Continuation of this trend is anticipated as a result of: a vigorous fixed-source enforcement program administered by the County Director of Public Health, the increased number of vehicles equipped with smog control devices, and the first impact of the increased utilization of the City-owned buses which serve the metropolitan area, consisting of seven cities and part of the county. Although these accomplishments are significant, they are not enough to achieve and maintain the prescribed national air quality standards for this region.

San Diego is not only willing but eager to pursue ways to further expand and improve public transit service—both the present bus service provided by the City-owned San Diego Transit Corporation and any new modes to be provided by yet-to-be-created operating entities. Our concern is that the EPA regulations—while providing moral authority and an administrative imperative for expanded public transit—do not, of course, provide the massive increase in financial assistance that will be inescapably required to actually achieve the expansion of public transit service which the regulations mandate.

Further, the City of San Diego cannot help but be alarmed by the seeming land use implications of the EPA "complex source" regulations which would impose controls upon facilities to which public access is exclusively or primarily by means of private automobiles, and by the parking restrictions. This City has adopted and implemented strong land use policies to curb costly urban sprawl and to encourage instead the development of a more compact city with a revitalized downtown. We have counted very carefully the tax, economic, environmental and social consequences of failing to check sprawl on the fringes of the City and decay at its core.

So, although we are committed to meet essential clean air standards, we frankly are not willing to reverse the significant progress we have achieved in curbing sprawl and revitalizing our downtown.

Particularly when to permit sprawl is to cause long trips between home and work and increased auto emissions as a consequence.

EPA proposals to reduce existing public parking and halt new private parking facilities preclude the City's partly implemented plans to reduce vehicle miles of travel. These plans encourage redevelopment of the urban core and discourage continued, disorderly urban sprawl with its attendant transportation problems that have been so characteristic of the Los Angeles area. The EPA proposals are counter to the City's plans to change this trend. As a viable alternative to continued urban sprawl, redevelopment of the urban core as a self-contained compact area for living, working, shopping, recreational,

cultural and educational activities would provide residents with a complete community requiring much less reliance upon the automobile. Nevertheless, these core residents should be entitled to their pro rata share of the automobile travel still permitted under the reduction imposed by EPA.

And in order to achieve the mix of land use—the diversity in texture and experience—for which we are striving in our new downtown redevelopment project, we are advised that financing for the hotel and retail elements—now, prior to achieving that expanded level of public transit service which EPA demands—is dependent on the availability of parking. We must recognize, as we seek to replace automobile travel with public transit, that until we have developed public transit into a realistic alternative, core residents and visitors will continue for a time to be dependent on the automobile; and until then, some accommodation of the automobile must continue.

Similarly, in the City's efforts to increase bus ridership, it is very likely that satellite parking lots will have to be developed for commuters utilizing bus service. Imposing uniform parking limitations as proposed by EPA is inconsistent with overall clean air implementation efforts. Parking controls should be left with the City of San Diego to carry out its broad plans to improve the total environment.

Transportation services to a developing downtown may be provided in levels, each of which is associated with increasingly higher densities of development. The first level is short range and must include private autos and on-site parking, but transit, and existing streets. The second level is intermediate range and involves increased bus usage, fringe parking and shuttle service. The third level involves heavy investment in mass transit systems that can substitute for the transportation service provided by the private automobile.

We in San Diego have recognized the importance of mass transit. Our City-owned San Diego Transit Corporation has a fleet of 250 buses. For several years we have subsidized transit from a 10¢ levy on the property tax, raising about \$1 million annually.

When the State of California enacted a subsidy for transit, instead of repealing or lowering our tax, we reduced the fare to 24¢. Since then, we have experienced a significant increase in ridership, an increase of more than 72% since June 1972. We now have 2¼ million trips per month. We in San Diego have made a positive commitment to transit. UMTA Administrator Herringer has called our system "one of transportation's success stories." Other cities, like Atlanta and Seattle, have done the same, with similar successful results.

Despite this dramatic gain in ridership, and despite a hopefully growing realization on the part of the American public that their use of the automobile will have to be altered radically, the EPA has concluded that "without substantial disincentives to the use of the automobile, there are no assurances that a transit system can be designed which would induce people to shift to transit." Accordingly, they have proposed the following incentives and disincentives for San Diego to discourage or reduce use of the automobile and shift people onto our public transit system.

Restriction of gasoline consumption by restricting supplies to retailers; (i.e., rationing)

Establishment of a bus and car pool computer matching system;

Reservation of exclusive bus and car pool lanes;

Required inspection and maintenance;

Tight restriction on the use of motorcycles;

Prohibition of new private parking and reduction of existing public parking capacity

of 20 per cent;

Retrofitting of cars with catalytic devices.

These standards for San Diego would require a reduction in vehicle miles of travel by 45%. Mass transit, says EPA, would be expected to carry "the bulk of the travel displaced" from automobiles, with the increased demand primarily at the peak hours. To accommodate this increased peak load demand we anticipate that we will have to increase our bus fleet from the 250 we presently own to 1,500 buses. We estimate this will cost \$62,500,000 and will take four years, assuming production and delivery of 300 per year.

A fleet of this size would further necessitate construction of four or five additional bus storage and maintenance facilities to handle this expanded fleet. We would have to hire 2,400 additional personnel at a cost of \$40 million.

Our operating deficit would soar. We will need an additional \$35 million in annual operating support funds. We would have excess bus and driver capacity during off-peak hours. We would be hard-pressed to expand our maintenance and replacement program to service a bus fleet of the size required.

We can also anticipate that we would bear some or all of the costs of many of these requirements, particularly in identifying and marking bus lanes and other TOPICS-type transportation improvements. In many cities, parking garages have been used to provide the local share in urban renewal projects, and revenues from parking meters and municipal garages are pledged against bonds or else are major sources of municipal revenues.

The effect of these transportation control plans is that local governments, already hard-pressed by transit money problems, will be still harder-pressed by Federal requirements made with little notion of the cost of such a program, or of the practical problems of meeting these requirements.

Last Friday, July 27, Acting EPA Director Robert W. Fri criticized his agency's "plan" for San Diego (as the agency has previously criticized the Clean Air Act standards) as being harsh and unrealistic in its requirement of a 45 percent reduction in private automobile use by 1977. Director Fri concluded that the 45 percent reduction required to meet the Clean Air Act standard "is likely to require unreasonable changes in the present life style . . . and could result in the paralysis of the entire urban area."

What is possible for San Diego by 1977, Fri said, is a 20 percent reduction in auto use and an extension of the deadline to meet the standards.

"Even to achieve the 20 percent reduction, transit planners and bus builders need to get hopping now," according to Mr. Fri.

That, of course, is putting it mildly. And—grateful as I am for this substantial relief and realism—still I am compelled to ask where I may expect to find funding to achieve a 20 percent reduction.

Clearly, EPA has not estimated the costs or identified the sources of funds to pay for the direct and indirect costs of their proposals. In spite of the recognized urgency in cleaning up the air, it will not be possible to undertake these programs without new funding sources. The proposals allude to potential assistance from the Department of Transportation in financing the acquisition of equipment. But operating costs of new bus service will far exceed the revenue from fares, and will require federal subsidy which has heretofore been reserved for capital acquisitions.

An expanded air quality monitoring program will be necessary to ascertain air quality changes as a result of transportation mode shifts and other control measures. Such monitoring will require expensive equipment and technical personnel.

In short, the Federal Government—notably, the will of Congress as interpreted by the Federal Court and transmitted by EPA—would impose great burdens upon the City

of San Diego and other cities throughout the nation, without our having been involved in developing these programs and without our having been consulted about their implementation until two weeks ago. It is true that under the Clean Air Act, the State is required to hold public hearings prior to submitting an implementation plan to EPA. But there is no requirement for coordinating with local general land use planning agencies, nor is there any requirement for coordinating and consulting with local transportation planning agencies on the transportation control elements of the implementation plan. There is no requirement, but there should be.

And in order to avoid fragmented implementation proposals and cumbersome layers of multi-jurisdictional review, it is strongly suggested that EPA and the State leave to the local governmental jurisdictions within an air basin the manner in which established air quality standards will be achieved and maintained. The local governments would be compelled to develop plans for State approval, which ultimately would require EPA approval. Of particular importance is the need for quantitative standards of clean air tolerances which can be translated by local jurisdictions in terms of urban growth, in a context of both a permissible rate and location within the air basin.

The EPA proposal looks to the State to identify agencies that have regional air quality responsibility. In San Diego that agency is the San Diego Air Pollution Control District whose Board of Directors is the County Board of Supervisors. Since clean air is a regional problem involving all the jurisdictions within the air basin, the policy-making directorate of the agency should be expanded to be representative of all cities in the County (plus ad hoc representation from the City of Tijuana). With this representation, it would be possible to consider matters in relation to all social, economic, and total environmental considerations rather than on the basis of the single element "clean air."

The air basin in the San Diego region comprises the western urbanized two-thirds of San Diego County and a portion of the northern tip of Baja California which includes one of the fastest growing cities in this hemisphere, Tijuana. Its estimated 600,000 inhabitants represent one-third of all the people in this basin. Mexican officials estimate a population of 800,000 by 1980. Any plan for this region must extend an invitation to Mexico to participate in a meaningful way. San Diego and Tijuana constitute an international metropolis. To commence understanding and the development of solutions to mutual problems and opportunities requires establishment of working relationships international in scope. The first step toward such a pact is being pursued with the San Diego Congressional Delegation. The EPA proposal did not discuss the sharing of our air basin with our neighbors south of the border, which we judge imperative if a meaningful plan is to be developed.

Another consequence of EPA's transportation strategies will be increased demand for fuel to run extra transit vehicles. The present fuel crisis can be expected to worsen, despite a lessening of demand for gasoline as people switch to public transit. Transit operating costs will rise as fuel prices continue to climb. We estimate that fuel costs for our bus fleet will go from \$300,000 to \$1,485,000.

The nation is confronted with the fact of a fuel shortage, whatever the causes. Cities and their transit authorities have been refused bids on diesel fuel contracts, have had deliveries curtailed or cut-off and have had to enter contracts at dramatic increases in price. Some cities have been unable to contract for an assured supply, quality, or price for their fuel needs. The irony of the situation is that mass transit is faced with a crisis situation already, yet cities are now

being called upon to provide additional alternatives to the automobile.

Public transportation is a much more efficient utilization of energy. Each conventional passenger bus can carry enough passengers to replace twenty or more automobiles. According to a recent report of the National Science Foundation (NSF), transportation energy efficiency declined by 4.3% from 1950 to 1970, while total passenger miles increased by 154%. These two factors resulted in an increased energy consumption of 166% since 1950. One of the key factors is the reliance on the automobile—which next to the airplane is the most inefficient user of energy. The NSF has reported the following statistics regarding energy consumption of transportation modes.

	Passenger-miles per gallon	Btu's per passenger mile
Buses.....	125	1,090
Railroads.....	80	1,700
Automobiles.....	32	4,250
Airplanes.....	14	9,700

The American Transit Association has estimated that a 24% diversion from passenger cars to mass transit could reduce petroleum demands by almost one-half million barrels daily.

Mass transit and cities cannot afford to "share the shortage" of energy supplies. Trains running at half-speed or buses with air conditioning turned off to conserve energy will not attract ridership. Mass transit, an essential public service, must be assured an adequate supply of fuel at reasonable prices. The uncertainty cities face over the availability and price of fuel not only disrupts a city's budgetary process, but also increases overall costs which must be borne by the local taxpayer, either in higher taxes, reduced services, or both.

Submitted for inclusion in the Record is a summary of the municipal fuel crisis and the energy policy positions of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

In conclusion, let me offer a personal observation which I hope will be relevant. Were the sole impetus to move to expanded public mass transit the need to clean our air, I would reject the EPA proposals.

Not because I do not assign high priority to air quality, but because the standard of the Clean Air Act can and should be satisfied otherwise. We should require U.S. auto makers to make a small, 4 cylinder car that meets the emission requirements of the Act. If foreign producers can, so can ours. Perhaps Congress should place a significant tax upon cars having engines with more than 4 cylinders. In addition to having a salutary effect upon the air, it might have as well a salutary effect upon fuel consumption and the energy crisis, and upon the balance of payments problem and long term employment for American auto workers.

But the need to move aggressively toward expanded and better public transit arises from the need to regulate land use, and to devote less precious urban land to accommodation of the automobile.

It arises as well from the need to improve upon the automobile as transportation in terms of safety and cost—and eventually convenience. It arises from the need to improve public transit for those who have no other means of transportation.

These needs are very great. They suggest to me that in the future, we need to think of public transit as a public utility, and that we need to devote taxes to it as we do to sewer and water and school systems... even to highway systems. How much have we subsidized the automobile by building the streets and highways on which it runs?

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Com-

mittee, let me express the gratitude of the National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors as well as my personal thanks for this opportunity to appear before this distinguished body. Your leadership in bringing the attention of the nation to the needs of mass transit is well-known by the mayors of the nation's cities.

Thank you for your courtesy and attention.

MILK FOR CHILDREN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as millions of our Nation's children return to school after the traditional summer recess, they face the very real possibility of not having milk served with their lunches or during the course of the school day. The administration's proposal to sharply curtail expenditures for milk in the national school lunch program and the special milk program should be seriously reconsidered in light of the hard, cold economic realities of 1973.

An editorial in the New York Times for September 1, 1973, conveys my feelings on the need to act immediately, and responsibly to ensure adequate funds to provide subsidized milk programs where they are most needed. The editorial follows:

MILK FOR CHILDREN

When schools open across the country this week, more than forty million children will find no milk on their lunch trays, unless local communities or their parents pick up the tab. The Federal subsidy, which amounted to \$95 million last year has for the moment been wiped out—a victim of President Nixon's budget-slashing and of an unresolved conflict between the Senate and the House.

The President's budget requested only \$25 million for the milk program, a \$70 million reduction and just enough to provide milk for the approximately six million children in schools without lunch programs. While the House went along with the President's cutback, the Senate called for an expenditure of \$97 million. Until House-Senate conferees, arrive at a compromise, there will be no subsidized milk for school lunches. In schools that have no lunch programs, the Agriculture Department will continue to provide children with milk by using leftover funds for day-care centers and camps.

The lapse in the general school milk subsidy comes at the worst possible time—when the price of milk and most other food has risen to record levels. Many children will be getting less milk at home because of the squeeze on family budgets, thus making its availability in school doubly important to their over-all nutrition.

To make matters worse, there is also the threat of a serious shortfall in the amount of Government-donated food available for the school lunch program. Many former surplus items are now on the scarcity list. In addition, some food companies, which had been eager to get the schools' lunch business when supply exceeded demand, are now delaying acceptance of local school board contracts in the expectation of getting more lucrative customers later on.

Contrary to the self-congratulatory folklore of America as a child-centered society, Congress shows no sense of urgency about preventing children from becoming victims of the adult world's preoccupation with

profits and budget-cutting. The conferees have acted irresponsibly in delaying action beyond the opening of school.

THE NEW SOCIAL SERVICES REGULATIONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has released a revised set of regulations for the social services program. The regulations, which will appear in the Federal Register next week, are scheduled to take effect on November 1.

Because of extensive public interest in this issue, I am inserting an outline of the new regulations in the RECORD.

[Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service (45 CFR Part 221)]

SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR FAMILIES AND CHILDREN AND FOR AGED, BLIND, OR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS: TITLES I, IV, (PART A), X, XIV, AND XVI OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING

Notice is hereby given that the regulations set forth in tentative form below are proposed by the Administrator, Social and Rehabilitation Service, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Notice of proposed rulemaking was published in the *Federal Register* on February 16, 1973 (38 FR 4608).

Final regulations responsive to comments received were published in the *Federal Register* on May 1, 1973 (38 FR 10782), with an effective date of July 1, 1973. An amendment clarifying several provisions was published on June 1, 1973 (38 FR 14375).

Public Law 93-66 signed by the President on July 9, 1973, postponed the effective date until November 1, 1973. Notice of this postponement was published in the *Federal Register* on July 25, 1973 (38 FR 19911).

The new proposals would amend the regulations published on May 1, 1973 and June 1, 1973 to:

1. Require States to establish, under the adult services program, a plan for deinstitutionalization and prevention of institutionalization of individuals through the provision of defined services; (§ 221.5(a)).

2. Broaden the coverage of potential recipients, consistent with the deduction for work-related expenses enjoyed by recipients, by defining the income limit as \$60 plus 150% (233% in relation to day care) of the payment standard (previously \$30) (§ 221.6(a)(3)(1)).

3. Permit an additional income disregard for the mentally retarded, with the amount to be established by each State; (§ 221.6(a)(3)(iii)).

4. Broaden the coverage (for family planning services) to include any female of child-bearing age who meets financial eligibility requirements; (§ 221.6(a)(3)(vii)).

5. Allow 6 months (instead of 3) from the effective date of the final regulations for redetermination of eligibility of all current recipients of services; (§ 221.7(b)).

6. Remove the cumbersome aspects of the assets test for determination of potential recipients, although States must continue to consider available resources in determining whether families and individuals are likely to become applicants for or recipients of financial assistance within 6 months;

7. Add the goal of strengthening family life, (§ 221.8(a)(3)), under which States may

provide family planning services; and other services including day care, to prevent child abuse and neglect (§ 221.9(b)(3)).

8. Expand the definition of health-related services to encompass those necessary to a program of active treatment for alcoholics and drug addicts; (§ 221.9(b)(9)).

9. Expand the definition of legal services to include those required to establish paternity of children born out of wedlock, obtain child support payments, and legally adopt a child; (§ 221.9(b)(14)).

10. Add a new defined service, Special services for the mentally retarded; (§ 221.9(b)(19)).

11. Provide Federal financial participation for appropriate medical services necessary for active treatment of drug addicts and alcoholics, together with medical treatment required for services to the mentally retarded, provided that any other public and private sources are utilized first. (§ 221.53(1)).

12. Incorporate new statutory language concerning Federal sharing in services to children in foster care. (§ 221.55(d)(5)).

The proposed regulations do not affect current provisions in Part 220 applicable to the work incentive program (WIN) and to child welfare services (CWS). Amendments to those portions of Part 220 will be published separately.

Prior to the adoption of the proposed regulations, consideration will be given to any comments, suggestions, or objections thereto which are received in writing by the Administrator, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 330 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201, within a period of 30 days from date of publication of the Notice in the *Federal Register*. Comments received will be available for public inspection in Room 5224 of the Department's offices at 330 C Street S.W., Washington, D.C., on Monday through Friday of each week from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (area code 202-962-4451).

Authority: Sec. 1102, 49 Stat. 647 (42 U.S.C. 1302). (Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 13754, Public Assistance—Social Services).

Dated, September 5, 1973.

MURDER BY HANDGUN: A CASE FOR GUN CONTROL—NO. 15

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the 15th victim in our gun control series was a 4-year-old child who was sitting in his baby carriage. When an irate motorist returned to an ongoing traffic dispute, he brought a pistol with him. He fired the gun into the ground—twice. He fired the gun again until it was empty. One shot struck an off-duty policeman in the chest; he is seriously wounded. A teenager was shot in the foot; his condition is excellent. But 4-year-old William Johnson died in Sydenham Hospital from a bullet through his head. Victim and killer were completely unknown to each other and only an accident of location resulted in death. It was because it is legal for anyone to own a handgun that an irrational argument became a murder.

Gun control laws are too late for Billy Johnson. What irrational instinct is preventing us from saving the future Billy Johnsons from similar fates?

Just as sure as you are reading this article, another 4-year-old child will die a senseless and brutal death unless we have gun control.

Reprinted below is the article which appeared in the New York Times of September 5, 1973:

BOY, 4, SLAIN AND TWO HURT IN HARLEM TRAFFIC DISPUTE

(By Frank J. Priol)

A 4-year-old boy was shot to death and a 17-year-old youth and an off-duty policeman were wounded yesterday in Harlem when, the police said, a motorist fired into a group of people who had sided with another driver in a traffic dispute.

The child, William Johnson Jr., was struck in the head by one bullet and died soon afterward at Sydenham Hospital. The youth, Clyde King, who was struck in the foot, was reported in good condition at Harlem Hospital.

The off-duty policeman, Officer Earl Robinson, 28, had been chatting with a friend on a stoop a block away when he heard the shots. As he ran toward the scene, the gunman fired two shots into the ground, then one at Officer Robinson, who was struck in the chest.

People in the crowd were beating the suspect when other policemen arrived and took him into custody.

He was identified as Robert Mayfield, 37, of 1385 Fifth Avenue, near 115th Street. The police said he was taken to Knickerbocker Hospital with severe lacerations of the face and body.

Police spokesmen and witnesses gave this account of the afternoon's events:

Mr. Mayfield, who was driving a customized gold Cadillac, stopped for a red light at 127th Street and Convent Avenue at about 2:50 P.M. A driver of a "gypsy" cab, identified as Alvin Carr of 376 West 127th Street, who was behind Mr. Mayfield at the light, began honking his horn. Words were exchanged and the two men jumped from their cars.

FAMILY ENTERS DISPUTE

A passenger in Mr. Mayfield's car, Miss Lavinia Little, 31, of the same Fifth Avenue address, jumped out of the passenger side brandishing a wrench, according to the police. When some of those in the crowd that had assembled wrested the wrench from her, Mr. Mayfield picked up part of a wooden sawhorse being used in street construction and, according to witnesses attacked Mr. Carr with it.

At that point, the crowd began to threaten Mr. Mayfield. The incident took place almost in front of Mr. Carr's residence, and the crowd, which included members of his family, sided with him.

Mr. Mayfield, according to the police, slipped away, but returned minutes later, they said, with a .38-caliber pistol and began firing at the group in front of No. 376, which was still discussing the incident.

The group included Mr. Carr, the cab driver; the King youth, who is his cousin, and William and Yvonne Johnson and their son, William, who was sitting in a stroller, drinking a baby bottle filled with apple juice.

After emptying his gun, Mr. Mayfield fled north on Convent Avenue pursued by Officer Robinson. After shooting him, the police said, Mr. Mayfield was again set upon by the crowd.

Police Officer George Hohenstein, one of many policemen who converged on the scene in response to calls from neighbors, attempted to protect Mr. Mayfield from the outraged crowd. He said they were beating him with tire irons and that one woman was slashing him with a straight razor. He described Mr. Mayfield as 6 feet 1 inch tall and weighing about 270 pounds.

WEDGED INTO CREVICE

Officer Hohenstein said he had wedged Mr. Mayfield into a crevice in a building until other policemen came to his assistance.

The police were still talking to William Johnson when his wife came running up the street. She had gone to the hospital with their son and was there when he was pronounced dead. She was screaming: "Junior's gone, Junior's dead." Her husband burst into tears.

Later, as the police were starting to leave, Mr. Johnson burst from the entrance to No. 376 crying: "Get an ambulance. My mother's had a heart attack."

The police ran up to the fourth floor and carried Mr. Johnson's mother, Gladys Johnson, out. She was taken to Sydenham Hospital. Her condition was not immediately determined.

Mr. Mayfield's fusillade, the police said, also struck a stray black-and-white cat. An hour after the shootings, while the police were still questioning witnesses, the cat was still lying by the building, barely breathing. It later died.

Officer Robinson was taken to St. Luke's Hospital, where his condition last night was listed as "serious but stable." Later, the Police Department said that one bullet had been fired from Officer Robinson's service revolver, but that the policeman had no recollection of when he had fired the gun.

Police Commissioner Donald F. Cawley visited Officer Robinson at St. Luke's Hospital and praised him for a "fine, outstanding job." He reported that the bullet that entered the officer's chest had "veered toward his shoulder" and that the wound was not as serious as it was first thought to be.

Commissioner Cawley said the shooting yesterday was another indication that there were "too many hand guns" available to the public.

SOME POINTED QUESTIONS FOR KISSINGER HEARINGS—PART II

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 30, 1973, I reintroduced the Bricker amendment, a constitutional amendment which would prevent treaties and other international agreements from overriding the U.S. Constitution and would limit the use of Executive agreements in conducting foreign policy.

Proponents of the Bricker amendment in 1953 felt that the United States was involving itself in so many foreign commitments that some sort of clear-cut constitutional provision was needed to limit the President's power in this area. That this problem is still with us today is demonstrated by our foreign policy with the U.S.S.R. in 1972 exemplified by the declaration signed by the two countries at that time.

Especially pertinent is the definition of the concept of peaceful coexistence as viewed by Mr. Kissinger and the Soviet Union. Also, it should be ascertained from Mr. Kissinger just how binding is the declaration on the United States. These two points should be clarified both for the American people and the Soviet Union at the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the confirmation of Mr. Kissinger as Secretary of State.

Many Soviet experts, commenting on the documents signed during the 1972 summit meeting in Moscow, claim that they legitimize, so to speak, the Soviet concept of peaceful coexistence as an international law principle. G. A. Arbatov, for instance, Director of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.A., in an article entitled "An Event of Great International Importance," said:

One is tempted to begin with the document "Fundamental principles of mutual relations between the USSR and the USA." This sizeable document, full of profound implications, in fact formulates international-legal principles regulating relations between the two states. The first place among them is occupied by the principle of peaceful coexistence of states belonging to different social systems.¹

Arbatov's assumption is questionable, to say the least, since even the U.N. has refused to identify peaceful coexistence with general international law principles concerning friendly relations and cooperation among states.

Even more disturbing is the Soviet assertion that the declaration signed by both President Nixon and CPSU Secretary General Brezhnev, belongs to the category of executive agreements concluded on the basis and in conformity with the constitutional powers of the President. The review "U.S.A.—Economics, Politics and Ideology," June 1973, organ of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.A., published an exhaustive study of the executive agreement which makes certain challenging conclusions about the meaning of the Moscow declaration.²

The writer quotes extensively from Supreme Court decisions, statements by Government sources, and legal literature and claims that legal force and permanence of executive agreements equals that of international treaties ratified by the Senate. He makes a distinction between two aspects of the problem: external—or international—which deals with the status of executive agreements in international law, and internal—or domestic—dealing with their status within the American domestic legal system. His reading of American sources leads him to assert that treaties subject to ratification and executive agreements enjoy identical status and the same legal validity in international law. As for the force of the executive agreement in domestic legal system, the author concludes that executive agreements are the "law of the land."

The official Soviet position, therefore, is that the declaration of the basic principles concerning mutual relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, based on peaceful coexistence, is an executive agreement binding not only under international law, but also internally as part of the law of the land.

In this context it is important to recall

¹ G. A. Arbatov, "An Event of Great International Importance," *SShA-Economics, Politics and Ideology*, No. 8, August, 1972, pp. 3-4.

² A. M. Belonogov, "Executive Agreement as a Form of International Obligations of the United States," *ibidem*, June 1973, pp. 8-19. He has also written "Specifics of Treaty Ratification in the USA," July 1973 issue of the review *Soviet State and Law*.

that the Soviet interpretation of peaceful coexistence—a concept in fact originating in the Soviet Union—differs greatly from our understanding of what constitutes friendly relations among states. A staple Soviet definition of this concept includes the following points:

Peaceful coexistence is a specific form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism in the international arena... The policy of peaceful coexistence which is carried out by socialist countries represents a powerful factor hastening the global revolutionary process... Peaceful coexistence does not exclude revolutions in the form of armed uprisings and just national liberation wars against imperialist oppression which takes place within the framework of the capitalist system.³

The blanket identification of peaceful coexistence as a principle of friendly relations among states has caused considerable skepticism in Europe. The well-known sociologist and writer, Raymond Aaron, in a recent article for the *Paris daily Le Figaro*, August 1, entitled "When the Capitalists Subsidize the Soviet Union" says in summary:

He barely can understand why for political reasons Mr. Kissinger supports massive American involvement in the Soviet economy. If Dr. Kissinger imagines that by attaching the USSR to the USA by ties of mutual economic dependence peace and Soviet good will will be guaranteed—he is a victim of an illusion which he many times denounced when he was just a professor.

Implications of détente based on the Soviet concept of peaceful coexistence have not altogether escaped public attention in the American press also. A recent editorial in the *New York Times* warns the Secretary of State "to take a fresh look at his conception of détente with the Soviet Union."

Inserted at this point is the above-mentioned editorial from the *New York Times* of August 27 and the text of House Joint Resolution 584, popularly known as the Bricker amendment:

QUESTIONS ON DÉTENTE

In his new post as Secretary of State, Henry A. Kissinger may find it necessary to take a fresh look at his conception of détente with the Soviet Union. It envisions that increasing relations between American and Soviet citizens will build mutual trust, with benefits for both countries. From Moscow's point of view, the anticipated fruits of détente include massive transfers of American capital and technological know-how to speed up Soviet development and—inevitably—the growth of Soviet power.

The Kissinger conception has now been fundamentally challenged from a startling source. Academician Andrei D. Sakharov, who invented the Soviet hydrogen bomb in the early nineteen-fifties and who more recently has become an outspoken advocate of Soviet civil liberties, attacks the Kissinger thesis at its weakest point—its failure to insist that détente move the Soviet dictatorship toward greater democracy and responsiveness to public opinion. In effect, this eminent Soviet dissenter asks Americans to ponder the possibility that, after they have helped strengthen the Soviet Union, they will find the Kremlin rulers of the nineteen-eighties more dedicated to world domination than even their authoritarian predecessors. Sakharov's warning is that détente

³ *Philosophical Encyclopedia* (in Russian), III, 452-454.

without Soviet democracy could be suicidal for world freedom.

Point was added to this somber notice by two reminders last week of how much repressiveness is still standard in Moscow. The disgraceful treatment accorded the Israeli team at the World University Games there and the open violence directed against Soviet Jews who wished to cheer the Israelis provided one shock. Equally disconcerting was the brutal decision of Soviet bureaucrats to deny Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn permission to live in Moscow where his wife and two sons are legal residents. As Solzhenitsyn rightly points out, this decision and the law on which it is based derive from the implicit assumption that the Soviet people are serfs of a state which really owns them.

Progress toward détente is threatened by the anxieties such developments arouse on whether the Soviet Union ever intends to become a genuinely open society.

H.J. RES. 584

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to force and effect of treaties

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which denies or abridges any right enumerated in this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

"SEC. 3. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

"SEC. 4. All executive or other agreements, between the President or any international organization, foreign power, or official thereof shall be made only in the manner and to the extent to be prescribed by law. Such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties, or the making of treaties, by this article.

"SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

SIX WINNING ESSAYS ON WATERGATE BY STUDENTS FROM ROCHESTER, MICH.

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, considerable public interest and comment has been generated by the on-going revelations concerning the burglary and wire-

tapping of the Democratic National Committee and the subsequent allegations that high Government officials sought to cover up the extent of the wrongdoing involved.

Recently, Council 5452 of the Knights of Columbus in Rochester, Mich., which is a part of the 12th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in the House, conducted an essay contest among senior and junior high school students to determine their views on this issue of such grave national importance.

The subject of the essay contest was "The Watergate Affair—Morality or Politics," and the contest was open to students of Adams Senior High School, Rochester Senior High School, Central Junior High School, and West Junior High School, all of Rochester, Mich.

I would like to share with my colleagues the six winning essays—three by senior high school students and three by junior high school students—because they reflect deep sensitivity to high ethical standards.

I congratulate these young people for the thoughtful preparation that went into these essays, and I commend Council 5452 of the Knights of Columbus for the public service it has rendered by encouraging these students to focus on the moral and ethical issues involved in the Watergate scandal.

First prize, senior high school students—Douglas Strayer, age 17, of 554 Old Perch Road, Rochester, Mich.:

WATERGATE—MORALITY OR POLITICS

(By Douglas Strayer)

Through the course of political history, never has there been an executive scandal with such far reaching implications and effects as the Watergate affair. The Teapot Dome Scandal of the Harding administration appears to be meager child's play when matched against the Watergate.

It was due to America's free press that a scandal of such high degree was brought into full light despite attempts by the White House to cover up the issue. American people supporting the President claim that incidents such as the Watergate occur all the time in politics and that bribery and corruption are facets of both political parties. They say that it happened to be the Republicans who were caught. However, to this writer, it seems that underhanded dealings such as Watergate and the magnitude of corruption it implies can't be shrugged off as political procedure. No matter what the political party, when there are charges of espionage, theft, and sabotage, the realm of politics ends and morality becomes an essential question.

With each new day of investigation, there are more and more startling charges made by very reliable people. Nightly news shows are talking regularly about impeachment and resignation for the President. Not only have liberal Democratic newspapers asked the President to consider resigning, but also a number of conservative Republican newspapers such as The Washington Star Daily.

It is customary in the two party system for the party not in office (currently the Democrats) to criticize the opposing party to keep them "in line". However, in the case of Watergate, it was the press who made the charges and kept the scandal an important issue, not the Democrats.

On the question of morality or politics, it all depends on whether you consider sabotaging one's presidential campaign as political tactics or not. All the facts are present

to prove the campaigns of Senators Hubert Humphrey, George McGovern and Ed Muskie were sabotaged in the 1972 elections. In 1971, Muskie was leading Nixon in the polls. Suddenly, Senator Muskie and his wife were humiliated with false charges of homosexuality and adultery. At present, Donald Segretti has been indicted on charges of slander against the Muskies. A point of interest shows that Segretti was paid by the Committee to Re-Elect the President. If an act such as this is a common political maneuver, then God help this country!

Morality comes in many disguises for politicians. Hardly anything can be considered a bribe to a congressman. Any money given to a politician, no matter what the purpose, can always be claimed to be a political contribution. After all, we have the right to contribute to our favorite congressman. This points out that politicians are different from common citizens by the fact that they can break the law and hide behind a shield of secrecy and lies. President Nixon has claimed executive privilege for some of his White House aides, stating it has deep roots in the Constitution. To the contrary, there is absolutely nothing about executive privilege in the Constitution.

No longer does President Nixon represent the mandate of the people, but the deceit of a fraudulent election.

Second prize, senior high school students—John Strayer, age 16, of 554 Old Perch Road, Rochester, Mich.:

WATERGATE—MORALITY OR POLITICS

(By John Strayer)

When reading about the Watergate Affair, I sometimes think I am reading a good mystery thriller. All the aspects of a best selling novel are present. The burglary, the payoffs, the closed door meetings, the burning of incriminating evidence, almost every type of political espionage imaginable.

Almost every day more new and startling evidence is revealed as high ranking political officials vacillate and then point fingers in an attempt to save their own necks.

The thing that is frightening is that this is happening in America. Are there so many flaws and loopholes in the Constitution that this kind of deceit can infiltrate into the decision making body of our country? I do not believe it's as much a failure of the Constitution as it is the men we elected. Under the Constitution a few men are given a vast wealth of power with which great things can be accomplished. However, some of these men choose to abuse this authority and use it for personal gain.

As astonishing as this whole thing seems to me, some people still believe that high political officials are incapable of such corruption. It also seems that the men involved, with their self-righteous attitude, feel that they're above the law. If, by chance, they do get caught they can use executive privilege to avoid testifying. If worse comes to worse, someone will pardon them with executive clemency.

I sincerely hope the courts don't feel these men are above the law because, besides being a matter of morality, this incident is also a matter of legality.

Even if the structure of our government is disrupted for a while as administrative rearranging takes place, I feel the guilty should be punished, even if this includes the President. To let the ones who are proven guilty continue in public office, on the basis that their work is important to the country's future, would make a mockery of the American system. When President Kennedy died, he and his administration were also doing important work for the nation. At that time the country didn't fall apart, so I don't believe a little White House cleaning would be a tragedy now.

Whatever happens, one thing should be learned, that the government and our officials aren't infallible.

Third prize, senior high school students—Duane W. Utech, Jr., age 16, of 461 South Adams, Rochester, Mich.:

WATERGATE AFFAIR—MORALITY OR POLITICS
(By Duane Utech)

The United States of America; the most powerful nation in the history of the world; the nation with a scientific technology so advanced that a major breakthrough is achieved every six months which increases the knowledge of the world by tremendous margins. Yet in all the greatness which is America, there seems to be only one stone of its foundation which consistently fails to hold up our country: the government. And today, it would seem as though this section of our nation has become as corrupt and vile as the criminal organizations which pollute our city streets. It has now become apparent that the rampant evils of our government must not go unchecked; and the American people must look toward Watergate as the cleanser of the cesspool of our political system.

As the trials of Watergate progress, and the picture slowly grows, the citizen is beginning to grow querulous about two things. First, when will the entire puzzle of espionage be intact, and second, is this scandal a question of morals or a question of politics? If it comes to a question of morals, then we must ask ourselves; who is in the right, and who is in the wrong? And if it is a question of politics, we must ask ourselves; if this is politics, then is there nothing better which we can accept to govern our country?

But even while our country lays in wonder—or indifference—the back stabbing, finger pointing circus continues. No one seems either willing or able to open the festering sore and clean it out. Each day it seems as though one of the members of Watergate will have to indulge in a disclosure of the intricate network of crimes, but they remain as tight lipped as a young boy who pulled his girl friends pig-tails in school. Is this pompous caravan of small children who see, speak, and hear no evil demonstrating a political maneuver? If this brilliant power play is politics, what can we define as pure idiocy? Is it politically acceptable to 'eaves drop' on an opponent's camp? And even if the members involved in the worst scandal since the 'Teapot Dome Affair' say yes, then can we, the American people, agree?

Is it morally acceptable for a group of people representing our Democracy to violate many standards, which our Democracy stands for? No matter how many times these same rights have been violated in the past, the mere fact that the violation went unnoticed then does not lessen the voracity of the crime. The fact is that the members of Watergate have been unearthed, and no matter how they squirm to be released from the hook of justice, the prosecutors must hold them until they are convicted for the worst crime committable in America today; molesting the rights of the American people. It is this authors belief that Watergate is definitely a question of morals; and the Watergate conspirators are most assuredly in the wrong.

First prize, junior high school student Joni Kaul, age 13, of 2710 Walbridge Drive, Rochester, Mich.:

WATERGATE AFFAIR—MORAL AND POLITICAL
(By Joni Kaul)

The biggest scandal in the history of the United States government is called The Watergate Affair. It centers around the wiretapping of Democratic Headquarters in the Watergate Hotel, Washington, D.C.

In June of 1972 some members of the

Republican Party tapped the lines of the Democrats when they were planning the Presidential Campaign. Tapping in the United States is against the law and that is why an investigation has begun into the cause. The Democrats say Mr. Nixon was in on it, and the President denied it.

Soon Mr. Nixon was seeing John J. Willson a Washington attorney who was retained by H. R. Halderman, the white house Chief of Staff, and John Ehrlichman, the President's adviser on domestic affairs. Their names were being mentioned by other suspects as either trying to cover up White House knowledge of the affair or helping to pay the wiretappers to be quiet. For this reason these two men had ample cause to hire a lawyer. But why was Nixon seeing him? It seemed to say Mr. Nixon himself was part of the conspiracy. However, there is no proof of this.

Mr. Nixon had solemnly denied any personal involvement and promised to see justice done. One of his fired aides threatened to implicate the President himself in a conspiracy to conceal White House involvement. Nixon took the blame and said that any of his party that took part in the bugging did so because they were overeager to have the Republicans retain the presidency and were loyal but misled. As head of the party, he would assume the responsibility.

In my opinion, I think it is a moral problem. Every person in the United States, every person in the world, should have his own thoughts, and his own privacy. I think that the Watergate Affair shouldn't have ever happened. The people who took part in it are breaking the law and destroying what is left of honesty in politics.

The Watergate Affair has to be called Political also. It involves both political parties as well as many men in very high positions in government. All of these people are too intelligent to claim they were unaware of the laws on wire-tapping. What they did was done without regard to any law.

The government and the nation both lose in this affair. Men who feel strongly about this issue may quit the government. Other honest, intelligent men might not want to go into government jobs.

This is something that will not blow over. The people of this country will have to have all the details and all those involved will have to pay a penalty. We cannot shrug off this problem of Watergate. We must do all we can to see that it does not happen again.

Second prize, junior high school students—Carol Hasselwonder, age 14, of 630 Campus Road, Rochester, Mich.:

WATERGATE AFFAIR—MORALITY OR POLITICS?
(By Carol Hasselwonder)

On June 17, 1972 bugs were discovered in the Watergate Building. It was discovered that it was Republicans on Nixon's staff who placed the bugs. The discovery of the bugs was brought to the attention of the public.

In other countries this type of thing is going on practically all of the time, but they just keep it a hush-hush business. Many Europeans were very surprised when the United States let this thing come out into the open. Men that were on committees during the election campaigns and are now on Richard Nixon's advisory staff are being questioned and prosecuted. Many people who were connected with this affair have dropped out of politics all together.

One good result of Watergate could be a clearer understanding in the country as well as in Washington of the role of a free press in a free society. Practically the most important result of all this is that Watergate could be an Historic check upon the long and dangerous increase in power of the Presidency.

The Watergate Affair is an example of how immoral some people become when they are given the chance to obtain greater power

and more money. It's ironic to think of how people in the government could break the law by committing a crime as serious as this, when they are the ones who help to make the laws.

President Nixon has given the go-ahead on all questioning needed to clear up this affair. Nixon says that he didn't know about the bugs until after they were discovered, but how could this be if his top associates and good friends knew about them?

In my opinion the Watergate Affair isn't some freak incident that happens only once or that you read about in books, it's an affair that's going on all over the world right now and will probably continue here in the United States and everywhere else as long as there are human beings. To want to have power and riches is a normal human instinct and people will do almost anything to get this. Even though it's a normal human instinct, it's still illegal and very immoral to go about trying to achieve it in this way. I feel that bugging is immoral because it destroys people's freedom and privacy. I feel that people who will do this sort of thing are rather corrupt for they are depriving people of their human rights.

Governmental or political agencies bugging other people is something that one would normally think of only in connection with criminals or crime syndicates.

I think that it will take quite a while before this whole mess is cleared up. Anyone who was connected with this thing should be punished severely. Maybe if this happened the bugging will stop.

Politically, it has weakened our standing in International Affairs a great deal. It has also cheapened our government and our country. The other governments in the world respected us but now their feelings about us have changed greatly. If this thing continues, nobody will ever respect us again. This incident has also helped to devalue our American dollar.

This affair has damaged our country both morally and politically. It is hard to say which is worse!

Third prize, junior high school students—Norman Bense, age 14, of 368 Nesbit, Rochester, Mich.

WATERGATE AFFAIR—MORALITY OR POLITICS?
(By Norman Bense)

The Watergate case all began on June 17, 1972, at 2:00 in the morning, when a policeman discovered five men hiding behind a desk, in an office at National Democratic Headquarters.

Actually, it began long before that, when the burglars first started planning the break-in, burglary, and wiretapping of the Watergate Hotel. Who helped plan this break-in? What did they want? These questions are now being asked by the Grand Jury, the Senate, The President, and many Americans.

After the break-in of Democratic Headquarters, the President ordered an investigation of it by his White House Counsel John Dean III. It was announced that the investigation did not turn up any evidence of White House involvement. But since mid-March, more and more facts have turned up that show White House involvement. Finally it was revealed that many White House officials were deeply involved in the planning and attempted cover up of Watergate.

It seems that the purpose of the break-in and wiretapping was to gain political information that the Republicans could use to hurt or destroy the Democrats chances in the elections.

James McCord, one of the five conspirators, really started making static in the White House when he made seemingly untrue statements before the Grand Jury. He stated that John Dean III, Jeb Magruder, and John Mitchell had known about the Watergate

plans in advance, and it had been discussed at a meeting in Mitchell's office in February of 1972. McCord also said that after the men were arrested, they received regular payoffs to keep quiet.

Since McCord began making these statements, more and more White House officials have been revealed to be involved with Watergate and have been trying to cover it up.

Up to now some officials have been fired, and two officials have been indicted by the Grand Jury. The officials involved are in such a high bracket in the White House, that now even the President is under heavy suspicion.

Some people say, "It's just politics." But if it is just politics why all the secret meetings and payoffs? And most of all why was such an attempt made to cover up Watergate? I do not think, that Watergate "Is just politics."

Watergate started as just a small, innocent affair, in which one or two minor White House officials were involved. But since mid-March of 1973 the Watergate Affair and the number of people involved have been growing like mosquitos in a swamp.

In my opinion, Watergate is too involved to be stated as "just politics." Watergate is immoral and completely wrong; and yet, this may only be the beginning of the greatest political crisis in the history of the United States.

I believe that even in these shocking days to Americans, the guilty will be brought to justice and sentenced in the most fair way known.

Let us just pray, for our sake and for the sake of this country, that the President is telling the truth, and actually did not know of White House involvement in the Watergate Affair until earlier this year.

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 8547—THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of this legislation to provide additional authority and power for the proper administration of export controls—and, in particular, the authority to impose export controls "to reduce the serious inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand." I am concerned, however, that this legislation does not require, does not mandate action by the administration to impose export controls when scarcities develop and the cost of goods and commodities to American consumers is increasing at an inflationary rate.

It is obvious that the Export Control Act has not been used effectively or adequately in the past for inflation control purposes. Yet the act could and should have great potential for curbing exports of articles which are increasing in price at an inflationary rate—articles whose inflation is contributing to a weakening of faith in the stability of the dollar and of the American economy. To date, the administration has used the power given by this Act on a very random and ad hoc basis.

It is time that the Congress began writing more legislation which is self-explanatory, self-executing, self-enforcing.

We should write more legislation which says that if "A" happens, then "B" comes into effect automatically—without executive "determinations" or maybe's—without interest groups besieging Cabinet officers and White House officials for special favors and special relief for their industries.

In the future, we should give consideration to legislation which would automatically impose export controls when the price of goods and commodities increases in an inflationary manner by a certain percentage. A system of automatic controls, triggered by price increases, would remove the arbitrariness and unpredictability of the present system where our trading partners are surprised and shocked by a sudden executive determination and action. If the law clearly states that controls will and must be imposed at a certain point—determined by increases, say, in the wholesale and consumer price index—then our trading partners will know what to expect. Through consultation and diplomacy, they would be encouraged to cool demand or seek alternative sources.

In addition, in the critical areas of raw materials and food goods, we should determine what the needs of our own people and industries are and work for the set-aside or reserve of necessary supplies. The American consumer and American industry should come first. We should not allow exports which cripple our own productive capacity. We should not export ourselves into scarcity and into hunger. The policies of the past year in which we have permitted so much food to be shipped abroad that the cost of food at home has spiraled out of control and affected the diet of millions of Americans, must not be repeated. It is unconscionable that our export policies have damaged the quality of life and health of our own people.

Some have argued that export controls, by limiting the range of goods that foreign countries can purchase thereby limit the usefulness and attractiveness of the dollar as a currency and medium of exchange. But the inflation caused by excessive exports and domestic scarcity also weakens the dollar.

It is also interesting to note that a number of other nations have taken action to curb exports and insure adequate supplies for their own citizens. It is my understanding that the Canadian Wheat Board is taking action to insure necessary reserves of wheat and feed grains at home before proceeding with exports. Mexico has placed limits on beef exports—and even the Australians have discussed the possibility of limiting the amount of meat available for export. Yet despite these kinds of examples, we hear little mention of the deterioration of the currencies of those countries.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill is opposed by sectors of the economy which are reaping large profits from an export trade created by worldwide shortages and the foreign demand created by the recent devaluations. It would be wise for these sectors of the economy to restrain their export sales. There was always a need for food throughout the world. There was not always an opportunity to

buy at bargain prices which developed through devaluation. Foreign cash buyers will disappear as the advantages created by devaluation ebb away. But the current food inflation may permanently eliminate taxpayer subsidies to the farmer and critically limit taxpayer supports. Farmers may have indeed won the battle over food prices—but they are permanently losing out with the destruction of the successful partnership between farmer and consumer which increased productivity, guaranteed income and produced essential food and fiber at fair and decent prices.

REVENUE SHARING: MYTH AND REALITY

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the concept of revenue sharing includes assumptions that it will ease the financial strain on State and local governments, enable communities to meet their priorities for government services, and somehow bring "power to the people."

But what is the reality? Research Atlanta, a widely respected independent urban policy research organization, has conducted a special study of the impact of revenue sharing on the city of Atlanta and Fulton County, which encompasses much of the city and its suburbs. Among its findings:

In fiscal year 1974, which began this past July 1, Atlanta and Fulton County will receive \$14.4 million in general revenue-sharing funds, but lose approximately \$27.9 million in Federal funds because of terminations and cutbacks on numerous programs by the administration. The net loss to the city and county will be \$13.5 million. This loss is being inflicted on vital projects in such areas as education, housing, manpower training, poverty, and community development.

In fiscal year 1975, if Congress were to approve the proposed special revenue-sharing measures, Atlanta and Fulton County would still sustain a net loss in Federal funds.

Beyond the financial loss is the unfortunate fact that no local mechanism or procedure exists to determine priorities for the use of general and special revenue-sharing funds. Also, as local governments shift from existing programs to those operated under revenue sharing, experienced personnel will leave and valuable services will be cut back or ended.

Then there is the impact on individual citizens. Instead of transferring "power to the people," revenue sharing would not, in fact, require the extensive citizen participation—notably among poor people—now necessary under many federally funded programs. One result of revenue sharing is that the poor will have less participation and fewer services. Community development revenue sharing, for example, would decrease

funds for Atlanta—with its large neighborhoods of poor people—from \$36.30 per capita annually to \$19.57, while the highly affluent neighboring DeKalb County would receive an increase from \$0.64 to \$6.82 per capita.

This illuminating study was compiled by Research Atlanta staff members Jocelyn Ross, Cheryl J. Pence, and Walter R. Huntley. They are to be commended for this and continually informative research projects, as are the organization's executive director, Sam A. Williams, and its board of directors: Ben D. Brown, John W. Cox, F. T. Davis, Jr., Robert P. Hunter, Clay C. Long, Michael H. Trotter, and William J. VanLandingham.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the introduction and summary of this copyrighted study. Those who are interested in obtaining a copy of the complete report may write: Research Atlanta, 52 Fairlie Street NW., Atlanta, Ga. 30303.

REVENUE SHARING IN ATLANTA
AND FULTON COUNTY
(By Research Atlanta)

I. INTRODUCTION

Revenue sharing is a new decentralized system of distributing Federal funds to state and local governments. Revenue sharing is a type of Federal "block grant" that does not designate the specific use of funds but rather a general use. It would partially replace the current system of "categorical grants", funds designated for specific program categories.

President Nixon in 1969 proposed a revenue sharing bill that never passed Congress that would have made \$500 million of Federal revenues available to state and local governments in fiscal year 1971, with the total rising to \$5 billion by FY 1976. In 1971, President Nixon, in his State of the Union Address, proposed a second revenue sharing bill which included two parts: general and special revenue sharing. General revenue sharing would allocate \$5 billion in Federal funds to the states, counties, municipalities, and the District of Columbia. Special revenue sharing would allocate \$11 billion by consolidating about 130 existing "categorical grants" into six broad categories (education, law enforcement and criminal justice, manpower, urban community development, health, and transportation) with fewer Federal regulations.

Nixon's general revenue sharing bill, entitled the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, was amended and passed by Congress in October, 1972. In January, 1973 President Nixon submitted the FY 1974 budget to Congress. It anticipated and proposed that the first four special revenue sharing bills be enacted by July 1, 1975. It also terminated many categorical grant programs in preparation for special revenue sharing. President Nixon also impounded housing, urban community development and other grants in an effort to reevaluate and control Federal spending. Special revenue sharing bills for community development, education, and law enforcement are before Congress.

According to the Nixon Administration, three factors led to this basic proposed change in intergovernmental relations. First, the great proliferation of categorical grants has created exceedingly complex financial and guideline relationships between governments and has distorted priorities. Second, the growing fiscal pressures on state and local treasuries showed the need for increased Federal aid with no matching requirements. Third, traditional approaches to categorical grant streamlining, such as consolidation

plans and incremental changes, have generally been unsuccessful.

The purpose of this study is to quantify the financial impact of general and proposed special revenue sharing on Atlanta and Fulton County. Special emphasis is also given to the policy implications of revenue sharing on local government. This report is prepared as a public service for elected officials of local, state and Federal governments, business and community leaders, and the public. Research Atlanta prepared this report, and wishes to thank Jay Fountain, Fulton County Finance Director; Madeline Burgess, Finance Department Research Director, City of Atlanta; and State Representative Jerry Horton. Information concerning revenue sharing came directly from legislation, and was complemented by financial data from Federal and local government agencies.

Research Atlanta is an independent urban policy research organization. It conducts practical research about local government finance, housing, education, and transportation in Metro Atlanta. It is funded by foundation grants and business donations.

II. SUMMARY

This report is a financial analysis of general and special revenue sharing and its impact on Atlanta and Fulton County, Georgia. The analysis includes local government policy implications created by changes in Federal funding.

The report is written in two parts: general and special revenue sharing. The general revenue sharing (GRS) chapter documents the amount of funds coming to Atlanta and Fulton County from fiscal year 1972 through 1976 and the local policy implications of this change in funding. The special revenue sharing (SRS) chapter documents the amount of SRS funds that would be received by Atlanta and Fulton County if the four SRS proposals are approved by Congress and/or implemented by the President. They are: community development, law enforcement, manpower, and education (health and transportation special revenue sharing have not been submitted to Congress yet). Also the SRS chapter lists the categorical grants to Atlanta and Fulton County being terminated or phased out.

Major findings

1. In fiscal year 1974 (July 1973-June 1974) Atlanta and Fulton County will: a) receive approximately \$14.4 million in general revenue sharing funds, b) lose approximately \$27.9 million in Federal funds due to terminations and cutbacks of categorical grant programs (compared to the 1972 funding level), affected by revenue sharing, and c) receive no funds under special revenue sharing. Thus in FY 1974 Atlanta and Fulton County will receive \$13.5 million less in Federal aid than they did in FY 1972 (this includes only those programs for the Department of Labor, Health, Education and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; Office of Economic Opportunity; and Department of Agriculture). This is equivalent to 8% of all 1972 local property taxes for schools and government in Atlanta and Fulton County.

2. In FY 1975 Atlanta and Fulton County will: a) receive approximately \$15.3 million in general revenue sharing funds, b) lose approximately \$40.7 million in Federal funds due to termination and cutbacks of categorical grant programs (compared to the 1972 funding level), and c) receive about \$22.8 million through proposed special revenue sharing programs. Thus in FY 1975 Atlanta and Fulton County will receive \$2.7 million less in Federal aid than they did in FY 1972 (only for the Department of Labor, Department of HEW, Department of HUD, LEAA, OEO and Department of Agriculture).

3. General revenue sharing is in effect from FY 1973 through FY 1977 and the amount of

funds which Atlanta and Fulton County will receive has been documented in this report. Special revenue sharing proposals currently drafted cover FY 1975 through FY 1979. Congress is receiving a separate bill for five special revenue sharing proposals. The sixth, manpower, is being implemented by executive order. Of the four SRS bills already submitted by the President, education special revenue has already been withdrawn.

4. The new policy effect of revenue sharing is the dismantling of Federal agencies or autonomous programs at the local level and redistributing most of those funds through local elected officials. Local elected officials may choose their own priorities for revenue sharing funding or continue to support programs similar to the previous Federal effort. This has several significant implications for Atlanta and Fulton County:

a. No local mechanism or procedure exists for measuring the effectiveness of current Federal programs about to be terminated. There is no local mechanism or procedure to objectively determine priorities for the city or county to use general and special revenue sharing monies.

b. There will be a one year lapse between categorical grant terminations and possible receipt of special revenue sharing funds to substitute for these terminated programs. During the interim most local staffs for these programs will disperse and force re-evaluation before local funding. The eventual start-up of local programs will be slow because new organizations will have to be formed at the local level.

c. Extensive citizen participation, especially among the impacted poor, is currently required by many Federal funded local programs which are being terminated. General and special revenue sharing funds would not require such citizen participation.

d. Metropolitan coordination of federally funded projects is currently promoted by the Atlanta Regional Commission through their review and comment (A-95 Federal circular) to the funding agency. General and special revenue sharing funds require no metropolitan or regional review.

e. Special revenue sharing law enforcement and education proposals require a state plan coordinated by the Governor in order to receive funds, and local governments must take initiative to be involved and plan their allocations according to the State's plan.

f. Community development and manpower special revenue sharing fund changes from previous categorical grants tend to decrease aid to the inner city while increasing aid to suburban counties.

4. General revenue sharing monies received in 1973 by Atlanta and Fulton County have been used as follows: Atlanta—\$6 million as general city budget increase for salaries, \$3.7 million for traffic improvements and capital construction, and \$750,000 for E.O.A.; Fulton County—\$6.2 million for operating expenses of existing and some new social service programs, \$2.2 million for capital improvements on existing programs, and \$150,000 for Federal cutback programs. Thus general revenue sharing funds have mostly been used to offset general budget increases and thus prevent local property tax increases rather than to replace categorical grant cutbacks.

5. Community development cutbacks and special revenue sharing represent the largest funding and program change to Atlanta:

a. During FY 1974 Atlanta would receive \$8.1 million phase-out for neighborhood development programs funds (a reduction of \$11.8 million from 1972 level).

b. From FY 1975 through FY 1979 Atlanta would receive one-third less through community development revenue sharing than through community development categorical grant programs extended at the FY 1972 level.

c. Community development special reve-

nue sharing will lessen money to the inner areas. Atlanta's receipt will decrease from \$36.30 per capita per year (average from 1968-72) to \$19.57 in FY 1979 whereas DeKalb County changes from \$0.64 to \$6.82 per capita.

6. Other special revenue sharing proposals are tentative and will have less of an immediate impact on Atlanta and Fulton County than community development special revenue sharing.

GROWTH OF AMERICANISM

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a speech I recently had the pleasure and privilege to read.

Any comment on these remarks by me would be unnecessary except to point out that the outstanding young man, Mark Jones, who gave it at a meeting of the Santa Rosa, California Kiwanis Club last month, is only 18 years old and has just graduated from high school.

I know everyone who reads these remarks will agree with me that Mark is a highly articulate, concerned and informed citizen. He is a credit to himself, his family and his country.

GROWTH OF AMERICANISM

(By Mark Jones)

I have spent much time in thinking of politics and how much it controls our daily lives, how badly our nation needs more and more ethical people in our government. I have heard the problem of our time stated and re-stated by a very vocal public; I have not heard very many offering concrete solutions.

We have heard many speak of their own individual cause, having all the answers; capital, labor, racism, ecology, the strict law and order promoters and those who recommend civil disobedience to correct the misled law and order promoters. All these and many more would have us believe that if you correct their specific problem you will save the world.

I believe there is no generation gap; I do not believe the prophets of doom who would have us believe the world is growing worse every day.

John D. Rockefeller III expresses it well in his recent book, "The Second American Revolution". Not a violent revolution, but neither a revolution that will be put down by violence. It is a humanistic, peaceful, but just as forceful revolution that says to industry—"You must stop polluting our lakes and rivers";

To our travellers—"You must stop polluting our air";

To our merchants—"You must stop misleading advertising";

To our government—"You must stop involving us in wars for selfish reasons";

And to the grass roots political Central Committee over the nation—"We will not be pushed into a political mold and work for any 'Last Hurrah' politicians who put their ego ahead of the public good."

I believe in our two-party political system and I believe I can speak for my generation when I say we will not work for a party who would provide all individual needs to the destruction of individual initiative and to the establishment of a welfare state.

And I believe I can speak for our generation when I say we will not work for a Party who is so conservatively engrossed in their own individual well-being that they are opposed to all proposed methods of creating more equal opportunities for all ages, races, ethnic backgrounds and minority groups.

Our second revolutionaries are not opposing you. Rather, we would express our gratitude for two hundred years of building a free country, the country offering the highest standard of living and the greatest opportunities ever offered any people. We are reaching out to you to help guide us in setting higher ideals and forever working to reach them.

This, gentlemen, is the purpose of my speaking to you today.

First of all I ask you to go back with me almost 200 years ago to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania when 56 men signed their names to the Declaration of Independence—for on that day America gave birth to the world its first independent republic.

The development of a government for the United States did not come easily. It was not the brain child of any one man or any one group with a common point of view. It spread over a period of years of controversy and compromise.

There were giants in America when the United States was born. The midwives and wet nurses of the new nation were unique in history. Never before had such a diverse group of men of superior, intellectual, capability been assembled in such a limited area of space and narrow segment of time.

There have been greater scientists than Benjamin Franklin, greater intellectuals than John Adams, greater philosophers than Thomas Jefferson, greater generals than George Washington, greater lawmakers than James Madison but never were there so many men of great virtue, energy, intelligence, knowledge and imagination gathered to devote themselves to a single purpose as in America during the last quarter of the eighteenth century and the first few years of the nineteenth.

Their single purpose was the creation of a nation with a government based on a wholly new concept. In the past, under any form of government, the state had controlled the people. This had always been accepted as the proper relationship between the governed and the government. When government became too oppressive the people sometimes rebelled and secured some relief or a change of government; but the state retained control.

The daring thinkers in the newly liberated colonies in America challenged that premise. They advanced an entirely new and radical principle. The state should be controlled by the people; not the people by the state. In the minds of those who were struggling to create a new nation, government was not the state. The people were the state, of which government was an instrument. James Madison put it this way:

"What is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this:

You must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is no doubt, the primary control on the government, but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions."

The preceding statement by James Madison became the first basic principle of Americanism as applied to government; the people must control the state, the state must not control the people.

When the constitution was ratified, "We, the people of the United States" comprised four million souls spread out rather sparsely over a narrow strip of coastal territory, divided into thirteen states. One hundred and forty years later—or 1900—the four million had become almost one hundred and twenty-three million in forty-eight states—stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific coasts. A small agricultural country had changed into the world's greatest industrial nation.

To the almost primitive conditions of post-colonial days, were added steam power, electricity, the telegraph, the telephone, radio, railroads, automobiles, airplanes, machine tools & automated power tools. Americanism took all this in its stride, adjusted to change and progress with but one serious conflict—the Civil War in the 1860's.

Two years before, a tall, lanky obscure congressman by the name of Lincoln would make national headlines as he campaigned for a U.S. Senate seat in Illinois. It was in the towns and villages of Illinois that he engaged Stephen A. Douglas in a series of debates on the slavery question. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise was the burning issue of the day; whether to let slavery spread into Kansas and Nebraska.

Within the debates Douglas expressed that he didn't care whether slavery was voted up or down and condemned Lincoln and his doctrine which declared all men created equal by the Declaration of Independence.

In his reply to Douglas, Lincoln reached out to his fellow countrymen with a message that it is just as important today as it was over one hundred years ago. In it Mr. Lincoln declared:

"My countrymen, if you have been taught doctrines conflicting with those great landmarks of the Declaration of Independence—if you have listened to the suggestions that would take away its grandeur—if you are inclined to believe that all men should not be created equal in those inalienable rights, enumerated by our chart of liberty, let me entreat you to come back. Think nothing of me. Take no thought of the political fate of any man whatsoever. But come back to the truths that are in the Declaration of Independence.

You may do anything with me you choose if you will heed these sacred principles. You may not only defeat me for the Senate but you may take me out and put me to death. Do not destroy the immortal emblem of humanity. If that Declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book in which we find it; and tear it out. Who is so bold to do it? If it is not true, let us tear it out. But if it is true, then let us stick to it and stand firmly by it."

We have come a long way since Mr. Lincoln contributed those words of wisdom to us and certainly a longer way since our founding fathers established our independent Republic.

When we look back 200 years ago we find that most of the four million people who first came to America descended from original settlers, indentured servants or transported criminals, with a small leavening of first generation immigrants. The vast population expansion includes tens of millions of immigrants to the point that the United States became the "melting pot" of the world. And almost all of these immigrants were from the so-called lower classes. It was not the Irish land-owner who came to America; it was the starving poor. It was not the Russian boyar who left his native land; it was the persecuted Jew in the ghetto. It was not the rich burgher who left Germany; it was the illiterate peasant.

Americanism embraced all of these—welded them into a seemingly homogeneous mass, the offspring of whom lost their identity with parent cultures and became—simply Americans. To each in equal share America continued to offer what the Founding Fa-

thers had promised—freedom, equality, independence—opportunity.

None of this progress, this change, and development affected the principles of Americanism as a form of government.

It remained a government in which authority and power were limited and largely decentralized. It remained a government based squarely on the theory of private enterprise.

The men who drew the governmental blueprint for America started with the assumption that men are endowed by God, with certain rights and privileges and that governments' only proper role should be in the protection of those rights. They rejected entirely the theory that man's rights stem from authority from the state, and proceeded to build in our constitution something new and different in the way of governmental charters. This novelty was in provisions which specifically stated that certain institutions and human relations were to be outside the authority of government. They actually forbade the government to infringe or violate these areas.

Strangely enough, not many Americans are aware of the fact that the concept of government confinement and individual freedom had never before been incorporated into a national constitution. And, unfortunately, not enough Americans today realize the wisdom and foresight that went into the framing of the U.S. Constitution.

Let me emphasize that these constitutional framers to whom the world owes so much were not guessing at a form of government that would work in the wilderness. They had experienced various forms of despotism and tyranny and studied others. They knew that the most progress is made when men have been released from bondage, given control over their own actions and allowed to receive the fruits of their labor. They acted accordingly and the result is the American miracle and the finest heritage it is possible for men to bequeath. And with bequest an enormous power has come down to us which carries with the requirement that we protect it zealously and use it wisely.

As America fills up with population and the task of getting a living out of the ground becomes more difficult the struggle for existence will become harder and the competition of life more severe. Then, liberty and democracy will cost something, if they are to be maintained.

And yet this scheme of a Republic which our fathers formed was a glorious dream which demands more than a word of respect and affection before it passes away. Indeed, it is not fair to call it a dream or even an ideal; it was rather a possibility which was within our reach. The men who came here were able to throw off all the trammels of tradition and established doctrine. They went out into a wilderness, it is true, but they took with them all the art, science, and literature which, up to that time, civilization had produced. It was the fondest hope of the Founding Fathers that their experiment in self-government would stand the test of time.

So, what happened in America must be kept alive, must be handed on to generations who, even today, are growing up never having known the true freedom of Americanism—freedom to work where and as they please, freedom to use the fruits of that work as they see fit with little governmental interference and freedom from endless rules and restrictions.

I am not saying that America does not have its problems. Certainly not. And we must not let our admiration blind us to certain facts. For instance, after the Declaration of Independence was written 89 years passed before we abolished slavery. Another half century passed before we enacted effective legislation against child labor. It wasn't until 1920 that women were allowed to vote. It

wasn't until 1954 that the Supreme Court ruled against segregation. And, today, we are confronted with such obstacles as ignorance, disease, discrimination, mental or physical illness or incapacity.

But, today, it is my belief that one of America's greatest challenges, which confronts us all, is in the field concerning Economics. And, today, we must recognize the fact that millions of Americans are turning towards such programs as welfare, because they have no where else to turn. We find that our government is taking care of more and more of our citizens while many hard working Americans must pay this charity through higher taxes. Where then do we find a solution? Let me begin by offering a phrase from a certain philosopher who once said:

"The noblest charity is to prevent a man from accepting charity, and the best alms are to show and enable a man to dispense with alms".

The preceding certainly is a profound observation which we must keep in mind, especially in dealing with America's economic problems.

Today, many of our economists would have us believe that labor is the number one driving force in our economy. And certainly this would have been true a hundred years ago. But since then modern machinery and industrialization have replaced much of our labor. Therefore, I suggest to you that capital is the moving force of our economy. Today, at least 80% of America's goods are produced by capital—that is by machinery rather than by labor. And what is even more astounding is that 81% of the citizens of America own no kind of stock or ownership of our nation's capital. Therein lies the solution to our country's economic problem. The solution does not lie in more big government hand-outs—it does not lie in higher taxes and it certainly does not lie in more welfare. But, rather, it lies in creating a program which will give each of our citizens the opportunity to invest and own a part of capital—a part of private enterprise—the foundation of America's economy and greatness.

And so my friends, let us remember that the greatest economic charity is that which enables persons to become independent of alms and, therefore, most self-reliant and secure under freedom. Only when that happens—when persons advance from the brink of starvation to time released for devotion to things of the mind and spirit, which comprise the supremely great charity.

So we find that even our country—the greatest and most powerful country in the world has its problems.

For example, recently, our nation has been hit by what is to be remembered as one of the most corrupt political scandals in our government. A word that I think all of us want to forget, "Watergate".

This incident not only affects a few officials, but it affects the whole attitude of the American people towards the foundation of our American government.

Recently, I have heard shouts of total corruption of our government and with some even mentioning the word "Impeachment" of our President. I will agree that many high officials in our government must be punished justly for pulling the stupid, immoral and ridiculous acts that should not be tolerated by this government.

However, before we allow our emotions to carry us away I think we should look at some other facts. First of all, there is no question that a tragic mistake has been made. However, as one European put it, "When it comes to corruption in Europe we accept it as an everyday thing because our system does not allow us to do anything about it, but the governmental foundation of America is so democratic, open and free that the judicial

system is allowed to do its work without restrictions. So, perhaps we should keep these words in mind remembering that when a problem arises in this country, at least we are able to correct it.

Secondly, over the past few months there have been some who have criticized our President immensely for allowing such a thing to happen. And there is no question that there was mis-judgment that took place.

But today I must speak up for my President—not as a Republican nor as a Democrat—but as an American who sincerely believes that justice and fair play must prevail. It is time for the American people to stop listening to the barrage of hear-say, exaggerated and sometimes false remarks put out by such news-editors as James Reston who has proven he is only out to seek embarrassment of the President of the United States.

But most of all I believe I can speak for the vast majority of Americans when I say I am not willing to condemn a man who has done so much for his country.

A President who has opened up the gateway towards a more positive understanding between the American people, the people of Red China, and the people of Russia.

A President who established the Environmental Protection Agency—the first Federal unit ever set up to protect our quality of life.

A President who signed into law the bill giving 18 year olds the right to vote and who has overhauled the selective service system with the goal of establishing an all volunteer army.

There have been outstanding accomplishments that must not be blindly cast aside by the rushing, careening momentum of the Watergate scandal. And I sincerely hope that the people of this nation will be able to find in their hearts the sense of justice and fairness which President Richard Nixon, like every American, so richly deserves.

The Watergate affair is one of many problems which confronts our nation today, but I truthfully have become convinced that as each day goes by, America, its leaders and its people are finding the cures to the ills which have tormented our country over these last few years.

For instance, in regards to crime, over these last two years, we find that the rate of increase of major crimes has been cut in half—to a five year low.

Over the last year more and more young people have been turning off to drugs and turning on to education and religion for their answer.

For the first time in forty years our government is now spending more money on human needs—such as education, poverty and health care; and at the same time retaining a strong military defense program.

In comparison to the early sixties, when racial tension ran high—we now see in the 70's that the white man and the black man, along with other minorities are listening to each other through constructive action and understanding.

And I say, "Thank God that we have a President of the United States who has used his leadership responsibly and sensibly in bringing an honorable end to the war in Southeast Asia. Over the past few years I believe millions of Americans stood firmly by their government and their President in support of his policies in the handling of the war, and these Americans are to be congratulated.

Unfortunately, there was a small minority of people in this country who let their emotions carry them away; who thought it was the *in* thing to do by criticizing their government in the handling of the Vietnam war. And, even today, these people keep insisting that this war could have been ended years ago and who say that men like Lyndon

Johnson and Richard Nixon should be blamed for prolonging the war far too long.

I will agree with one statement—this war could have been ended years ago but the blame for prolonging it does not rest on the shoulders of such outstanding men as Lyndon Johnson or President Nixon but rather the blame should rest on the ungrateful and stupid individuals who marched in the streets of Washington, D.C. protesting the war in Vietnam. It was people like Joan Baez, Jane Fonda and Ramsey Clark who were used as puppets in satisfying the North Vietnamese in their propaganda gimmicks and thus prolonging the war.

A few months ago on February 11th, at about 3:15 in the morning I saw on television one of the most moving events I have ever experienced. At that time a military airplane was just landing on the Philippine Islands. But this was no ordinary airplane for it was carrying some of the greatest Americans I have ever seen. The prisoners of War. The first P.O.W. to get off was a Lieutenant Commander Denton. In a short message he thanked the American people, praised his President and closed with the words: "God bless America."

As each man got off that plane they saluted the American flag, its president, and its people with meaning, pride, and respect. These men will not be forgotten for they have proven to the American people that through patience, understanding and faith in the government which our founding fathers created almost 200 years ago that we are moving towards a more perfect society.

And through this faith let us always remember that the best way to move a mountain is to change our position without sacrificing our principles.

194 years ago 56 men stood by that statement when they signed their names to the Declaration of Independence. But whatever happened to those men who signed that document which formed our government?

Well, five signers were captured by the British and punished as traitors. Two lost their sons in the Revolutionary War. Another had two sons captured. Nine of the 56 fought and died from wounds or the hardships of the war.

Thomas McKean, who served in Congress without pay was so hounded by the British that he was forced to keep his family in hiding.

At the battle of Yorktown, Thomas Nelson learned that General Cornwallis had located his headquarters in Nelsons' home. Nelson urged Washington to open fire and the house was destroyed.

Francis Lewis had his home and properties destroyed. The enemy jailed his wife and she died within a few months.

John Hart was driven from his wife's sick bed. His 13 children died for their lives. His fields and grist mills were laid waste. He returned home at the end of the war after living in wilderness for more than a year to find his wife dead and children vanished. He died shortly after of exhaustion and a broken heart.

What kind of men were these patriots?

They were soft spoken men of means and education. 24 were lawyers and jurists. 11 were merchants; nine were farmers and large plantation owners.

But they signed the Declaration of Independence—knowing full the penalty if they were captured. Standing, tall, straight and unwavering they pledged: "For the support of this Declaration, with firm reliance on the protection of the Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

These immortal words—when first they were written, proclaimed to the world an idea new among men. This was the American dream, the prayer for the future, but the golden goal was not to be had without cost. The American way was not gained in a day. It was born in adversity, forged out of con-

flict, perfected and proven, only after long experience and trial and faith in God.

It seems that in this day and age people are becoming more involved in trying to help create solutions for nations' problems. This, of course, is good but many Americans have taken it upon themselves to try to solve our nations' problems without asking for one thing that must be put ahead of all other things—and that is God's help.

We can do more for our country and the world by praying for our elected leaders than if we could walk into the Senate chambers in Washington, D.C. and express our opinions to our elected representatives. If they listened to our opinions we could be right or wrong. But what God tells them when they listen to Him must be right. It is infinitely better for our representatives and our world leaders to listen to God than to listen to us.

Most of us can never enter the White House and offer advice to the President—but we can give him what is far more important than advice. We can give him a lift into the presence of God, make him hungry for Divine Wisdom, which is the grandest thing one man ever does for another. We can visit the White House with prayer as many times a day as we think of it and every such visit makes us a channel between God and the President.

And so, gentlemen, I ask you now to join me in a sincere effort of prayer to uphold and perpetuate the greatness of America that she may continue to be the land of individual opportunity, dedicated to a better world for all mankind.

Let us Pray:

Our Father, we pray for this land. We need Thy help in this time of testing and uncertainty, when men who could fight together on the field of battle seem strangely unable to work together around conference tables for peace.

May we begin to see that all true Americanism begins in being Christian; that it can have no other foundation as it has no other roots.

To Thy glory was this Republic established. For the advancement of the Christian faith did the Founding Fathers give their life's heritage, passed down to us.

We pray, Lord Jesus, for our President. We are deeply concerned that he may know the will of God and that he may have the spiritual courage and grace to follow it.

We pray for the leaders of this nation. Strengthen the courage of the representatives in Congress, assembled—sincere men who want to do the right, if only they can be sure what is right.

We would pray that all over this land there may be a return to the faith of those men and women who trusted in God as they faced the perils and dangers of the frontier, not alone in crossing the continent, in building their cabins, in rearing their families, but in raising a standard of faith to which men have been willing to repair down through the years.

Thou didn't bless their efforts. Thou didn't bless America. Thou has made her rich; Will Thou also make her good?

Bless this land that we love so much our Father, and help her to deposit her trust, not in armies and navies, in wealth and material resources, or in achievements of the human mind, but in that righteousness which alone exalteth any nation, and by which alone peace can finally come to us. This we ask in that name that is above every name, Thy Son, Jesus Christ, our redeemer. Amen.

In 1859, right before the Civil War, John Brown was tried for treason, conspiring with slaves and other rebels. He was convicted and sentenced to hang. As he rode in a small wooden wagon to the place where he would be hung he took a long look around him and

as he did so he mumbled to himself; "This is a beautiful country".

If John Brown could say that when he knew that his life would end very shortly, then we today, even more so can state, "This is a beautiful country and, with God's guidance, we can make her even more beautiful. Thank you.

RURAL HEALTH PLAN LOOKS TO THE FUTURE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the lakes area regional medical program, with headquarters in my home city of Buffalo, is engaged in a most promising program of attracting medical personnel to rural areas now lacking adequate health care.

The rural externship program was initiated in 1972, with 35 health science students placed with preceptors in the western New York and northwestern Pennsylvania counties served by LARMP. This year 56 students were selected from over 180 applicants for 8-week summer assignments in rural areas.

Paid small stipends from LARMP and community sources, the students have been living in facilities furnished by host hospitals and have rotated duties at clinics, county health care agencies, doctors' offices, and hospitals. Their fields of study include medicine, dentistry, nursing, nutrition, pharmacy, physical therapy, medical technology, and podiatry. It is felt that exposure to the practice of medicine in these rural areas will not only help alleviate the current manpower shortage, but encourage their return after graduation. Already a number of students have expressed interest in careers in the area.

Reports indicate that the program is a most successful one—in fact, that it is an outstanding example of the many extra ways in which the regional medical programs are benefiting communities across the Nation. Pending detailed study, Congress has wisely extended for a year a number of public health programs the administration wants to eliminate. Some of the concepts may have ended their usefulness, but I do not believe the regional medical program is among the ones which should be terminated.

Certainly, the lakes area regional medical program is filling a gap in health services for the people in our area. The rural externship program is one small part of the overall plan, but in the years ahead it may prove to be one of the most important and farsighted parts. I would like to include in my remarks the following newspaper articles about participants in the rural externship program.

The articles follow:

[From the Wellsville (N.Y.) Daily Reporter, June 13, 1973]

HEALTH PLAN DUE JUNE 18

Fifty six health science students have been selected from a list of over 180 applications to participate in an eight-week Rural Ex-

ternship program, sponsored by the Lakes Area Regional Medical Program, Inc.

The students, studying in such areas as medicine, dentistry, nursing, nutrition, pharmacy, physical therapy, medical technology, podiatry and hospital administration, underwent an orientation session recently.

The program officially begins June 18 and will run until August 10.

Students will be placed with a preceptor or health professional in assigned rural communities. The program is designed to provide students with working and living experiences that hopefully will interest them in a rural health career after they graduate.

Students have been assigned to preceptors in Allegany, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, Erie, Genesee, Niagara and Wyoming counties in Western New York and Erie and McKean in northwestern Pennsylvania.

The program, funded and organized by the Lakes Area Regional Medical Program, Inc., with some local community contributions, was initiated in 1970 in response to the professional health manpower deficit in rural areas. Since it began the LARMP has placed 119 health science students in the Western New York-Pennsylvania region.

Of the total number this year, 17 are medical students. Many communities are trying to recruit physicians for their areas with little results.

Dr. John R. F. Ingall, director of the LARMP, says that the Rural Externship program is one way to try to provide some possibilities for providing health manpower.

[From the Wellsville/Hornell (N.Y.) Sunday Spectator, July 22, 1973]

EXTERN GETS TO PRACTICE IN ANDOVER (By Heidi Hoppe)

ANDOVER.—One never knows where fortune may lead; it can keep one in his own back yard or take him around the world and back again.

Richard Cudahy, raised in Little Genesee, N.Y., has been led by his desire to become a physician to both extremes: from medical school in Mexico he has returned to serve an externship in Andover.

The Lakes Area Regional Medical Program's rural summer externship program has made it possible for Cudahy to work and learn at Andover Medical Center. He plans to return to the Autonomous University of Guadalajara, Mexico, in August.

Cudahy said that an "extern" differs from an "intern" in that an extern has not yet finished medical school, while an intern has.

His duties are similar to those of an intern, however, and much is expected of him.

He said, "The atmosphere doesn't make me feel inferior and I am allowed to work up to my capabilities."

His duties as an assistant to Dr. Daniel V. Tartaglia and Dr. F. Clifford Miller, the center's physicians, are many.

The day starts with making rounds with the doctors at Jones Memorial hospital.

Then, from "10 a.m. to whenever," Cudahy works at the center, talking to patients, making preliminary examinations and noting tentative treatment. The doctors then verify Cudahy's decisions.

"I'm not allowed carte blanche or anything like that, and I don't do anything difficult or dangerous. The patient isn't the guinea pig, I am," Cudahy said.

He went on to say that most patients don't object to a student instead of a full-fledged M.D., and "aren't scared to death," as he said he expected.

One of the privileges Cudahy finds most remarkable is that he is allowed to watch surgery "on the spot."

He dresses and scrubs with the doctor, who explains every procedure as it is being performed. "It's almost like my own operation," he said.

Cudahy explained that working at the An-

dover Medical College is different from most externships, which are based at hospitals and call for hospital-related work.

Cudahy, however, has duties in every phase of "family practice" work, even going on house calls with one or the other of the doctors.

He is constantly being taught techniques and procedures, and is often instructed by the nurses—"The nurses are phenomenal," he said—when the doctors are too busy.

Cudahy has only laurels to shower on Andover Medical Center and his externship there. "I'm being taught extremely well," he said. "It's like being paid to go to school."

As for the center, Cudahy termed it "great" and said he had never seen a place like it that could serve so many people and yet retain personal interest and follow-up in every case.

Cudahy's "baptism by fire," as he calls it, is a work-study program whose primary goal is to interest medical students in practicing in this area.

He needs no prodding, however, since he has wanted to be a general practitioner in the Little Genesee-Bolivar area since he "was about five."

This leads to question why he is studying in Mexico.

Cudahy replied at length and with much feeling.

He wanted to study in the United States, ideally in New York, for largely financial as well as geographic reasons. But, not being one of the lucky third of those applying to medical school who are accepted in this country, he began to look elsewhere.

"There are always rumblings in the bushes about med schools among students," he said, and he heard of Autonomous University through these channels.

He chose it above other foreign schools since it was on the continent and since he had studied Spanish; the entire curriculum is taught in that language.

The 1967 graduate of Bolivar Central School previously attended the State University at Buffalo for a year and a half and then transferred to Alfred University, where he received his bachelor of science degree in biology in 1971.

He continued with one year of graduate work in biology at Alfred, and then went to Guadalajara.

He expects either one to three more years of schooling in Mexico, depending on whether he passes his medical board exams. If he passes, he can try to transfer to a school in the United States.

"I think it's great," said Cudahy of the Mexican university. "It provides a recourse for Americans who can't attend schools here."

A breakdown of the student body shows roughly, a third Americans, a third Puerto Ricans and other Latin Americans and a third Mexicans.

About 2,000 Americans in all attend the school.

As far as the education provided, Cudahy said that Autonomous University compares very favorably with U.S. schools. "I have had some of my best professors in Mexico," he said.

Cudahy said, however, that the high quality of his education in Mexico does not detract from the problem of financial strain.

He pays \$4,000 per year in tuition—not an uncommon figure for medical schools—but very little scholarship aid is available to students attending school in other countries.

If the ideal solution of more medical schools in this country is not realized, Cudahy said funds should be provided to aid Americans in foreign schools.

While he was home for Christmas vacation this year, Cudahy lobbied with the state legislature to achieve this goal.

He also spoke to several groups in the area on changing the state Education Law

to allow county medical education funds to be used by students attending a World Health Organization-accredited foreign medical school.

Until a solution is found, said Cudahy, most students, like himself, must personally secure sufficient funds year after year—an often overwhelming task.

He recently wed the former Amy Buell of Bolivar, who will be returning to Mexico with him in the middle of August.

"We're going a week before classes begin," he said, "to have our honeymoon in Mexico. The only honeymoon we had at the time of our wedding was a day at the Buffalo Zoo!"

Cudahy is doubtful that he will be able to resume his post at Andover Medical Center next summer.

"But I want to come back to watch," he said.

[From the Olean Times Herald, July 30, 1973]

FIVE HEALTH SCIENCE STUDENTS IN COUNTY EXTERN PROGRAM

Five of the 56 health science students involved in a Rural Externship Program in Western New York are serving the eight weeks of the program in Cattaraugus County.

The students in medicine, dentistry, nursing, nutrition, pharmacy, physical therapy, medical technology, podiatry and hospital administration have been placed with health professionals to serve as preceptors in many communities.

Sponsorship is by the Lakes Area Regional Medical Program, Inc. (LARMP). Buffalo. It was the aim of LARMP "to provide students with working and living experiences that hopefully will interest them in a rural health career after they graduate." With 17 medical student externs in the program, the sponsors hope it may provide solutions for some of the many communities which have been desperately trying to recruit physicians.

Three of the externs placed in Cattaraugus County for the summer are residents of the Olean-Allegany area.

Miss Marilyn Raub, a physical therapy student senior at Albert Einstein College of Medicine, the Bronx, lives at 3739 Birch Run Road, Allegany. She was assigned to the Cattaraugus County Health Department.

Steven J. Lari, 79 Silber Ave., Bethpage, N.Y., is a medical student in his third year at the University of Buffalo, was assigned to the Olean Medical Group, where he is working under the guidance of Dr. Arthur Beck.

The other three have been assigned to St. Francis Hospital.

Miss Jean Albert is a pharmacy student, a senior at University of Buffalo, who resides at 134 Fulton St., Olean.

Miss Kathryn Hill, a freshman student in physical therapy at Northeastern University, Boston, lives in Allegany.

Miss Mary Leong, a junior at University of Buffalo, majoring in medical technology, resides in Buffalo during the school year.

A native of Singapore, Miss Leong, her parents, two sisters and one brother, came to the U.S. three years ago, primarily so that the four offspring could study at American schools without separation from their family. Although she had studied English as a "second language" many years, she had difficulty with it at first, particularly in her first job, which involved extensive use of the telephone in a New York office of Chase Manhattan Bank. Her father, in the import-export business now, liquidated his contracting enterprise in Singapore to emigrate to the U.S., and lives now in Queens, New York.

Miss Leong, whose experience in the U.S. had been limited previously to the metropolitan New York area, said the summer program was giving her an opportunity to sample another new (to her) aspect of American living. Her bachelor's degree in medical

technology will open up to her the opportunity to health related work in research, public health, hospital, industry—even police.

Dr. John R. F. Ingall, LARMP director, said the Rural Externship Program "is one way to try to provide health manpower for areas needing them."

[From the Dunkirk-Medonia (N.Y.) Evening Observer, July 28, 1973]

PROGRAM BRINGS MEDICAL STUDENTS TO COUNTY FOR SUMMER; OFFICIALS HOPE THEY'LL RETURN

(By Paul Lancaster)

In order to acquaint future doctors and other health science personnel with rural areas, Brooks Hospital and two other county hospitals are participating in a rural externship program sponsored by the Lakes Area Regional Program, Inc.

The program has brought 18 medical students to the county to experience rural area medicine in the hopes of drawing these students back to the area once they graduate.

Most of the students currently are in a medical school within New York State, and many are from the county. Three of the students are from the northern part of the county—Michael Nedvesky of Fredonia, Stephen Stratton of Sheridan, and Joan Wilkosz of Brocton.

Most students come from western New York. Three students, however, Joseph Cama, George Gonner and Salvatore Vicario, are graduate medical students studying at the University of Bologna and the University of Rome, respectively.

The externship program was begun in the county in 1971. Lakes Area Regional Medical Program and local hospital officials hope the program will bring these students back to the area after they have completed their studies.

There is little data to gauge the effectiveness of the program thus far, according to George McNaughton, assistant administrator at Brooks Hospital in Dunkirk. In the past two years, the hospital has only had three externs, before an expansion of the program's scope this year. Mr. McNaughton said one of those students still is carrying on "serious correspondence" with regard to possibly practicing medicine in the area after he is out of school. "It's just too early to have attracted physicians from this program yet," added the administrator.

According to Mr. McNaughton, the late Dr. William W. Kunz was the man who first coordinated the program in this area. He had one extern living at his house and accompanying him in his work, whether in the office or on an emergency call in the middle of the night. The extern received what Mr. McNaughton called "quite realistic" experience under the program.

Now, with 18 students stationed at three county hospitals—Brooks, WCA in Jamestown, and Jamestown General—for an eight-week term, the program no longer can offer such a one-on-one correspondence between the extern and "preceptor," or health sciences professional. There aren't enough doctors who can afford the total attention needed to work one-on-one with all the students.

Instead, the program now is arranged so that each student is exposed to all aspects of the medical profession, from writing up and filing medical records to helping out in emergency cases.

The students receive stipends of up to \$100 per week in the eight-week program. Many of them have indicated, however, that they would still enroll in the externship program even without the stipend.

Most of the students have been rotating among the three hospitals. While at Brooks, they stay in a house owned by the hospital normally used for storage. The externs occa-

sionally make trips outside the hospitals to view special medical situations, such as those at Gowanda State or the speech and hearing clinic at Fredonia State. One student called it "the kind of medical education . . . you don't get in medical school."

GREAT PROGRAM

Martha Slye, a hospital administration student currently at Brooks Hospital, calls the externships "really a great program." She attends Cornell University.

Miss Slye said she has worked in many areas of hospital life besides administration. She has viewed surgery, helped out in the emergency room, and worked in food service and therapy. "I've seen things that I'll probably never see again as a hospital administrator," she said.

Michael Nedvesky is a pre-med student at New York University from Fredonia. He said every doctor is "extremely cooperative and friendly" in explaining various hospital operations to the students.

The Fredonia native has worked in a veterans hospital in New York City, and he compared work there with the routine of a rural hospital such as Brooks. "The big city hospital is supposed to be more efficient," he said, "but here it's at least as efficient."

Michael Dujanovich, a University of Buffalo medical technology student from Lackawanna, says the externship program has "influenced me toward working in this type of atmosphere." He said the program has fulfilled its goal of introducing the students to a true picture of rural health services.

So far this summer, 12 of the 18 county externs have worked at Brooks Hospital. Besides those mentioned above, they are Richard Giachio, a New York City med student at U.B., Paul Dumaine, a Bemus Point pharmacy student, also at U.B., Janet MacLaughlin, a Syracuse area therapy major who attends the Albert Einstein School of Medicine in New York City, Gary McFadden of Jamestown, a Temple University med student, Michael Botty, a dental student at U.B. from Fulton, and Melodee Walker, a Pennsylvania native, majoring in physical therapy at U.B.

Other area medical students in the program are Stephen Stratton of Sheridan, a dentistry student working with Dr. John V. Ingham of Fredonia, and Joan Wilkosz, a nursing student from Brocton.

TAXES AND THE SICK

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the cost of medical services is rapidly increasing—9.2 percent on a per capita basis fiscal year 1972 over fiscal year 1971—the administration's floating of a proposal to scrap the medical expense deduction is untenable. The income tax deduction allowed for legitimate medical expenses incurred during the course of the tax year, unfortunately, offers all too little comfort to those American's who see a larger and larger portion of their income gobbled up by spiraling medical costs.

I firmly believe that the long-range answer to financing the country's health care will be some form of National Health Insurance, such as that introduced in the Senate by Senator KENNEDY, and in the House by Mrs. GRIFFITHS, which I have cosponsored; however, until such

solution is fashioned and operable, the need to retain the present provisions in the tax code is obvious.

An editorial in the New York Times on September 5, 1973, speaks to the issue, and is worthy of consideration.

The editorial follows:

TAXES AND THE SICK

More than thirty years ago, while World War II was still on and most domestic concerns were being pushed aside, Congress first introduced into the tax code a provision permitting tax savings for families with extraordinarily high medical costs resulting from severe illness of any kind. Millions of families have since benefited from the provision for tax deduction of out-of-pocket doctor and related hospital costs exceeding 3 per cent of gross income. In effect, this deduction provides a limited form of insurance against bills for major and catastrophic illness, aid sensibly geared to a recognition that families with different income levels have differing ability to pay medical costs.

Recently this provision has come under attack from within the Administration. Treasury Secretary Shultz urged the House Ways and Means Committee last April to reduce sharply the benefits available from this section of the tax law, a proposal aimed primarily at simplifying the personal income tax. Now some H.E.W. officials would go much further. They want the present deduction for medical expenses wiped out and all payments from private health insurance made taxable. The motivation here is to make available up to \$7.5 billion in now uncollected tax funds to finance a system of national health insurance.

Our conviction has long been that top priority in protecting Americans in the field of health costs should go to constructing a system of catastrophic illness insurance to guarantee that no American family would be bankrupted by illness. Obviously, the creation of such a system would largely remove the need for the present tax deduction. But until dependable financial protection against medical catastrophe is available, Congress would be well advised to remain skeptical about plans for ending or reducing a tax provision that annually helps millions of ordinary Americans.

LAWRENCE COUNTY VOCATIONAL SCHOOL FIRST IN SKILL OLYMPICS

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, 1973, the Lawrence County Area Vocational Technical School Opening and Closing Ceremonial Team placed first at the National Skill Olympics sponsored by the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America, at the competition held in Tulsa, Okla. This vocational technical school is located in New Castle, Pa. The winning team was comprised of Roberta DeProspero, Joanna Falatko, Shirley Hairhoger, Theresa Betts, Jenny Morgan, Mary Ann Guy, Joann Lamberti, and advisor coach, Peter Yerge. I believe these fine young people deserve recognition for their performance which won them the national title. The Vocational Industrial Clubs of America hold national conferences each year with entire involvement of all States. This group

is a very important part of our national youth development. I am proud of the accomplishments of the Lawrence County, Pa. Vocational Technical Team in capturing the National Opening and Closing Ceremonial Title.

AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY DEFENDS INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, this Labor Day, in a year when Americans have had to reexamine and reaffirm their basic constitutional freedoms of speech, assembly, and privacy, AFL-CIO President George Meany spoke out forthrightly to defend these values and the labor movement's solid support of them.

In an article in the AFL-CIO News of September 1, Mr. Meany set out labor's continuing interest in seeing these guarantees fulfilled.

It is a lesson we all should heed. For, as Mr. Meany points out in quoting William Pitt:

"Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves."

The article follows:

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS ESSENTIAL TO FREE UNIONS (By George Meany)

Labor Day is the day America sets aside to honor the free workers who built this nation and their unions which enable them to better share in the fruits of their labors.

It is a day for looking back on the accomplishments of the labor movement—free collective bargaining victories such as decent wages and working conditions to legislative victories such as social security, Medicare and federal aid to education.

It is a time for looking ahead, to set our sights higher and higher so that all Americans will benefit from economic justice and human dignity.

But it is time, too, to remember—to remember that the trade union movement could never have accomplished all that it has for its members and for society, if we did not live in a land of freedom.

So, on this Labor Day, it is proper that we consider how the rights and liberties enjoyed by all Americans affect us as workers and as citizens.

Freedom and individual rights are the basic ingredients of democracy. Freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, the right of privacy—these are not just nice conveniences; they are the fundamental elements of a free trade union movement.

Without freedom, there can be no free trade union movement. And since unions are the indispensable instrument of free workers to improve their standard of living, democracy is clearly the worker's staff of life.

But having rights on paper and exercising them in fact are not necessarily the same thing. What makes the American labor movement unique in the history of free people is that we exercise our rights, daily, diligently, and with determination.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM

Historically, it was the workers exercising their First Amendment rights of free speech and assembly who formed the first American unions. On the foundation of their individual rights, workers built a collective move-

ment—a movement dedicated to bringing workers a measure of economic freedom that would permit them to enjoy their other freedoms.

As an example, the right of every American to eat in a restaurant of his choice is meaningless if he does not earn enough to pay the dinner check. So we operate to translate rights into reality.

From its earliest days, the American labor movement has been a movement of dissent. Workers dissenting against economic exploitation. Workers dissenting against sweatshops and other substandard working conditions. Workers dissenting against employers' control of their lives, their homes, their schools, their opportunity to improve their lot and, most especially, that of their children.

Unions have never been very popular with "the establishment"—for dissent is never popular with those who have much and intend to keep it all. By its very nature, dissent is a questioning of authority. And a host of weapons—literally and figuratively—have been used by those in authority either to deny workers their rights or to coerce or subvert them into not exercising their rights.

Not so many years ago it was not uncommon for workers to be spied upon at work and in their homes. Phones have been tapped. Workers have been on the wrong ends of billy clubs, guns, fists, attack dogs and tear gas. Private and public armies have tried to intimidate workers and their unions.

Courts have enjoined workers from exercising their rights, and police have enforced these injunctions with violence and, sometimes, with death. But workers were not deterred.

New weapons were tried—the weapons of thought control and fear. Workers have been hooked up to so-called lie detector machines, monitored by television cameras and interrogated about intensely personal matters, about their private lives and their past, present and future actions.

RIGHTS VIOLATED

Workers have repeatedly seen their rights as free Americans violated—by public as well as private officials. Therefore it is no accident that workers are zealous of preserving the rights and liberties of themselves and all Americans—in preserving democracy.

Only in a democracy can workers control their individual destiny—economic and political. To be free, workers must live in a system where people are more important than wealth. And, in the final analysis, that is just what a democracy is all about.

We have seen what happens to our fellow workers in countries that have no democracy. That is why free workers always oppose dictatorships of the right and of the left.

History proves the case. In Mussolini's Italy, unions were the first targets of fascist terror. In Hitler's Germany, the Federation of Trade Unions was the first organized force to feel the deadly blows of the Nazi storm troopers.

In Czechoslovakia in 1948, the Communists used control of the unions and thus stifled effective, democratic opposition. Communist rulers in East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary had to crush workers' rebellions to remain in power. The Russian worker today has no right to freely associate, speak his mind, bargain with his employer—and, certainly, he has no right to strike.

Because workers know what it is like to have their rights trampled on and because they have seen what happens to workers and their unions in countries that have no freedom, they are justifiably concerned when these rights are endangered. Recent events have strengthened our resolve to protect these rights.

We know that workers cannot have freedom and democracy just for themselves. The genius of democracy is that it clothes every

citizen with equal rights, giving no person special treatment over another.

FEAR—A PERSISTENT THREAT

The most persistent threat to freedom, to the rights of Americans, is fear. The fear that government or an employer might take away an individual's job, or his ability to get a job—depriving him and his family of a livelihood—has intimidated more than one American worker.

Only in the absence of fear can ideas and men be truly free. Thus, Americans must know that they can freely express their ideas without being considered enemies of those in power.

Americans must know that their homes are thresholds over which no government can cross. They must know that loyalty to individuals or groups in power must be subordinate to loyalty to country.

They must know that justice will always be superior to power. They must know that their government respects their rights.

For a government that doesn't trust its citizens can not expect the citizenry to trust it.

The phrase "law and order" has been much used and much abused in recent years, but if "law and order" means anything it means that everyone—rich man, poor man, president and plumber—obeys the law; that the law has no favorites; that before it all men stand equal.

Certainly there can be no order if the law is not respected.

Some have contended that the enemies of society—drug pushers, traitors, mobsters—are so vicious and ruthless that the government must be vicious and ruthless in dealing with them.

Justice Brandeis had the answer to that specious argument. He said: "The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding."

GOVERNMENT MUST OBEY LAW

People obey the law when they know that those entrusted with its enforcement likewise obey. This means the government does not wiretap; does not burgle; does not terrorize law-abiding citizens in their homes on the basis of an informer's tip. As William Pitt stated, "Where the law ends, there tyranny begins."

That is why the AFL-CIO has strongly opposed legislation to permit the government to wiretap or to undermine the Fifth Amendment. And, for the same reasons, we oppose legislation to end strikes through government compulsion.

These are not separate issues. The issue is the same: the rights of individuals.

We reject the contention that it is "necessary" for the government to encroach on the rights of individuals for whatever reason. Again to quote Pitt: "Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves."

Today "necessity" has become synonymous with "national security." The labor movement has long held that the government has the power—indeed, the obligation—to defend the nation against any enemy who would deprive us of our liberty. But some today would deprive us of our liberty in the interests of what they call "national security."

The Constitution provides us with no definition, no guideposts of "national security"—except as to what constitutes treason. It certainly does not say that the President of the United States will solely determine what is "national security," what is a threat to it, and what extra-legal or illegal actions can be used to meet that threat.

If one man can determine unchallenged what is "national security," and then can justify crimes committed by his authority on that basis, democracy is dead. And we can never allow that to happen.

We flatly reject the notion that the way to fight communism is to undermine individual liberties and adopt the very tactics which make communism abhorrent to all who believe in human freedom.

UNPOPULAR VIEWS

We do not believe communism can be defeated and democracy saved by suspending the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment, or by outlawing unpopular views or ideas, whether by governmental fiat or vigilante action.

One of the aspects of totalitarianism which makes it so abhorrent is its destruction of the right of privacy.

The tools of those who would invade an individual's right of privacy are the tools of repression, thought-control and tyranny. Wiretaps, hidden microphones, closed circuit television monitoring people innocently pursuing their daily lives, lie detectors, tape recorders, personnel questionnaires, computer data banks, peepholes, cameras, spy glasses, private detectives—all have been and are being used to intrude upon the privacy of individuals. The claim is that this is "necessary." Employers say they spy on workers to catch malingerers and the thieves. Governments say they do it to protect "national security" as defined by one man.

Similarly, there are those—including some editorialists who otherwise support individual freedom—who claim it is "necessary" to deny workers the right to strike because of society's right to enjoy an uninterrupted flow of goods and services. Thus, they propose, the government should dictate the terms and conditions under which workers would be compelled to work.

Of course, the inevitable result of this illogical policy would be government dictation of all wages, prices, rents, profits—what a person could buy, how he could live, where he would worship, what he could write, say, think.

Strikes are an inconvenience. But the public's right not to be inconvenienced certainly is not paramount to the individual's right to be free.

President Eisenhower summed it up this way: "There are worse things than strikes—and one of them is the loss of freedom."

Ben Franklin said it earlier. "Those," he said, "who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety."

EXERCISING FREEDOM

The exercise of individual freedom causes each of us some inconvenience. Certainly, an Administration is inconvenienced at times by a free press or by demonstrators exercising their rights of assembly and petition. But it is far better for any Administration to be inconvenienced than that freedom be banished.

That's why the framers of the Constitution drafted the Bill of Rights. The rich and powerful don't need it but the poor, the weak, the downtrodden do.

The issue today is the rights of the people—Are they to be protected? Is government to be permitted to decide which laws are going to be obeyed and by whom and when? Are Americans going to be governed by laws or by whim?

Organized labor does not just brood about invasion of individual liberty. We attempt, with all the vigor at our command, to blunt the efforts of any who would pervert freedom, deny liberty, intrude upon privacy, undermine democracy.

We insist that working men and women—indeed all Americans—be treated in a manner commensurate with their inherent human dignity. And that can only be achieved in a nation dedicated to liberty, by a government committed without reservations to guaranteeing the rights of all the people.

On Labor Day 1973, we do not despair. We have faith in the people and in the true strength of the system of government they

established, fought for and nourished. And, for our part, we intend to help preserve, protect and defend that system and the rights and liberties of all citizens against any foe, any time and in any place.

Our consciences as free men and women will tolerate nothing less.

OVER 70 HOUSE MEMBERS ALREADY SPONSOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SELF-GOVERNMENT BILL

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the interest in the House has been encouraging for the adoption of the District of Columbia self-government and governmental reorganization bill, H.R. 9682. The committee voted 20 to 4 to report the bill favorably on July 31, and within 3 days there were over 60 Members agreeing to cosponsor the bill.

Today Chairman MADDEN, Chairman RODINO, Congressmen FLOOD, BURTON, LEGGETT, MATSUNAGA, and DE LUCA are joining in cosponsoring this bill for a new city government for the Nation's Capital. Each day reveals more of a groundswell for 1973 as the year of action on District of Columbia self-government.

The Senate has already passed its bill, by a vote of 69 to 17 on July 10 of this year. Democrats voted for the bill 41 to 7 and Republicans voted for it 28 to 10. I am hopeful that by the same substantial majorities the House will approve the House bill when it comes to the floor later this month.

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE: OUTDOOR RECREATION, AN INTERVIEW WITH JAMES G. WATT, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, during one of my recent television reports to my constituents, I interviewed Mr. James G. Watt. Mr. Watt is the director of outdoor recreation. I insert the dialog of that interview at this point:

RARICK. As the spendable income of American families rises and the number of hours actually spent at work decreases, Americans are using more time in various forms of recreation. Boating, fishing, hunting, camping, and many other forms of outdoor sports are popular in our part of the country. And their popularity is certain to increase.

Today we will look at outdoor recreation and a little-known federal bureau that works with our state officials to help preserve our great natural heritage for all Americans to enjoy.

Americans need outdoor recreation, especially in these times of increased urbanization. Sales of camping, boating and other outdoor sporting equipment has mushroomed to an all-time high. Bicycling has

become one of the country's favorite sports. Clearly, our people are looking to the great outdoors for relaxation and healthful activities.

To help us explore this area of American life, we have as our guest today the Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Mr. James G. Watt. Thank you for joining us today.

Mr. Watt is a native of Wyoming and has served as Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation since 1972. I understand that he is quite an outdoorsman himself.

Jim, we in Louisiana are also great lovers of the outdoors, and consider our state to be a "sportsman's paradise". Indeed, that is our state motto and it appears on all license plates. What is your bureau doing to help Louisiana continue to keep that title?

WATT. We are doing quite a bit. I wouldn't want to suggest to you that you're the Nation's greatest sportsmen to date, because most of us from Wyoming talk about the big game and so forth, but you have a good point. Louisiana is a fantastically great State for outdoorsmen and it is a sportsman's paradise.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation works closely with your State and local governments and the private sector in encouraging land-use planning activities. We feel that if the private sector can understand what the Federal, State and the local governments are going to do, we can cooperate in a manner which will make the land useful to the people. Some land should be retained in a natural state so that wildlife—birds, fish and the like—will not be destroyed or damaged but will be preserved in a natural paradise. Other parcels of land need to be used for industrial expansion. It is through land-use planning that we can preserve what needs to be preserved while providing adequate resources for the future. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is working closely with State and local officials in hopes that they'll take the lead in land-use planning. We must not allow the Federal Government to move in and do the land-use planning. That is a local responsibility.

RARICK. I'm glad to hear you say that and I'm sure so are many of our listeners.

WATT. I look forward to working with you to keep it that way. Let's keep the Federal Government out and let the local people do the local land-use planning.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation administers a fund—the Land and Water Conservation Fund—which is used to match State or local money for acquiring land or for developing recreation resources—for parks, recreation areas, tennis courts and swimming pools. We try to develop a balanced outdoor recreation program with a mechanism for preserving valuable natural areas.

RARICK. While we're on this Land and Water Resource Fund, can you tell our listeners how this is being used in Louisiana specifically?

WATT. In Louisiana we have found a good State government that has been very responsive to people like yourself, who like to see money well invested in outdoor recreation programs. In your district alone, the Sixth Congressional District, there are seventeen different acquisition and development projects, valued at over \$3.5 million. About 17,000 acres of land have been acquired under this program. There are some interesting projects, some great ones right in your district. Statewide we have obligated over \$15,770,000 in Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund money, since 1965.

RARICK. In other words, Louisiana is substantially benefiting through this fund.

WATT. Louisiana is one of the country's leading outdoor recreation States.

RARICK. Well, I know that Louisiana has made great use of available funds through your agency because I believe that at last count, we had expended all of the available money that had originally been allocated to

our State. Can you tell me which of the State agencies you work with on outdoor projects?

WATT. We work with several agencies in Louisiana. The Game and Fish Commission and the Parks and Recreation Commission are very responsive and we enjoy working with them.

RARICK. I believe in Baton Rouge it's BREC.

WATT. We've worked a lot with Whitey Lagasse. Whitey's been most responsive.

RARICK. What does the appropriations for the fund look like for 1974?

WATT. When States like Louisiana respond as they have, matching the Federal funds, it looks good. We expect full funding in Fiscal 1975 at the \$300 million level. In years gone by, not all the States have been as responsible as Louisiana in providing matching funds, so this year we're not budgeting the full \$300 million and giving the States an opportunity to catch up. Louisiana has been an outdoor recreation leader and needs more money than we are going to make available this year. Next year we'll have more funds at our disposal.

RARICK. So you're not going to penalize us merely because we have been using the funds?

WATT. Not at all.

RARICK. The Bureau also works in the area of environmental protection, I understand. How does it function in this respect?

WATT. Congressman, we look at the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation as the environmental conscience of the Department of the Interior. We do not have specific environmental responsibilities. We try to look at the total environmental perspective as to where the Department should be going. We evaluate, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, the impact a proposed highway might have on the environment or how an industrial site or a Federal building involving Federal funds might effect the local environment. We try to balance the need for development with the need for natural preservation. Such a balance will prevent undue environmental degradation while permitting essential development.

We have a strong philosophy that people are the purpose of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. When God created this earth and man, He created man as the principal and other things are for the benefit of man and we've got to get that balance. Too much fighting has been going on.

RARICK. In other words, you're using a common sense approach.

WATT. A little more common sense is needed, that's for sure.

RARICK. Under the Surplus Property program, any State, parish, city or town can apply to your bureau for surplus federal property to be used for public recreation purposes. How does this program work and what types of surplus federal property is available?

WATT. I'm glad you brought that subject up. We need help in this area. Your people can help to identify Federal land—whether it is a military base, or under-utilized land associated with a Veterans' Hospital, or an air strip that is not being used, or a naval dock, Coast Guard dock—or any type of Federal facility that is not being fully utilized. People can help us to identify those areas, and through some creative planning and imagination we can utilize them for park and recreation purposes. We can bring about the pressures needed to release these lands and facilities—buildings or whatever—to local or State governments for outdoor recreation purposes.

The President is taking a special interest in this program. He has called it the Legacy of Parks program and we have already transferred over \$150 million worth of Federal land and facilities to State and local governments for recreation purposes. Over 300 parcels of land have gone to non-Federal interests for park and recreation purposes. This is a great program. Let's see if we can't transfer some property in your district.

RARICK. Well, most of us think, talk about outdoor recreation and we think we are talking about the country and the forests and the woods, but you also work in the area of recreation in urban areas. And this is the type of surplus property you have reference to.

WATT. I have been referring to both types, but let's not just talk about wild areas. We take an interest in providing facilities where the people are, in the populated urban areas. We are interested in the best possible parks such as those we have provided in your district.

RARICK. Well, I was just going to ask you what specifically do you do to help the urban people, the city people in my district?

WATT. We provide professional recreation planners who work with your city and State people to help identify resources that might be made available and then, of course, through the Fund money can be made available for acquisition and development. We help provide the playground areas for high-density use, parks for picnicking or just strolling, and water-based recreation facilities.

Most of the recreation in America takes place within a few miles of home or work. Sometimes we think about recreation only in terms of getting into the car or truck and driving out to go hunting, fishing, or boating. However, most of our recreation is walking or bicycling—you mentioned bicycling being a big recreation interest now—playing in the backyard or gardening. We need to make more of these opportunities available to the people.

RARICK. If any of our people listening to this program are interested in reporting to you any instances of surplus property, where or how will they get in touch with you? Of course, they can always write to me.

WATT. Let me encourage them to write you and you can call me and we will take care of it that fast, O.K.?

RARICK. That's fine. And I think it's safe to say that surely your bureau's meeting with public acceptance and you're finding that your bureau is going over because the people are interested?

WATT. The people have given us tremendous support. Ours is a great program because people care.

RARICK. I think that it's only safe to tell you that of course, I voted for the bill and for the funding and I'm fully behind your bureau. I really appreciate your being on our program and helping to bring to our viewers in Louisiana some of the problems that you face and the hopes and aspirations of our federal system and cooperating with the people back home.

Our guest today has been Mr. Jim G. Watt, who is the Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Jim, we certainly appreciate your being with us on the program.

WATT. I look forward to joining you again.

CLEAN AIR AND FUEL ECONOMY

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on September 10 the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment will begin 2 weeks of intensive hearings on the implementation of the Clean Air Act. One of the subjects which we will be considering is whether the provisions of the act are a major contributor to this country's fuel shortage, and if so, what legislative remedies would be appropriate.

Today, I have introduced legislation

which would require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take action to insure that the policies of the act do not contribute to the fuel shortage. The bill would require the Administrator to prescribe regulations which would prevent motor vehicles subject to the provisions of the Clean Air Act from experiencing an increase in fuel usage. Second, the bill requires regulations to promote conservation of fuels by automobiles. Specifically, these regulations might include: mandatory labeling, establishment of fuel economy performance standards, limitation of optional equipment which increase fuel consumption, requirements for the use of elements of design which increase fuel economy, limitations on vehicle weight, and limitation on the use of features which impede fuel economy.

It would appear that, through implementation of these requirements, any increase in fuel consumption resulting from provisions of the Clean Air Act can be negated.

I emphasize that neither the policy of the bill nor its specific provisions reflect a final position on my part. The bill is intended only as a point of departure. I look forward to a thorough exploration of its provisions during the hearings.

ERSKINE COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SPEAKER REX L. CARTER

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Rex L. Carter, the distinguished and highly able speaker of the South Carolina House of Representatives, delivered a splendid commencement address recently before the graduates of his alma mater Erskine College at Due West, S.C. Opened in the year 1839, Erskine was one of the first 4-year denominational colleges in the South and has maintained its rich heritage of academic and spiritual excellence. We call to the attention of the Congress and the people of this Nation Speaker Carter's superb address:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE REX L. CARTER

I suppose that the easy thing for me to do would be to reminisce with you about my college days at Erskine for it is the most obvious thing we have in common. Our Alma Mater is something we have shared together. I said it would be easy. Perhaps I should have said it would be comfortable . . . comfortable because it would be simple, nostalgic . . . comfortable because it would put us on common ground and I would feel at ease. But we share other common ground. Our Erskine experiences are behind us. The challenges we share are ahead of us. And it is these challenges that I would like to discuss with you today.

It is normal procedure for commencement speakers to hurl forth great pleas to new graduates. Please that you lead your generation in building a better world. Commencement speakers by and large have an almost maternal attitude towards graduating college students for you represent the embodiment of the aspirations of every parent.

Throughout most of your lives your par-

ents have dreamt of the day when you would graduate, go out into the world and enjoy a better life than they had. In return, you like most college graduating seniors, have probably concluded that yes, my generation can build a better world, can enjoy a better life, than the last generation. As a commencement speaker, I am supposedly bound by tradition to challenge you to go out and build that better world and to tell you that all of mankind is waiting on your success. In your heart, you're supposed to resent the many ways my generation has failed to make a better world. This is the cycle that has been established by countless generations—a cycle of parental hope, adolescent accomplishment, academic recognition, commencement challenges and quiet resentment at the failures of previous generations.

I will not complete or repeat that cycle today for to be perfectly truthful, I haven't been waiting on your generation to save the world and despite what you've been told, neither have most of the other members of my generation.

My generation has been cognizant of mankind's shortcomings and has done a great deal to alleviate some of them. It has recognized the immorality of racial prejudice and arbitrary legal limitations and has done a great deal to reverse hundreds of years of prejudice. We have built a prosperity never witnessed in the history of the world; we have generally expanded the human and legal rights of every American citizen; we have provided for new levels of educational achievement; we have experimented with the wonders of mass technology, mass communications, and scientific achievement. While most of these experiments have led to improved life expectancy, comfort, and material wealth, some of them have created more problems than they have solved. But remember, every advance began as an experiment so we never expected every experiment to work out the way we had planned. Nevertheless, the direction proposed and followed by my generation has been a good one for it has expanded man's rights and provided more amply for his needs.

In short, the generation that preceded yours has left the world a better place than when we came into it. And so did the generation before mine and the one before that. And we can expect your generation to make further advances.

But it will be a while before my generation dies off and turns the world over to yours, so what happens now? It is really very simple. For the time-being you will stop being in a separate generation. Like every other class before you, you will soon stop looking at yourselves as separate and distinct from prior generations. Almost without knowing it you will be absorbed by the generation presently in charge of solving the world's problems. From occupying an anti-establishment position, you will soon, because of your academic success, become a part of the establishment. Your new role may chafe at first but it is a role in which your every action will make your adaptability easier. It is because of this assimilation that history and generations are contiguous. It is because of this absorption process that mankind is perpetually in forward motion. You adopt the motions of those who came before you and they, in turn, slowly adopt many of your new ideas and experiences. After all, it was their challenge to provide those experiences for you. A partnership is thereby established between every generation. A partnership that at some point in time become an equal partnership.

It is my hope that my generation learns to accept your new ideas quickly, for the pace of society has been greatly accelerated by new technological advances, particularly advances in mass communications. We can no longer afford to let new ideas have a suitable and long incubation period. We have to become more tolerant of new ideas, more ac-

cepting of new proposals if we are to achieve control of our own technology and continue to master the direction of our own destiny.

I truly hope that your college experiences have taught you the wisdom of many ideas and experiences uncommon to your own backgrounds before you took this extra step into the world of learning; and I hope that your education has taught you to feel both tolerant and comfortable with experiences, ideas, and life styles that have little in common with your own . . . for our country is desperately in need of a generation that is intent on continuing the American experience of diversity.

A few moments ago I spoke in glowing terms of the achievement of my generation and the generations before mine. I spoke of the new economic status enjoyed by the citizens of our State and Nation, a status won by advances in technology and communication as well as by a maturing human spirit. But there is a certain danger involved in each of these advances, in each of these experiments.

A danger that I hope your experiences will overcome. If there is any challenge that both your generation and my generation must now work together to meet it is in maintaining a diversity of opinion. I see the possibility of countless doors being closed in the future of this country, because so many Americans are looking for the comfort achieved by dealing only with those with whom we share common ideas and similar experiences. Every television program today is in many ways like every other television program. We have become very much a product of common aspirations . . . aspirations put forward to us on radio, through mass magazines and newspapers, through television, and through the other means of mass communication that we found it necessary to develop to deal with the mass population. We have become such a product of common aspirations that those who do not receive a college education are expected to feel inferior to those who do. Those who do not reach a precise level of economic success are forced to be both pitied and resented. Those who do accept mass ideas are to some degree forced to feel square and those who accept none of it are often outcast from a society that seems bound and determined to bend all of the aspirations of the Nation into a common mold.

You must remember that to do what is best for the majority in the long run . . . to share aspirations and goals . . . to want for everyone the best that they are capable of achieving is not to be confused with a blind rush to conformity . . . a blind insistence that what you perceive to be right for society is in fact what is right for society.

Such a view . . . such an insistence is visited upon us today in the public domain. It is called Watergate.

A handful of men placed in positions of immense authority found themselves imbued with the vision that they knew what was right and good for all America. And they swept aside our laws, our principles, even our Constitution in an irrational race to impose their distorted vision upon us all.

What you must remember is that more than one person can be right in almost any given set of circumstances based upon his own background . . . his own understanding of the matter at hand . . . his own frame of reference. You must keep in mind always that very few things are black or white but rather an infinite number of shades of gray.

I suggest that you go out not as the class of '73 to build a better world but to go out as individuals and maintain your own identity in a society dominated by mass media, mass technology. Keep your names . . . for they are more attractive than numbers. Keep your ideas . . . respect diversity and learn to work with your fellow man without robbing him of his uniqueness.

Because I am the Speaker of the House of Representatives I have a responsibility to

practice what I preach . . . to put into action what for you and I have just put into words . . . and I want you to know that I am trying to do just that.

A few weeks ago the Supreme Court handed down an order that has the potential of destroying the diversity that we as South Carolinians have recently learned to accept. I don't have to tell you that throughout most of our history we have tried to associate only with those with whom we shared common experiences. Whites associated with whites, blacks with blacks, the poor with the poor, and the rich with the rich.

But since the end of the Second World War, we have as a state, learned at an accelerated rate to accept each other and to build on our diversity rather than to be destroyed by it. The pace may not have been perfect but the direction is and it has brought South Carolina a prosperity and pride that we would have thought impossible only a few years ago.

Yet this new mandate by the court to reapportion the South Carolina House is being used by some to set a course that would assuredly take our State and our aspirations backwards.

Some men argue that the house, instead of basing representation on counties with the number of representatives determined by population, want to divide the house into 124 districts with equal populations. They argue that this single member district plan would allow greater minority representation, both racial and political, and of course, on paper the idea sounds fine. It even sounds like it is promoting the diversity which I think we should seek. But it isn't.

What it is doing is setting up 124 districts wherein the population of every district has the same set of common experiences. True, more blacks would properly be elected because there would be many predominately black districts. Whites would be elected in white districts, Democrats would be elected in Democratic districts, Republicans in Republican districts. But every one of the 124 men elected would in the long run have only one set of responsibilities and that would be to his district made up of people with whom he shared a common experience. Whites in white districts wouldn't have to consider the needs and aspirations of blacks; blacks in black districts wouldn't have to consider the needs of whites; Democrats wouldn't have to consider the representation of Republicans or vice versa. The alignment of the house itself would be formed along racial and political lines; with no one representing the people of the State at large.

Today, I represent a county made of whites and blacks, of farmers and industries, of a large city and small towns, and because I am elected by all the people of my county, I am forced by the pressures of democracy to represent the people with all of their diversities. If we have single member districts I might very well end up representing an all white middle class community with no responsibility for the poor, for the farmer, for the man from a small town, for the black, for anyone other than the limited group in my district.

There would be no more diversity in my responsibility. Multiply this effect 124 times and you end up with a House of Representatives wherein every man represents only those with whom he shares common experiences, and the antagonisms, the bickering, the insular alignment, the suspicions could well destroy the respect for the other man, for the other way of life that has taken us so long to achieve.

I want to see the aspirations of all South Carolinians respected and promoted by our Government and I shall do all within my power to see that the reapportionment of the South Carolina House is based on population districts based on whole counties or adjoining counties. I will oppose any single member

district plan designed to guarantee the election of men who will be forced only to represent the common experiences of the district in which they are elected and to oppose the representation of any other district with a dissimilar population group. I will not be a party to destroying the growing respect South Carolinians are building for each other.

There seems to be a headlong rush to force us all into the same mold. This is only one of the challenges we will share together. I have made a point today of saying that I did not see your generation apart from my own. I have emphasized how strongly I feel that upon leaving Erskine, you and your ideas will be assimilated by the generation who have left Erskine before you.

Everything you have done, everything you have learned, leads me to conclude that your ideas will be better than mine; just as I have learned that the ideas of my generation were in many respects better than the ideas of the generation that preceded me. I have talked to you briefly about two problems confronting us now. One, Watergate, on the national level; second, reapportionment here at home. These will no longer be academic subjects for you to consider. They will no longer be the point of classroom discussions or library conversations. They are a very real part of the world that you enter today. They are only examples. Examples of the immediate challenges that you face. I feel very strongly that you will not face them as a separate generation; but you will join with all other South Carolinians as individuals in trying to solve them.

I spoke briefly about a challenge that I personally think America must meet. The challenge of maintaining our individuality. The challenge of respecting diversity of heritage, diversity of ideas, diversity of background and position. I know that each of you will not be political firebrands. I know that each of you will not participate in every public discussion, but I do hope that each of you has learned one lesson . . . that there are more lessons than any of us will ever learn. And so, at the same time, has learned to respect the rights, ideas and diversity of others.

As the commencement speaker today, I have said my piece. I have shared my ideas with you, but in my other role as a public servant, I am obliged to listen and share your ideas, too. My door is open, as are the doors of most of the legislators in this state. We all have a responsibility to listen to what you have to say. Be content that they will listen to you not as the members of another generation, but as equals. An equality that you have earned and shall now hold through the remainder of your days. Use your power well and make certain that, when the time comes, you too respect the ideas of the next generation.

A JADED PUBLIC FORGETS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Bob Thomas in a Today article of June 27, 1973, offers several important comments on the contributions of science and technology in general, and specifically on the contributions of our space program and Skylab. This incisive article deserves the attention of those concerned with the future well-being of our Nation. The article follows:

A JADED PUBLIC FORGETS

(By Bob Thomas)

"Superficially, it is deceptively easy to furnish numerous examples of innovations from aerospace programs which have entered non-aerospace fields of medicine, commerce, business, industry and education.

"The list is impressive. But, individually, and scattered throughout the economy, they make little or no impression on the public."

That statement by Dr. Werner von Braun, made more than 15 months ago, still holds as gospel today.

The problem would seem to be that we are a nation of short-term pragmatists, and not mentally geared to long-range planning and deferred benefits from advanced science and technology programs.

It boils down to this: as a nation of individuals we ask only, "What have you done for us lately?" Some of us even ask, "What have you done for us today?"

Consider the world as we know it compared to the adventures of Marco Polo. Think of mass communications as we know that compared with Morse's first telegraph key. Consider the world of modern medicine compared with the knowledge available to Joseph Lister.

One is the beginning, and one is now.

This is the beginning of space science and technology. We are not privileged to see the future, but just an atom of imagination will unveil a vista of probabilities for us.

It will be for generations yet unborn to reap the fruits of experiments being conducted on board Skylab through the remaining months of this year.

The Skylab workshop orbiting the earth at an altitude of 270 miles, will not be visible—because of its planned trajectory—over Central Florida until the evening of July 10. Precise times of pass-overs, location in the skies, direction and duration of the sightings will be published the day before the events.

What man discovers in space today may not become a universally applicable reality until the beginning of the next century. But that is the frequent nature of scientific technology.

And who is to say what may be the serendipitous treasures 1960 coupled with a find of 1970 could easily result in some "medical miracle" of the '80s.

To quote Dr. George M. Low, deputy NASA administrator:

"On discussing the benefits of the space program it is helpful to distinguish generally between the different types of benefits that are realized.

"First, there are the benefits of space science and exploration. These are difficult to define but are nevertheless real. Today we are making practical use of scientific research conducted 30 to 50 years ago. In the same way, we can be sure that 30 to 50 years from now our children will be making practical use of the results of the science and exploration we are doing today, even if we cannot say exactly how this will come about."

And there is a second type of benefit—that which has a direct application to the advancement of aeronautical and space technology and systems.

These include, Low points out, "The improvements in civil and military aviation, improvements in communications and weather forecasting from the use of satellites, and the benefits in many fields that will be obtained through the use of earth resources satellites."

But the benefits of NASA programs do not stop there. There are the economic benefits to be considered. It is a generally accepted economic precept that a dollar invested in research and development returns more than \$7 to the economic mainstream in an 18-year period.

"Another important aspect of the economic benefits which flow from our programs in aeronautics and space," Low points out;

"concerns the increasing competition we must continually increase our productivity, and the only way to do this is through advancing our technology."

However distant the technology of space research and development may seem at the moment, chances are it will—or has already—touched your life.

METHADONE CONTROL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, methadone has become increasingly popular in the treatment of heroin addicts. Along with the increase in its legitimate use has come an increase in its diversion to the black market and a lack of control over methadone programs.

The lax conditions under which methadone is transported and delivered has contributed to its diversion to illegal channels. This situation led me to introduce in Congress the Controlled Substances Act of 1973.

The bill provides for the security and safekeeping of certain controlled substances including methadone.

Apparently, the situation has not been deemed dangerous enough and the bill has remained unacted on.

In an attempt to demonstrate the urgency of the situation I submit the following editorial by Mr. Herb Saltzman of WOR Radio and a press release issued by my office on March 21, 1973:

WOR RADIO EDITORIAL

(Speaking for WOR Radio, Herb Saltzman, Station Vice President and General Manager.)

It's time for the City to give harsh examination to methadone clinics in New York.

Two-thirds of the addicts under treatment in the City are on methadone. The clinics that dispense that heroin substitute are becoming as big a problem as heroin itself. Especially offensive are clinics privately run for profit by doctors. Some of those clinics are ruining New York's best neighborhoods.

Many clinics need cleaning up. Addicts often loiter near them, bothering local residents, their children and businessmen, sometimes selling their take-home doses to other addicts.

Frequently clinics are not in the communities where their need is greatest. For example, there are six privately-run clinics on the East Side. Some residents say the doctors who own and run those clinics won't work in areas with high-addict populations.

New York City should have control over the location of methadone clinics. They should also have a voice in locating clinics within their own neighborhoods. More police are needed to patrol the areas around these clinics.

The drug problem in New York is bad enough, without letting methadone clinics destroy the City's neighborhoods.

[Press release from the office of Congressman CHARLES B. RANGEL]

RANGEL INTRODUCES CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES SECURITY ACT IN CONGRESS

Calling present security arrangements in the handling, shipping and delivery of narcotics for medical clinics and pharmacies "criminally incompetent and increasingly dangerous for all Americans," Representative Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.) today announced his introduction of the "Controller

Substances Security Act of 1973" in the House of Representatives.

Rangel said, "In 1972, over twelve thousand methadone pills were lost in transit to my home city of New York. In dollar terms in the street this represents \$120,000 worth of methadone. In human terms, it means more illegal methadone sales in schools, homes and on city streets. It also most likely resulted in many of the methadone overdose deaths reported in New York City last year.

"The shipping of methadone and other narcotics from manufacturing companies," said Rangel, "is commonly done by commercial trucks, common carriers and through the mail. It is delivered in the same manner as cotton bandages and other supplies."

A recent New York Post article reported that one pharmacist, who asked not to be identified, said the methadone supply for his treatment program was often delivered and left outside on his doorstep.

Rangel demanded, in a letter to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, that this ridiculous practice be stopped. "The Federal Government has the responsibility to take an active role in insuring the security of controlled substances," said Rangel. "The 'Controlled Substances Security Act of 1973' will make the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, in the Justice Department, responsible for the security and safe-keeping of these narcotics. The BNDD, working with manufacturing companies, will issue guidelines and regulations outlining complete and proper procedures for securing shipments of methadone and other dangerous drugs. The Federal agency will have the power to fine manufacturers and ultimately take away their licenses if security measures are not established and maintained," Rangel explained.

The former U.S. Attorney said, "there is clearly a need to establish the type of program set forth in the 'Controlled Substances Security Act of 1973.' I hope that my colleagues in Congress will give serious consideration and swift approval to my proposal.

INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on August 20, 1968, tanks and troops of the Warsaw Pact, led by Russian troops marched into the nation of Czechoslovakia to put an end to the successful reform movement which had been in existence there for less than a year. This ruthless act shocked the world, and brought fear and anxiety to the hearts of the citizens of Eastern Europe.

On August 20, 1973 we face a much different world, a world in which an unprecedented era of international relaxation between nations is emerging. Nowhere is this improvement in relations more apparent than between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Yet, in Czechoslovakia today, many of the deplorable conditions which came about as a result of the invasion remain.

The courage and determination of the Czech people to resist the yoke of Soviet oppression has deeply impressed the world during the last 5 years. And there have been results. Worker unrest and

discontent both in Czechoslovakia, and in Poland in recent years have forced the Soviets to make the improvements in the quality of life for the citizens of Eastern Europe its highest priority. This has been clearly demonstrated by a series of recent dramatic economic agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union. As a result, for many in Czechoslovakia, there have been significant improvements in the average standard of living.

Yet for these same people, the struggle for the basic freedoms continues undaunted. It seems incredible that in this day such inherent freedoms as the right of free speech and free assembly are still denied to the people of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Speaker, let the fifth anniversary of this bleak day in the pages of world history serve as a reminder to the American people that the Soviets cannot be expected to carry out an effective detente policy with the United States unless they release their stranglehold on the nations of Eastern Europe. The fate and future of these beleaguered people should remain a paramount factor in the actions of American leaders in all our future dealings with the Soviet Union.

WHO REALLY WON THE BATTLE OVER FOOD PRICES?

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have been an avid reader of various farm publications which have been sent to my office unsolicited. As a Member of this body from a heavily urban area, I have felt an obligation to keep abreast of farm news and developments because of the direct impact of this vital information upon the consumers of my community.

This month's issue of the Farm Journal contains an article by the magazine's managing editor, Dick Braun, entitled "You Won the Battle Over Food Prices," which contains statements which could be of particular interest to millions of American consumers and taxpayers who have been subjected to unprecedented food price increases.

Of particular interest is Mr. Braun's statement that:

If the American consumers aren't willing to pay the current price for food, the world is full of consumers who will—and, temporarily at least, there isn't enough for everyone.

The thesis apparently exists among our agricultural community that it has no special responsibility toward supplying adequate, reasonably priced supplies of food to the American people. This thesis runs completely contrary to the thesis under which Congress operated for the last period of nearly 40 years, during

which huge sums of Federal tax dollars were voted to subsidize, support, pay directly, or give massive tax credits to the farmers of America to stimulate adequate production of a steady and reasonably priced supply of food.

It would now appear that the American farmers' true colors are showing, as evidenced by the comments by Mr. Braun. If the American consumer will not pay the asking price, whether that price results, he says, from shrewdly calculated market shortages because of withholding from market, or from incredibly massive shipments to food-short countries, then our own farmers will readily find buyers in other countries who will pay any asking price. The American farmer is now telling the American consumer that he is just one bidder among many and must suffer the consequences of not paying the asking price, no matter how high it goes.

Yet the American consumer-taxpayer has supported and subsidized the agricultural industry by well over \$100 billion in tax money during the last 30 years, specifically to assure the consumers of our own country adequate and reasonably priced supplies of wholesome foods. For that contribution, the consumer's thanks from the farmer has come in the form of unprecedented price increases and "shrewd" market manipulations through such clever devices, cited by Mr. Braun, as "chloroformed chicks" and "producers sending piggy-sows to market."

In addition, tax law has been written to allow farmers in America an unprecedented advantage over the average consumer and the farmer wisely has taken full advantage of every one of these laws. In response to a request from my office, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue and Taxation informed me that in 1970 proprietorship, partnership, and corporate farms in America paid a total estimated Federal tax of \$1.4 billion. During the same year the Federal Government, and thus the American taxpayer, subsidized these same farmers with \$5.4 billion.

The full text of the letter from the joint committee and the compilation of farm subsidies for 1971 are as follows:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON
INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1973.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VANIK: This is to confirm our telephone response on June 15 to your telephone request of the same date for an estimate of the Federal income tax paid by the agricultural sector of business.

We estimate that for calendar year 1970 (the latest year for which data are available) proprietorship, partnership, and corporate businesses engaged in agriculture, forestry, and fishing and showing a net profit had an income tax liability of \$1.6 billion. If a narrower concept of agriculture be employed to include only businesses characterized as "farms" the income tax liability is \$1.4 billion. The corporate share of these estimates of income tax liability approximates \$100 million.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE N. WOODWORTH.

THE ECONOMICS OF FEDERAL SUBSIDY PROGRAMS, JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: JAN. 11, 1972

TABLE 5-1.—GROSS BUDGETARY COSTS OF FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDIES, FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

(In millions of dollars)

Program	1970 actual	1971 estimated
Direct cash payments:		
Direct payments for commodity purchases ¹	398	316
Feed grain production stabilization	1,644	1,510
Sugar production stabilization	93	84
Wheat production stabilization	863	891
Wool and mohair payments	53	72
Cotton production stabilization	828	918
Conservation related programs ²		
Dairy and beekeeper indemnity payments ³		
Tax subsidies: Expensing and capital gains for farming	880	820
Credit subsidies:		
Emergency credit	6	
Farm operating loans	8	
Soil and water loans	17	
Price-support loans	87	
Storage facility and equipment loans	2	
Farm Ownership Loans	68	
Rural electrification loans	179	
Rural telephone loans	67	
Crop insurance ⁴	9	
Order of magnitude total	5,202	

¹ As was indicated above, the correct estimate of the gross budgetary cost of this kind of farm subsidy is the difference between what Government pays for the commodities and what it sells them for. It has not been possible to make such calculations for the many commodities the Government now supports through purchases. The subsidy cost figure used above is the overall net loss for the Commodity Credit Corporation, reported in their annual Report of Financial Condition and Operation. This is a very crude proxy that probably underestimates the actual subsidy per commodity. For more detail on this program see app. D.

² At a minimum this would include Rural Environmental Assistance, Great Plains Conservation, Cropland Adjustment, Conservation Reserve, and Emergency Conservation Measures. The gross budgetary cost for fiscal 1970 of approximately \$320,000,000 for these programs has been accounted for under "Natural resources."

³ Although the obligations in fiscal 1970 and 1971 were not significant, they rise to \$5,000,000 in fiscal 1972.

⁴ This figure represents the amount by which expenses exceeded revenues for fiscal year 1970. As of June 30, 1970, the Corporation reflected a deficit of \$33,700,000 as a result of expenses and indemnities exceeded revenues in past years.

Source: "1971 Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance"; "The Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 1972"; "The Budget of the U.S. Government—Appendix, Fiscal Year 1972"; "Special Analyses, Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 1972"; Department of Treasury estimates, app. A and B.

It seems to me that the consumers of our country deserve a fair and equitable deal from the agricultural industry. Since almost all of the great strides made by the farmers of America in development of modern farming techniques, finance, storage, and sale have been subsidized or paid outright by all the taxpayers of America, those same taxpayers hardly deserve to be gouged by the same farmers who were the willing beneficiaries of taxpayer largesse in past years.

The American consumer-taxpayer has the right to expect adequate and reasonably priced food supplies even if it requires stringent and automatically triggered export licensing controls to assure adequate domestic supplies. Contrary to the assertion made by Mr. Braun, the farmer has no right to expect that he may automatically bypass domestic food needs of our own people in favor of foreign consumers with ready dollars, without regard to selling price. We must demand our adequate share of American farm production after which we can attend to foreign sales.

It is totally unsatisfactory that our

consumers must now spend 100 percent or more for chicken than they did a year ago; it is absurd that we must shell out as high as 40 percent more for wheat-related products which stem from a bungled wheat sale to other nations; it is equally ridiculous that because of that same deal, feed-grain costs have soared into space, forcing meat off the American diet and out of the reach of millions of our own consumers. While no one I know would deny fair and reasonable returns to all segments of our economy, excessive and unreasonable demands and gains by our agricultural sector serve only to alienate the 93 percent of the country who have loyally supported and subsidized the agricultural sector. While Mr. Braun may be correct in stating that the "Farmers have won the battle over food prices,"—his emphasis—I would contend that these same farmers may rapidly be on the way to losing the war: the war on inflation; the war for sound nutrition; the war against hunger; the war for equity and justice for matters such as these.

There was always a need for food throughout the world. There was not always an opportunity to buy at bargain prices which developed through devaluation. Foreign cash buyers will disappear as devaluation ebbs. The current food inflation may permanently eliminate taxpayer subsidies to the farmer and critically limit taxpayer-supported gifts of food. Farmers may have indeed won the battle over food prices—but they are permanently losing out with the destruction of the successful partnership between farmer and consumer which increased productivity, guaranteed income and produced essential food and fiber at fair and decent prices.

The full text of Mr. Braun's article is as follows:

[From Farm Journal, September, 1973]

YOU WON THE BATTLE OVER FOOD PRICES

(By Dick Braun)

It's hard to believe, but just a few short months ago housewives carrying meat boycott signs lined up around supermarkets to drive down the price of meat. (It didn't work.) This month they were lining up again—this time jostling each other to grab the last pieces remaining in the beef cases. After all the frenzied protests, price was suddenly unimportant as many over-bought to build a "meat cushion" in their freezers.

Like bolts of lightning the chloroformed chicks, the unemployed butchers and the barren display cases hammered the near-dazed consumers with these facts of life:

The price ceilings, which many had demanded, only delayed the inevitable explosion in food prices—and stripped the counters of beef.

Food at bargain-basement prices had finally gone the way of the \$800 automobile, the \$2 shirt, and 5¢ cigar.

If American consumers aren't willing to pay the current price for food, the world is full of consumers who will—and, temporarily at least, there isn't enough for everyone.

Farmers are exercising market shrewdness by holding beef and grains for higher prices, preventing price-depressing gluts on the market even at harvest. Wheat prices, for example, actually increased as harvest progressed. Farmers were holding 75% of their crop.

Farmers have spent millions to promote and advertise their products, but no promotion is as effective as the news of shortages.

TV networks and newspapers showed: broiler growers killing chicks that would lose money; producers sending piggy sows to market; cattle feeders holding cattle because ceiling prices would mean a loss; others selling to Japan and Canada because they paid more money; packing plants closing down and laying off workers. When all that happened, the old custom of taking food for granted evaporated like dry ice on the Sahara desert.

Consumers got the message. They could foresee even worse meat shortages if prices were not allowed to rise above cost of production. They couldn't stop talking about those chloroformed chicks. Sure, they'll continue to complain, but more consumers now understand that the very club they demanded to drive back prices—the price freeze—turned into a boomerang. Economists said it would happen; Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz has said many times it would happen, before he bowed to Administration policy.

Those reasons prompt our headline: Farmers have won the battle over food prices. Also:

THE ADMINISTRATION IS BUCKING

The price freeze came off all food except beef, and that fades away on Sept. 12. Possibly sooner. After a meeting with cattle feeders and packers early this month, Secretary of Agriculture Butz assured them that, were it up to him, he'd remove the price freeze on beef now.

There were further indications that "unfreezing" arguments would be pushed before the Cost of Living Council, though a Council spokesman and Secretary of Treasury George Shultz both expressed firmness on continuing the beef freeze until Sept. 12. Either way, you win on Sept. 12.

CONGRESS GAVE IN

Remember all the pressure for a food price freeze from members of Congress last Spring? Well, the Senate voted 84 to 5 early this month to lift the beef price freeze immediately. Obviously, Senators are now convinced of the failure stuck out so every one could see.

In Omaha, over 300 beef companies and wholesalers from the East and Midwest filed suit against the government's freeze on beef prices, charging discrimination against beef. A Pennsylvania meat dealer asked a U.S. District Court to declare the beef freeze unconstitutional in a class action suit on behalf of the nation's retailers.

Packing houses across the country were closing in droves—101 by early August. Armour announced a 60% cutback in meat production. Laid-off workers were loudly complaining, and even the unions were giving second thoughts to their clamor for price controls. Meanwhile several supermarket chains were buying cattle direct from feedlots and having them custom-slaughtered by packers to keep beef in their meat cases.

Canadian buyers flocked into Midwestern markets. They said it was because of a shortage of grain-fed beef in Canada. They were selling beef back into the U.S. at above-ceiling prices; that's legal.

Black markets and price kickbacks were thriving, the press wires chattered (though without verification). Hijacking of beef trucks and cattle rustling activity quickened. A U.S. attorney in New York impaneled a Federal grand jury to investigate alleged illegal activity resulting from the price freeze.

Amid all that melee, some were questioning if there was actually a shortage of beef. Internal Revenue Service investigators,

charged with keeping tabs on beef prices, claimed they could find no real beef shortage. But cattle slaughter figures showed a drop of more than a third in one week early this month, compared with average weekly slaughter figures for the month of June.

It seems likely, as we go to press, that the giant tidal wave for price controls on food has moved back to sea, washing with it the advocates of price controls on food. And while there will be more efforts, such as export controls, to hold down your prices, you've won the big battle of the price freeze.

**MRS. HELEN COLES: A TRULY
REMARKABLE WOMAN**

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate Mrs. Helen Coles for her achievements during her 30-year career with the IBM division of the New York City Board of Education.

Mrs. Coles is a truly remarkable woman both on and off the job. Her dedication to people and to life itself is truly commendable. In this respect I submit the following article from the *Amsterdam News* of July 28, 1973:

NEW YORK—YOUR TOWN

Helen Coles is a practical woman. She shows it in everything she does, from her position as a Provisional Administrative Assistant IBM in the Board of Education, to her post as President of Local 1251, District Council 37, to her preoccupation with politics as a District Captain in the Democratic Party and a member of her union's Political Action Committee.

At work, Helen is in charge of a unit in the Bureau of Management Information data processing for the Board of Education Payroll Division.

Her job is to prepare information for the computers that print out the checks of employees who do not receive the same regular check each pay period.

This covers substitute teachers and others who work on an hourly or daily basis and whose salaries must be computed each time.

\$6,000,000 A MONTH

"We process usually at least six million dollars a month," says Helen "and in September and February considerably more."

At those times, with the start of the new terms, Helen's unit has to prepare information for new employees, people who transfer schools, change their states, etc. During the year, all payroll changes, such as the number of deductions, raises, back pay or anything out of the ordinary must be cleared through Helen's group. "We have a very good production control system," Helen says, "we know anytime paychecks are held up unnecessarily it won't be long before we hear quite loudly from the people who are waiting for their money."

LONG LINES

Helen went to work for the Board of Education after a lengthy career in the phone company. "I was in long lines and I felt I learned all there was to learn and there was nowhere to go. Besides," she adds, "their idea of a pension at that time was my idea of not much at all."

She started her career with the City as a Tab Operator and rose steadily up the ladder to Senior Supervisor, and her position today as a unit head. "The day I joined the Board, I joined the union," she points out. Her career in the union was equally consistent as she went up the ranks of her local from Shop Steward to Treasurer to her first election as President in 1970.

Local 1251 is made up of over 1900 employees of the Board of Education, predominantly white. Helen's third local Presidential election comes up next fall and she is quietly confident that she will be reelected by the membership.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY

In addition to the day-to-day administration of her union affairs, Helen's activist instincts are channeled into politics through her union and local Democratic Party.

On the day this article appears, she will be up in Albany as part of a lobbying effort for District Council 37. "We'll be there to show strength in numbers and to go door to door to the legislators if we have to," she says. The object of this trip is to preserve the pension rights negotiated by civil servants with the City. "I know the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, but this is ridiculous," says Helen Coles, "now after thirty years work they want us to retire to welfare."

HER BAG

To Helen Coles, "politics is my bag, I only wish I could make the rest of my folks see that. Every thing we go through, everything we get or don't get is determined by politics." A confirmed anti-Rockefeller New Yorker, Helen will campaign, too, against the pending transportation bond. "Rich people will make money on tax free bonds and we'll be saddled with more debt and sooner or later the fare will go up anyway," in her opinion. Helen's political efforts are based on a thorough knowledge of current affairs, strong opinions and lots of energy. In the Presidential election last fall she led a group of eight volunteers ringing doorbells to get out the vote in East New York. "Election Day we were out at 6:30 a.m. and I want to tell you there's nothing worse for me than to hear a brother or sister tell me he's not going to vote."

As with most busy people, the more Helen does, the more she finds time for. She sews, too, as Vice Chairman of the Prison Task Force of Riverside Church.

Helen Coles was born in Greenwich Village, educated in Virginia, attended Xavier University in New Orleans. Her son, Carl, is Manager of Data Processing for CBS, daughter Donna is an Administrative Assistant for a major corporation. A granddaughter, Courtney, "is the smartest of us all," according to Helen. Husband Bill Coles is in charge of microfilm for the State Supreme Court and makes his vocation his avocation as an inveterate camera bug.

**THEY EXPLORE WORLD OF WORK,
STUDY**

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an unheralded NASA program of importance to the country was recently cited in the *Daily Press* of Newport News, Va. In the July 15, 1973 edition, Elaine Justice,

Daily Press staff writer, described the National Aeronautics and Space Administration student work-study program. This commendable effort warrants wider understanding as a contribution to our most important resource—young Americans. The article follows:

**NASA CO-OPS—THEY EXPLORE WORLD OF
WORK, STUDY**

(By Elaine Justice)

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is doing more than sending men to the moon. It's also helping young men and women to achieve greater career heights by a practical work-study program called cooperative education. The co-op program is a part of the curriculum of 370 colleges and universities all over the country with almost 70,000 students participating. This number is rapidly increasing, too, because the program has merits not easily ignored by today's college student.

The major advantage in attending college through the co-op program is that it allows a student to make a smooth transition from academic life to a satisfying career by alternately working and attending school on a year-round basis. "I didn't know what I wanted to do," said NASA co-op student Joseph Farmer of his college plans. He related that the co-op program had not only given him a chance to investigate a promising career, but that it had enabled him to stay more interested in school.

The co-op program not only helps students explore different careers but often enables many to attend college who might otherwise not have gone. High school students who sign up for the 4 year co-op program in the spring of their senior year can go into pre-co-op programs in which they work 3 months in the summer before their freshman year of college. This not only enables the student to earn needed money for school but makes him eligible for financial assistance during his freshman year at a college or university.

In addition, most companies with co-op programs try to hire as many of the program's participants as they can, making it easier for students who've completed the training to obtain jobs in an ever-competitive job market. "Out of the five graduates from our co-op program this year, we were able to hire four," said the director of the program at NASA, Joshua Foyles. "We like to appeal to the better students," he related, and added that a really good student who has completed college under the program would have no trouble getting a job with any top firm.

The co-op program at NASA is "small but active" in the words of one employee, and it does seem highly efficient in its operation. The total number of trainees at NASA under the program is around 52, but only a portion of that number are on the job at any one time because of the varying work-study schedules. Students can alternate work and school on a quarter, semester or even yearly basis. "It takes five calendar years to finish school this way," stated Foyles, but he went on to relate that the students graduating under the program have 15 months job experience, which is a big advantage in finding a career or just a job after college.

There are three types of co-op students at NASA. The three-year co-ops from two-year colleges such as Thomas Nelson will obtain a degree in applied science after completing the program specializing in mechanical or electronics technology. The five-year co-ops at four-year institutions can start the program as pre-co-ops and return after the freshman year as full co-ops who will receive degrees in everything from business administration to physics.

While on the job, trainees get "fringe benefits" which include fifty per cent of their health insurance paid, one third of their life insurance paid, 13 days of sick leave, and an annual leave of 13 days per year after the first work-study period. The program even pays for all except one round trip of the trainee's transportation to and from college.

At present, a new co-op program in secretarial science is in the planning stages and will be open to participants during the 1973-74 school term.

PUTTING THE CIA IN ITS PLACE

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the Watergate affair has given added impetus to congressional efforts to put an end to the awesome ability of the Central Intelligence Agency to undertake covert military and paramilitary operations and restore the CIA to its intended role as a gatherer and evaluator of intelligence.

Under five Presidents, and with at least the tacit assent of Congress, the CIA has been able to establish an enormous, far-flung apparatus that frequently has assumed a major, and in my judgment improper, role in American foreign policy. The Bay of Pigs fiasco, the covert operations in Vietnam as disclosed in the Pentagon Papers, and the not-so-secret war in Laos are but a few examples of the CIA's ability to make and execute foreign and military policy outside the purview of Congress and the public.

In both the 92d and 93d Congresses, I have authored legislation aimed at removing the authority of the CIA to undertake military operations. The CIA has a proper and a valuable role in the gathering and evaluation of intelligence and I would not want that function eliminated. But operations such as the CIA's war in Laos are fraught with peril and cannot be condoned in the absence of specific congressional approval and public debate.

With the hope that the work of the 93d Congress will not be concluded without enactment of legislation restricting the CIA to its proper role, I present for the consideration of my colleagues a useful and cogent analysis of the CIA by Andrew Hamilton, appearing in the September edition of the Progressive.

The analysis follows:

THE CIA'S DIRTY TRICKS UNDER FIRE—AT LAST
(By Andrew Hamilton)

For the first time in more than two decades, Congress is beginning to take a hard look at the Central Intelligence Agency. In the wake of revelations of CIA complicity in the Watergate affair, a serious debate about the Agency is now taking shape, and it could develop into an historic battle over the role of clandestine operations in American foreign policy.

"Clandestine operations" (which should not be confused with the gathering of foreign intelligence) include a wide range of political, propaganda, economic, cultural, and

paramilitary activities known within the CIA as "covert action" and "special operations," or, more generally, Dirty Tricks. These operations have included, over the years, such practices as:

Hidden support and assistance to political parties in foreign election campaigns.

The establishment of dummy foundations to provide funds for a number of private organizations engaged in scholarship, propaganda, labor, youth, and cultural affairs.

Establishing ostensibly independent, private companies, including a number of airlines.

Arranging coups d'etat; supporting, training, and leading private armies and air forces in foreign nations.

Helping to establish security police organizations in a number of countries, and other Cold War ploys.

The CIA operations amount, in total, to a clandestine American foreign policy under the exclusive control of the President, insulated from public control and even from public scrutiny—not to mention Congress itself.

President Nixon has given a clear signal that he places a high value on covert operations. His new Director of Central Intelligence, William Egan Colby, fifty-three, spent his adult life in Dirty Tricks, beginning with OSS guerrilla operations in World War II and culminating in a twelve-year stint as one of the CIA officials most deeply involved in the Vietnam war.

Colby was CIA station chief in Saigon (and a staunch supporter of President Ngo Dinh Diem) from 1959 to 1961. From 1962 through 1967 he was chief of the Far East Division of the Clandestine Services, the formal title of the operating arm of the CIA. From 1968 to 1971 he was involved with the "pacification" program in Vietnam, first as deputy and later as ambassador in charge. In 1971-72 he was back in Washington again as Executive Director (number three man) at the Agency. When that post was abolished in a reorganization this year, he became head of the Directorate of Operations, which runs the Clandestine Services.

Colby is a quiet, undemonstrative man—"when he's really mad he's almost whispering," recalls a former employee—whose mild manner conceals the toughness and boldness of a behind-the-lines guerrilla fighter. He has the reputation of being one of the CIA's most resourceful managers of Dirty Tricks. He was responsible, as head of the pacification program, for American participation in the Phoenix program in which thousands of Vietnamese suspects were killed or jailed on suspicion that they worked for the Vietcong.

Senator William Proxmire, Wisconsin Democrat, complained during the recent debate on Colby's nomination that the Senate was being asked to cast a "blind vote." He observed: "We don't really know who Mr. Colby is. We are not allowed to go back into his personal employment history and judge his fitness. We do not know what jobs he has accomplished. . . . And we will be confirming him for a blind position [about which] we know very little. . . ."

Although the Senate confirmed Colby August 1 by a vote of eighty-three to thirteen, the decisive battle will begin this fall. Senator John C. Stennis, Mississippi Democrat, has announced that his Senate Armed Services Committee will hold hearings on the CIA's basic legislative charter to determine whether the Agency exceeded its authority in waging war in Laos and in its involvement with the White House "plumbers" in the Watergate affair.

Stennis's Committee is the one whose CIA Oversight Subcommittee has failed to meet

for several years, and whose members have rarely expressed any interest in supervising the secret and powerful Agency. But the hearings come amid a growing feeling in Washington—expressed even by Chairman Stennis—that the CIA's Cold War mission as the clandestine action arm of U.S. foreign policy no longer serves the national interest, if it ever did.

The man who founded the CIA in 1947, President Harry S. Truman, reached this conclusion a full decade ago. In 1963, he wrote: "For some time I have been disturbed by the way the CIA has been diverted from its original assignment. It has become an operational and at times a policy-making arm of the Government. . . . I never had any thought that when I set up the CIA it would be injected into peacetime cloak-and-dagger operations."

Other Presidents have had qualms about the CIA. John F. Kennedy, a former aide once said, wanted to "splinter it into a thousand pieces and scatter it to the winds" after the Bay of Pigs disaster, a CIA-planned operation which Kennedy had approved. Lyndon B. Johnson, hardly a shrinking violet when it came to U.S. exploits abroad, was appalled by the ramifications of some CIA operations. When he took office he learned, according to an account by Leo Janos in the July, 1973, *Atlantic*, that "we had been operating a damned Murder Inc. in the Caribbean." Even Richard M. Nixon, in a 1969 speech to CIA employees, acknowledged that "this organization has a mission that, by necessity, runs counter to some of the very deeply held traditions in the country, and feelings, high idealistic feelings, about what a free society ought to be."

But President Kennedy, like his successors, soon came to recognize the immense potential of an organization whose acts could be neither traced by the victims nor supervised by his political opponents in Congress. The Kennedy years, in the opinion of one former intelligence official, became "the heyday" for the CIA's covert political intervention in other countries. President Johnson followed by unleashing massive CIA operations in Laos and South Vietnam. And President Nixon, in the same 1969 speech, concluded that the CIA "is a necessary adjunct to the conduct of the Presidency."

What both troubled and attracted these Presidents was not the CIA's "quiet intelligence" activities, but its wide range of Dirty Tricks. In the decade since Harry Truman's warning, little has been done to curb the President's own Back Alley Boys. Except for a handful of progressives, Congress continued politely to look the other way and ask no embarrassing questions. Now, in the lurid light of Watergate, Congress can no longer refuse to take a closer look.

By their very nature, covert operations defy effective Congressional oversight. A handful of men in the House and Senate, senior members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, are the only members of Congress allowed to ask the Agency what it is doing. Their meetings have always been secret, and their deliberations are never disclosed even to other members of Congress. Their recommendations to the Agency, if any, have never been tested in general debate or put to a vote of Congress.

From the time of its inception, the CIA's name has been synonymous with secrecy; no outsider can hope to obtain more than a rough map of its terrain. It is the Agency's practice neither to confirm nor to deny any allegations made about it. CIA employees take the most stringent secrecy oath administered by the Government. This oath has been interpreted by the Agency as prohibiting a present or former employee from re-

vealing anything he has learned while working for the CIA—an interpretation that has won at least partial support in the Federal courts. Victor Marchetti, a former CIA official, is under court order to submit the manuscript of his forthcoming book about the Agency for review before publication, and the Agency has been authorized to make deletions, provided they are not arbitrary or capricious.

But the Agency has found it impossible to remain wholly invisible. The picture I present here was assembled from the public record (which grows longer almost daily), and from interviews conducted over a period of several years with a number of present and former CIA employees, intelligence officials from other U.S. agencies, foreign service officers, Congressional sources and Administration aides. (While I had a limited contact with CIA intelligence analysts when I served as a member of the National Security Council staff in 1970-1971, I had no contact with the clandestine organization or activities of the CIA.)

The CIA has both a public and a secret charter. The public charter, on which Senator Stennis's hearings will focus, is found in the National Security Act of 1947 and its 1949 amendments (U.S. Code Chapter 50, Title 15, sections 403 ff.). It is the vaguest of charters, stating that the CIA shall "coordinate" intelligence activities undertaken in the interest of national security and shall:

Advise the National Security Council regarding national security intelligence activities.

Make recommendations to the NSC for coordination of intelligence activities.

Correlate, evaluate, and disseminate national security intelligence.

Perform "for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies such additional services of common concern" as the NSC directs.

"Perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct."

The last two provisions provide the official rationale for the CIA's clandestine activities, both in collecting intelligence and in performing covert operations. These duties are detailed in the Agency's "secret charter"—a series of top-secret Presidential orders known as National Security Council Intelligence Directives, or "N-Skids."

The Senate Armed Services Committee, which has jurisdiction over the National Security Act, apparently has never seen these documents, though they are essential to an understanding of the CIA's clandestine operations. Colby, the new director, recently promised to make the "N-Skids" available to the Committee, but there is no reason to assume that they will be disclosed to the public.

Section 403(d) also contains two seemingly contradictory provisos regarding CIA activities within the United States. One declares that "the Agency shall have no police, subpoena, law-enforcement powers, or internal security functions." The other states that "the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure."

The first proviso, which the CIA apparently violated in extending assistance to the White House "plumbers," was intended to protect the FBI's turf from CIA encroachment and to restrict the CIA to foreign intelligence activities. The second proviso, however, seems to give the Director scope for a broad range of domestic counter-intelligence activities. Whatever the justification, the CIA has not been reluctant to undertake clandestine operations within the United States.

The Act also permits the Agency to keep secret its budget, organization, personnel strength, identity of personnel, and other operational and administrative details, notwithstanding other provisions of law, and to spend money without regard for normal Government procedures.

Three points about the CIA's charter stand out:

First, the Agency is answerable directly to the President, and to the President alone. (The National Security Council is merely an advisory body made up of Presidential appointees—the Secretaries of State and Defense and the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.)

Second, the CIA enjoys extraordinary freedom from public and even Congressional scrutiny.

Third, its duties encompass much more than the routine collection and evaluation of information. "The powers of the proposed Agency," warned Secretary of State George C. Marshall in a memorandum to President Truman in 1947, "seem almost unlimited and need clarification."

The CIA grew rapidly from its first days in 1947. ("Bigger than [the Department of] State by '48," was a common boast.) The Agency now has about 16,500 employees (after a seven per cent reduction in force put into effect earlier this year by Director James R. Schlesinger, now Secretary of Defense). In recent years its direct budget has hovered around \$750 million, including funds for direct expenses and covert projects, but it may now be slightly lower as a result of the winding down of the wars in Vietnam and Laos.

Similar in size, budget, and overseas staff, the CIA rivals—if it does not surpass—the Department of State as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy. In *A Thousand Days*, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. wrote that in 1961 the Agency "had almost as many people under official cover overseas (i.e., posing as employees of other Government agencies, such as the Foreign Service or AID) as State; in a number of countries CIA officers outnumbered those from State in the political sections (of the U.S. mission). Often the CIA station chief had been in the country longer than the ambassador, had more money at his disposal, and exerted more influence."

This situation seems to have changed little in the last twelve years. Some recent U.S. foreign policy officials believe that the CIA's overseas employees, both direct and indirect, U.S. nationals and foreign, including those operating under "deep cover"—that is, with no visible ties to the U.S. Government—far outnumber those of the State Department.

For a variety of reasons, the CIA's direct budget (including project money) does not begin to tell the full story of the Agency's size or role within the Government:

In large overseas clandestine operations, such as the war in Laos, covert activities in Vietnam, and the Bay of Pigs invasion, direct Agency costs and project funds represent only a fraction of the total costs to the U.S. Government. The staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee found earlier this year, for instance, that of the \$375 million ceiling set by legislation for spending in Laos (until recently a CIA operation) during the last fiscal year, only \$5.5 million represented direct CIA expenditures, while another \$60 million was distributed by the CIA as project money for support of Laos and Thai irregular troops. The rest of the funds were supplied from the budgets of the Agency for International Development and the Defense Department. (These Laos program figures exclude additional large costs for U.S. air operations in Laos, many of

which have been in support of CIA-directed military operations.)

The CIA has financed, and apparently controls, a number of private corporations which provide cover for covert activities overseas. Of these the largest and best known is Air America. Earnings from these activities are said to be available to the Agency in addition to the annual budget provided from general Federal revenues.

The CIA has the use without cost, according to former officials, of U.S. military bases and "surplus" equipment, from which it is said to have built up a large worldwide supply and operational base network.

For these reasons alone, the CIA has been called a multi-billion annual operation. But, in addition, the Director of Central Intelligence, in his role as head of the U.S. foreign intelligence community, has responsibilities for coordinating the activities and reviewing the budgets of all U.S. foreign intelligence agencies and operations. In total, these activities—most of them under Defense Department auspices—cost between \$3 billion and \$4 billion a year, not counting the CIA.

These operations include the costly overhead reconnaissance activities of the Air Force (such as spy satellites, U-2s, SR-71 aircraft); communications and signals intelligence, which come under the direction of the \$1-billion-a-year National Security Agency; the analytical staffs and operations of the Army, Navy, and Air Force intelligence agencies; the Defense Intelligence Agency; the minuscule State Department Bureau of Intelligence and Research; and such miscellaneous other organizations as the National Photo Interpretation Center and the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, the latter of which transcribes and translates overseas radio broadcasts. When the tactical military intelligence operations of the various military commands around the world are included, the annual cost may reach \$6 billion, according to some sound estimates. In cost, personnel, and influence, the foreign intelligence "community" ranks with or above several Cabinet departments.

The CIA is organized into four main divisions, known as "directorates," each headed by a deputy director. Until recently, these men reported more or less formally to the Executive Director, nominally the Agency's number three man. Under Schlesinger's reorganization plan, the post of Executive Director was abolished early in 1973 and the incumbent, at that time William E. Colby, was made the head of the Agency's largest branch, the Directorate of Operations, which has responsibility for all clandestine activities and for the CIA's eighty-five overseas stations. In recent years this Directorate (formerly called "Plans") has had about 6,500 to 7,000 employees and a budget of about \$350 million, or nearly half the Agency total.

The other directorates are:

Intelligence, which collates, analyzes, and disseminates intelligence collected by all U.S. foreign intelligence agencies and also gathered from unclassified sources. The size of this directorate has been estimated to be roughly 3,000 persons; its budget, about \$75 million.

Science and technology, which oversees research and development of technical systems for collecting intelligence, such as spy satellites; analyzes scientific and technical data collected by all sources, and circulates reports on its findings. The personnel strength is estimated at about 1,500; its budget at about \$125 million, not counting large additional amounts (perhaps \$500 million to \$1 billion) spent annually by the National Reconnaissance Office and the Air Force on technical collection systems.

Administration, under which are lumped such functions as supply, finance, medical

and personnel services, training, security, and communications. (Overseas communications appear to have been transferred to Operations under the Schlesinger reorganization.) In recent years, the personnel strength of this directorate has been estimated at roughly 4,500 and its budget at about \$200 million a year.

Former intelligence officials calculate that when support costs are distributed, somewhere between two-thirds and three-quarters of the CIA's direct budget is allotted to clandestine operations. Of these funds, more than half are said to go to various types of covert foreign policy operations—Dirty Tricks—rather than to intelligence collection and reporting by overseas stations.

A separate staff known as the Office of National Estimates supervises the preparation of the intelligence community's principal long-range projections—the series of National Intelligence Estimates which cover such diverse subjects as the strength and organization of the Vietcong and the size, trends, and doctrine of the Soviet strategic nuclear forces. The office is under the direction of the Board of National Estimates, a dozen senior officials from CIA, State, and the military.

In addition, a number of smaller staff offices are attached to the office of the Director. These include the inspector general, general counsel, legislative counsel, cable secretariat, and an office of plans, programs, and budgets. Perhaps the most important of these offices is the Intelligence Community Staff (ICS), recently expanded by Schlesinger and given a stronger role in coordinating the programs and budgets of the entire intelligence community.

The Directorate of Operations constitutes the covert side of CIA, known as the Clandestine Services. Officers of the Clandestine Services generally pose as officials of some other U.S. Government agency or private organization, and sometimes use false names. Except for some minor modifications that may have been instituted in the Schlesinger reorganization, the Directorate is organized as follows:

A number of specialized, functional staffs oversee aspects of clandestine activity. Their names provide some notion of the range of CIA work: Foreign Intelligence (espionage and political reporting); Counter-intelligence (reporting the operations of the intelligence services of other nations); Covert Action and Political Action (secret financing of various youth, labor, cultural and academic groups, operating clandestine radio propaganda outlets, large-scale efforts to influence foreign elections); Special Operations (planning, supporting and directing paramilitary operations); and Technical Services (wiretapping, lie-detector operations, illegal entry, false identities, disguises, and the like).

Most work of the Clandestine Services is carried out by the large regional divisions and their field staffs abroad and in the United States. The major divisions, and some of their activities which have come to light, are:

Domestic Operations Division, which allegedly recruits agents among foreign students and U.S. residents with relatives in foreign countries. It also interviews Americans planning to travel abroad for pleasure or business and those who have recently returned. (The Domestic Contract Service, which carries out these interviews, was recently transferred from the "overt" side of the Agency, where it was under the Directorate of Intelligence, to the Clandestine Services.) This Division also apparently conducts counter-intelligence activities among East Europeans, Cuban, and other emigre groups in the United States.

Western Hemisphere Division. Among the major known clandestine operations of the past twenty years are:

Overthrowing the Guatemalan government of Jacobo Arbenz in 1954.

Setting up and supporting a special anti-Communist police agency for the Batista regime in Cuba in 1956. The agency, known as BRAC, soon gained a reputation for brutality and oppression.

Later backing anti-Castro Cuban exiles in a variety of political and paramilitary activities, culminating in the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961.

Helping to put down an attempted coup in Guatemala in 1961, in part to protect the base of operations for the planned invasion of Cuba.

Mounting a major covert political campaign to deny leftist Brazilian President Goulart control of the Brazilian Congress in 1962.

Advising and assisting the successful Bolivian effort to capture Che Guevara in 1966-67.

Intervening with covert financial and other support for opponents of Salvador Allende in the Chilean Presidential elections of 1964 and 1971.

Far East Division. Largest of the regional divisions, this organization supervised:

Large-scale clandestine operations by Nationalist Chinese and U.S. agents against mainland China from the Korean War period through the late 1960s. Agents were air-dropped into China—two, Richard G. Fecteau and John T. Downey, were captured in 1952 and freed after the U.S.-China rapprochement of 1971—and guerrillas and political agents were infiltrated into Tibet in the late 1950s.

The Philippine campaign against Huk guerrillas in the 1950s.

U.S. efforts to establish the South Vietnamese government of Ngo Dinh Diem after the Geneva settlement of 1954. CIA agents subsequently encouraged (at President Kennedy's direction) the generals' coup against Diem in 1963.

An unsuccessful coup against President Sukarno of Indonesia in 1958, in which an American pilot, Allan Pope, was captured.

The arming, training, and operations of an army of Meo tribesmen in Laos during the 1960s.

Financing and directing a wide range of clandestine and special operations during the 1960s in Vietnam. These included cross-border operations into Laos and Cambodia to gather intelligence and harass North Vietnamese and Vietcong base areas, organizing and paying various mercenary groups, and setting up the Provincial Reconnaissance Units, special Vietnamese teams whose job was to locate and capture (or assassinate) Vietcong political agents. The latter effort, originally organized under the "Combined Studies Division" of the U.S. military command in Vietnam, later became known as the Phoenix program, which Colby headed.

Near East-South Asia Division, now reportedly becoming one of the more active branches of the CIA. The best known CIA exploit in this part of the world was the coup which overthrew Premier Mohammed Mossadegh of Iran in 1953 and returned political power to the Shah.

Africa Division. Deeply involved in Congo affairs during the early and mid-1960s, when the CIA supplied pilots (Cuban veterans of the Bay of Pigs), mechanics, and aircraft to the government of Moïse Tshombe.

The Europe and Soviet Divisions. One of the first major clandestine operations of the postwar period was the massive infusion of funds to prevent a Communist victory in the 1947 Italian elections. According to reliable sources, CIA continued well into

the 1960s to provide a large annual subsidy to the Italian Christian Democratic Party. In Greece, the Agency became deeply involved in internal politics in the late 1940s, and its role, according to sound speculation, is undiminished today.

The CIA and its predecessor organizations also helped organize anti-Communist labor unions in France and other West European nations during the period following World War II. The Washington office of the Clandestine Services provided funds to support an entirely independent underground network established under cover of the international division of the AFL-CIO.

For many years during the 1950s and 1960s the Covert Action staff in Washington ran one of the most remarkable CIA activities: the large-scale subsidization of a wide range of youth, academic, cultural, propaganda, and labor organizations in the United States and abroad. Among the long list of beneficiaries of the payments, which ran as high as \$100 million a year, were the National Student Association, the Asia Foundation, the American Newspaper Guild, Radio Free Europe, and the Congress for Cultural Freedom (which sponsored *Encounter* magazine). The Covert Action staff, under Cord Meyer, Jr., now CIA station chief in London, set up numerous dummy foundations to distribute the money, using a wide number of legitimate charitable institutions as cooperating go-betweens. (One of the dummy foundations was named, by strange and, to me, annoying coincidence, the Andrew Hamilton Fund.)

These subsidies, exposed in 1967, were terminated, but the Covert Action staff remains in business. According to informed sources, its annual budget continued at about the \$100 million level in 1971.

This list of operations is hardly comprehensive. It does not, for example, include such large-scale intelligence exploits as the U-2 project and the first spy satellites, both initiated by the covert side of CIA. But the list illustrates the wide range of political, propaganda, and paramilitary operations which the CIA has carried out, in deepest secrecy, at White House behest.

Two points stand out: These operations were often mounted not against hostile countries, but against neutrals or allies. And they frequently resulted in creating and sustaining repressive regimes. The CIA has been accused by well-informed U.S. officials of helping to establish "anti-subversive" police units in a number of countries which have then used them to repress all liberal political opposition.

Informed sources estimate that of the roughly \$350 million annual budget of the Clandestine Services in recent years, perhaps \$225 million—most of it project money—was allocated to covert action and special operations (including \$80 million to \$100 million for Vietnam and Laos). The remaining \$125 million went to support the CIA's Clandestine Services in its espionage and counter-intelligence activities.

As the budgetary breakdown suggests, the road to glory and advancement in CIA is through operations—Dirty Tricks—rather than the patient and often grubby work of collecting foreign intelligence. A number of former high-ranking intelligence officials have complained over the years about the Agency's tendency to mount "operations for operations' sake."

In theory, CIA covert operations are tightly controlled, and can be engaged in only with the approval of the President, who delegates the task of reviewing suggested operations to a high-level NSC committee consisting of his assistant for National Security Affairs, Henry A. Kissinger; Deputy Defense Secretary William P. Clements, Jr.; Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs U.

Alexis Johnson; and the CIA Director. But this group has no staff facilities for a proper review—the papers are handled at the White House by a single CIA official who acts as secretary to the committee—and, in any event, the committee would hardly be disposed to subject CIA plans to close scrutiny.

CIA station chiefs, moreover, enjoy considerable autonomy. An enterprising, empire-building station chief, as one source pointed out, will be on the constant lookout for an opportunity to mount a covert action, perhaps by bribing a foreign minister or a key legislator. With sufficient initiative, he can increase his budget and staff and enhance the standing of his station with Washington. In the process, the United States gradually becomes drawn more and more into the internal politics of that country.

"The Clandestine Services," says a former CIA official, "never developed a philosophy that 'our job is to spy.' They have always had the desire to manipulate events."

The CIA's predisposition toward operations has been influenced by the fact that for most of its life the Agency has been headed by men who made their reputations in that field. Allen W. Dulles (1953-61) and Richard C. Helms (1965-1973) were both operators; so was the new Director, Colby. Colby and Helms, before their respective appointments as Director, were both in charge of the Clandestine Services, a job which has generally been filled by forceful men who wielded great, if unobtrusive, influence in Washington. By contrast, the Agency's senior intelligence official, the Deputy Director for Intelligence (DDI), has seldom been a man of comparable stature or influence.

As long as the glory, power, promotion, influence, and White House attention fall on the Dirty Tricks operators at CIA rather than on the intelligence specialists, the inherently unmanageable predisposition of many CIA station chiefs toward operations rather than intelligence work is unlikely to come under control. And as long as operations are the principal source of his influence, the Director of Central Intelligence can hardly be faulted for taking a narrow view of his job. In theory, he wears at least three hats: He is the top operator; he is the nation's senior interpreter of foreign intelligence; and he heads the vast but amorphous community of U.S. foreign intelligence agencies. In practice, however, recent directors have not fulfilled all roles equally well.

For several years, White House foreign policy experts have sought improvements in intelligence analysis and management of intelligence budgets and activities. In November, 1971, President Nixon ordered a reorganization of the intelligence committees to address these problems. He gave the Director of Central Intelligence power to oversee the budgets and activities of all intelligence agencies, including those under the Defense Department. The Intelligence Community Staff was expanded and an Intelligence Resources Advisory Committee (IRAC) was established with the Director as chairman. At the same time the National Security Council set up an Intelligence Committee to review the quality of intelligence reports.

Director Helms, in the White House view, failed to make the reforms work. This was a factor in the decision to replace Helms (now Ambassador to Iran) with James Schlesinger, author of the 1971 reorganization plan.

Schlesinger's background seemed admirably suited to the broader concept of the Director's job. He was not only a management expert but also an economist and defense intellectual, with a background at Rand Corporation, where he had a reputation as a forceful analyst. But the Watergate scandal forced shuffles. Schlesinger became Defense Secretary. Colby, his successor, is not considered by intelligence experts to be as well-equipped to manage the intelligence community, or to improve the quality of analysis. His appointment appears to have shelved or diminished the ambitious reforms envisioned

by Schlesinger. Instead the appointment of Colby put the spotlight back on operations.

When Congress confronts the CIA this fall, it should recognize that it is time for the United States to end all Dirty Tricks operations—by the CIA or any other organization. Such operations, a standard part of the U.S. foreign policy repertoire since World War II, have become more than occasional embarrassments: They are now a distinct liability to the nation's foreign relations. And they present a serious threat to constitutional government in the United States.

The reasons for ending clandestine operations are not just moral but practical as well. The moral objections to covert actions are obvious. Intervening in another nation's internal politics violates the principles to which the United States professes to adhere when it establishes diplomatic relations. And covert intervention offends the general principle that nations, like individuals, should be accountable for their actions.

There are at least two practical objections. The first is that clandestine operations have a corrupting influence on American politics and foreign relations. They undermine the credibility of the Government at home and abroad. Their inherent secrecy violates the principles of accountability in the American political process. Available recourse to clandestine operations breeds contempt for more arduous—but legitimate—methods of achieving objectives. As Watergate has demonstrated, an easy familiarity with clandestine operations and a ready access to persons and techniques used in clandestine operations can become a direct threat to the American political and legal system.

It has been evident for some years that the American political establishment is deeply divided on the directions and the tools of foreign policy. Politics no longer stops at the water's edge. No more vivid demonstration of this division is needed than the recent votes in Congress to end the bombing of Cambodia and to limit the President's war-making powers. In these circumstances a clandestine foreign policy becomes a danger to domestic politics. To prevent leaks, the circle of people in the know is drawn ever smaller. In the process, the definition of the national interest becomes more narrow, and more directly associated with the political fortunes of the party in control of the Executive branch.

As the confusion between the national interest and political advantage spreads, distrust of the opposition grows to paranoid dimensions. Political operatives find it difficult to discriminate between domestic opponents and foreign agents. In this paranoid state, they have no difficulty justifying the resort to espionage and Dirty Tricks—originally developed to fight a clandestine war against alien enemies—against their domestic political opponents. The existence of occasional proof of similar skulduggery on the part of their opponents merely intensifies the psychosis. The result is an indiscriminate intermingling of domestic politics, foreign policy, and covert operations—a common theme in the Watergate affair and associated cases.

If the corrupting effect of clandestine operations is one practical objection, a second is that when they do not fail spectacularly, they are often ineffective. The successes of the CIA in clandestine operations may be, as several Presidents have hinted, substantial. But these successes would have to be of phenomenal value to outweigh the general damage which results from the CIA's blunders, from the widespread assumption that the Agency meddles everywhere, and from the exposure of those operations which have come to light over the years.

An outright ban on the CIA's clandestine operations would result in a cut of as much as fifty per cent in the Agency's budget, an annual saving of perhaps \$300-\$400 million, not counting the savings of substantial ad-

ditional funds diverted from other agencies for covert CIA activities. The more important effect, however, would be a much needed redirection of the efforts of the Agency's overseas staff (which could be greatly reduced in size) toward collection of intelligence.

Since many CIA operatives already work under diplomatic cover at U.S. embassies, it might prove feasible to transfer activities devoted to gathering intelligence—not to operations—to the State Department. (The far smaller British Secret Intelligence Services come under the control of the Foreign Office.)

Such steps would go a long way toward restoring the primacy of the Department of State in foreign relations, and toward putting clandestine activities under an official directly responsive to the Congressional committees responsible for foreign relations. Under the present system, decisions on the use of the Clandestine Services are made by the President, who is not directly answerable to any committee of Congress, and operations are the responsibility of the Director of Central Intelligence, who answers to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, neither of which has principal responsibility for oversight of foreign relations.

Freed from his weighty operational responsibilities, the Director of Central Intelligence could begin to devote full time and attention to improving the management of the intelligence community and upgrading the quality of analysis.

Finally, it would be feasible to set up a more broadly representative system for Congressional oversight of intelligence activities by the CIA and other agencies, since the risk of compromising sensitive foreign policy operations would no longer exist. This could be accomplished by creating new House and Senate committees, as recommended by Senator Proxmire and others, or by setting up a joint committee on intelligence, along the lines of the existing joint committees on economic policy and atomic energy.

In sum, the Congress should:

Repeal CIA's vague authority to carry out "other functions and duties related to intelligence," as directed by the National Security Council.

Substitute, if necessary, language authorizing overseas and domestic activities strictly for collecting foreign intelligence, plus such counter-intelligence activities as are required overseas (leaving domestic counter-intelligence to the FBI).

Consider placing the Clandestine Services under the operational control of the Secretary of State, either by requiring that he be responsible for reviewing and authorizing clandestine activities, or by transferring the CIA's intelligence collection functions to the State Department.

Deny CIA all project funds for covert action or special operations, but allow limited secret funds for intelligence purposes only.

Require the CIA to divest itself of ownership or control of such organizations as Air America.

Clarify and strengthen the statutory powers of the Director of Central Intelligence by giving him explicit authority in law to review and make recommendations to the President on the budgets and programs of all U.S. foreign intelligence activities.

Require disclosure of the overall expenditure of the CIA and other intelligence agencies, with reasonable accuracy allowing a little leeway for security purposes.

Establish a committee or committees of Congress to oversee the programs and authorize the budgets of all U.S. foreign intelligence agencies, including the CIA. An effective oversight committee is essential to insure that a Congressional ban on clandestine operations is honored by the President. Given the fine line between some types of intelligence gathering and the clandestine manipulation of events, it will be impossible to draft a

law which closes all loopholes through which small-scale operations will be undertaken. Thus vigorous oversight will provide the only reassurance that the spirit of the law banning Dirty Tricks operations is being observed. The committee should include, but not be restricted to, current members of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate, and Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees of the House.

The committee or committees should have automatic access to all finished intelligence reports published by any intelligence agency, and these classified reports should be retained at the Committee for review by all members of Congress. This would provide Congress with an intelligence library, which it now lacks, and could considerably improve the quality of understanding and Congressional action on foreign policy and defense questions.

It is by no means certain that a majority of Congress is ready to bar all clandestine operations. Such a step would signal a major shift from the way the United States has conducted foreign policy since World War II, and opponents will no doubt argue that it would be tantamount to "tying the President's hands" or "unilateral disarmament." And it might also be argued that a clandestine action agency is more necessary in the 1970s than ever, given the decline of the Cold War with its clear-cut antagonisms, the emergence of a multi-polar world of shifting alliances, and the developing contest among the industrial nations of the world for access to oil and other raw materials. Nor is President Nixon likely to abandon without a struggle a tool which seems peculiarly suited to his approach to foreign (and domestic) antagonists.

Finally, the job of defining clandestine operations so they can be stopped without damaging the capability for intelligence-gathering activities or leaving large loopholes could prove difficult for legislative draftsmen.

These are all important practical considerations. Were the nation really in a state of siege, were *real politik* the only basis for conducting American foreign relations, were there a genuine consensus on the aims and methods of American foreign policy, and were clandestine operations compatible with American democratic institutions and processes, then such reasons might suffice to justify continuing such operations. In the real world, they do not.

The Administration's approach, and that of many influential members of Congress, will be to cope with the CIA's current crisis merely by making its covert operations even more truly clandestine, and by restricting them in size to reduce the risk of exposure. But the only way to clear the nation's reputation, restore credibility, and re-establish a basis for a foreign policy based on broad consensus—and the only way to create a real basis for effective Congressional participation in foreign policy—is to put a firm end to clandestine operations. The divorce must

be clear and categorical, and ought to carry the force of legislation—an outright ban on Dirty Tricks.

THE AFRICAN CRISIS: THE TIME IS NOW

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to agonize over the national crisis that is Watergate, let us take the time to understand and fully comprehend a crisis that, in human terms, is overwhelmingly more serious and compelling: The crisis of drought and famine that faces some 23 million human beings in western Africa.

A concise and thorough outline of the situation is hereby submitted for the attention of Congress:

THE FAMINE AFFECTED AREA

The "Sahel" Region (word means "border" in Arabic) which runs for approximately 965,000 square miles across Senegal, Mauritania, Mali, Upper Volta, Niger, and Chad. It forms a belt along the southern edge of the Sahara Desert.

POPULATION

Population is both Arab and African, and consists largely of nomadic herdsmen roaming the interior with their livestock, and farmers along the edges of the desert.

CAUSES OF PRESENT EMERGENCY

- Severe ecological imbalance created by:
- (1) Five years of light rains, unseasonal rains or no rains at all in the Sahel;
 - (2) Over-grazing by nomadic herds recently increased in numbers by immunizations and newly-dug waterholes.

IMMEDIATE CRISIS

Millions of cattle are already dead—remainder have exhausted available forage and water and are already succumbing to famine-related diseases.

Farmers were unable to plant this season's crops due to drought. Past years supplied little or no reserves. Many have been forced to consume their crop seed to stay alive and have nothing to plant even if the rains do come. (Usual rainy season extends from mid-June into September).

Famine-weakened people and animals increasingly susceptible to epidemic outbreaks. Polluted watersources and carcasses of wild-life and livestock add to threat.

Sahel's roads and communication systems are weak to non-existent, especially during

rainy seasons. Some parts are virtually unreachable except by air. For most of the Sahel, it is very difficult to get help in or information out.

As many as six million people could literally die of starvation and famine-related diseases within a matter of weeks in the Sahel.

LONG-RANGE CRISIS

Cover soil is exhausted—once-arable lands and pastures have now become desert-like.

A whole generation of children has been growing up with inadequate nutrition for good physical, mental development—particularly as Sahel has lost usual protein source of meat and milk. Effects on future population can't be estimated.

Refugees who managed to escape into cities or less affected countries are creating serious social problems.

National economies disrupted and facing additional burden of famine relief. Many depended heavily on "head taxes" (of cattle) and crop taxation for revenues.

As is clearly evident from the outline, the effect of the drought on the people, animals, and land of western Africa is staggering.

An immediate and vigorous effort must be undertaken by concerned Americans and a caring Congress to see to it that aid is given to our African neighbors.

I support the efforts of and commend Congressman DIGGS and Senator HUMPHREY for their untiring endeavors in this matter.

There is no time to waste. Every elected official and public representative and, indeed, every American must do his part to see to it that the human suffering and anguish of the African citizens is relieved.

An editorial by New York radio station WWRL is most relevant at this time. It is entitled "The Time Is Now":

THE TIME IS NOW

Let's quit talking about the glories of Africa's past and consider the misery of the present in the Western and equatorial areas of the continent due to the present prolonged drought. Cattle are already perishing by drought and famine. Six million lives are threatened in Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Upper Volta.

While the famine has not been front page news in America, Black Americans have demonstrated a sense of solidarity that reaches across continents, and that in itself is front page news in the Black community.

So WWRL offers a righteous right on! to organizations such as the African Support Committee, Africare, the Black Solidarity Day Committee, and others addressing themselves to the plight of the six African nations hardest hit.

SENATE—Friday, September 7, 1973

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thou hast shown us what is good. Thy word has taught us to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with Thee. Grant to all who serve here the grace and the wisdom to fulfill the

divine instruction. While enacting measures for the betterment of the Nation, may we also strive to make better persons. May a new spirit descend upon this Nation that we may be a people who love the Lord our God with all our heart and soul and mind, and our neighbor as ourselves.

We pray in His name who was the incarnation of goodness. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the

Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 7, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.