

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EASTER SEAL SOCIETY OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

## HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, 1973 marks the 50th anniversary of the Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults of Pennsylvania. Since 1923, the society has worked on behalf of the needs of Pennsylvania's handicapped persons with dedication and distinction.

Last year, for example, the society was involved in the following activities:

Handicapped children and adults received 42,459 services through the Pennsylvania Society and its 45 affiliated Easter Seal Societies.

The camping facilities of the Pennsylvania Easter Seal Society—Camp Daddy Allen, Camp Easter Seal, Camp Harmony Hall and Camp Lend-A-Hand provided recreation for 979 handicapped adults and children.

Pennsylvania Society staff provided professional consultation, in-service training, leadership development and regional meetings for Easter Seal staff and other professionals in rehabilitation.

Local affiliated Societies were led in achieving a record \$3,077,629 in public support through planned fund raising procedures and a total income of \$4,652,485.

Extensive career and scholarship program for high school, college students and professionals maintained.

Continued a sustained public education and information program through film library, news media, brochures and newsletters.

459 Professional staff served the handicapped through Easter Seals.

Mr. President, I would also like to share with my colleagues the following excerpt from the Pennsylvania Easter Seal Society philosophy:

The Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults of Pennsylvania recognizes that individuals with handicaps, like all persons, desire and have a right to live in dignity within the limits of their capabilities and to be responsible for their own welfare and destiny. The basic purpose of The Easter Seal Society is to make this possible, working in cooperation with other agencies.

It shall do such things and perform such acts as it may deem necessary to accomplish its purpose and shall receive, hold, and apply funds, gifts, bequests, and endowments, or the proceeds thereof, to give effect to and carry forward its purposes.

The Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults of Pennsylvania believes, therefore, that all persons with handicaps regardless of age, creed, color, type of handicap, financial status or place of residence are entitled to the services needed for maximum development of their potential as accepted and contributing members of society. Because problems of handicapped persons are shared by and contribute to those of their family members, programs and services for crippled children and adults must be family oriented, rather than just patient oriented.

As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the members of the Pennsylvania Easter Seal Society for their half century of service, and to wish them continued success in the future.

## GREAT COMMUNICATOR

## HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the death last month of Channing L. Bete, Sr., brought to an end a life notable for its varied and constructive contributions to mankind.

Mr. Bete was surely one of the most innovative communicators of modern times. He must rank with Gutenberg and Mergenthaler as one whose genius imparted understanding to millions. His contribution was the scriptographic technique, which combined brief words and small—often comic—designs to explain complex ideas at a glance.

Hardly a profession has lacked his touch. His small booklets, entitled "What Everyone Should Know About \_\_\_\_\_" brightened thousands of professional offices. He made the legislative process and even the Constitution itself easily understandable through the scriptographic technique.

He searched everyday life for problems to solve. One of his most impressive works was a scriptographic look at what public education should be like in the year 2000. He believed deeply in a universal language, and therefore championed Esperanto.

Mankind lost a great friend in the death of Channing Bete. A measure of his role in community life is expressed in this editorial farewell in the August 21, Greenfield, Mass., Recorder:

## FAREWELL TO A FRIEND

An inspiration to all who knew him was Channing L. Bete, Sr., who made "scriptography" a common word in the communications field.

Most innovators are unsuccessful in developing their ideas; Chan Bete knew how to make use of his inventions. Most successful persons are either disliked or envied—or both; Chan had more admirers than anyone else in Greenfield.

From his earliest years in this town, Channing L. Bete was making friends and influencing people. He had a speech defect in those days but nothing could obscure his intelligence and his delightful sense of humor. Appreciative smiles and outbursts of laughter followed him wherever he went. And he traveled far, geographically and intellectually.

Chan was expert in communications. He employed words and pictures in selling both goods and ideas. After years of work in sales promotion, he sold his advertising agency and devoted the rest of his working life to the development of scriptography. This combination of simple drawings and hand-lettered text has been employed in scores of interest fields. It entertains, it instructs, it advises and it informs—all in an informal but most effective way. And it has sold by the millions of booklets, ranging from an analysis of the U.S. Constitution to a description of a symphony orchestra.

Scriptography has been marked especially by the Bete brand of humor—gentle and chuckle-provoking. More than anything of his professional creation, it has disclosed the inner Chan Bete, his deep perception of human problems and needs and his innate goodness. He used it wisely and well in

the interests of man's knowledge and improvement.

Channing Bete the citizen was equally important to our society. He wrote Kiwanis Club shows that raised money for needy children. His years of service to Greenfield Public Library led him into the state libraries field and the improvement of this area of public enlightenment. As a hospital trustee and a Chamber of Commerce official he was farsighted and innovative.

But it is as Channing Bete the man and the neighbor that he will be most greatly missed. No Greenfield citizen of this era has been more beloved and more respected than this quiet, diffident man with his wry smile and his twinkling eyes. No man has had more admirers and probably none has been as trusted as this miracle worker with words. Whether it be a column to The Recorder from the Red Sox training camp or a public comment supporting the library, his personal stand attracted others without a question.

The very thought of Greenfield without Chan Bete is enough to make one rebel against the fates. All who knew him are grieving today.

## A REPLY TO SOLZHENITSYN

## HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an eloquent address delivered in London on September 1 by the Honorable Geoffrey Stewart-Smith, Member of Parliament, with whom I shared the platform on the occasion of the closing session of the Seventh World Anti-Communist League Conference.

In my judgment, Mr. Stewart-Smith has herein offered advice that the free world will ignore at its peril.

I ask unanimous consent that extracts of his address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, Mr. Stewart-Smith's address was ordered to be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, as follows:

## A REPLY TO SOLZHENITSYN

With your permission, I would like to accept the responsibility this evening of making a public reply to that great Russian writer: Solzhenitsyn.

After having so rightly been awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1970, Solzhenitsyn declined to attend the Prize-Giving in Stockholm for fear of not being allowed to return home. Instead he sent a written address.

In it, he made an arresting statement:

"The Spirit of Munich" he said "has by no means passed away, it was not just a brief episode in our history. I would dare to say even that the spirit of Munich is the dominant one of the 20th Century. The timorous civilized world, confronted by the sudden renewed onslaught of a snarling barbarism found nothing better to oppose it with than concessions and smiles."

So challenging an observation, full as it is with the most profound meaning for our generation, deserves an answer.

I have chosen his words, but there are many other examples of similar sentiments

expressed by courageous and freedom loving peoples throughout the communist countries.

The only possible thing that I have in common with that great Christian writer, Solzhenitsyn, is that I too am an unofficial spokesman for liberty in my nation. His views did not enjoy the support of his government, and I doubt if my views represent the opinion of mine.

I feel obliged to speak out and to say to Solzhenitsyn: "you are right", the spirit of appeasement and Munich is abroad throughout the world today, but do not despair, there is hope, all is not lost.

It is true that there are many today who advocate a policy based on the illusion that there can be a permanent and lasting peace built upon slavery.

But we here gathered together are men of a different breed, we are defiant and anti-appeasers. We seek to build a real peace on firm foundations. Our conference is called Peace Through Freedom.

There is an unbridgeable divide between the jackals of tyranny and the ideals of freedom.

Appeasers have in the past and do today, put their trust in tyrannical and unelected party leaders and governments.

We put our trust in the people.

Some western governments—notably the West German—have taken the soft option and by contemptible opportunism have recognised a tyranny on German soil in international law—without the consent of the people of East Germany.

The whole contemporary appeasement policy—so delicately referred to as detente or accommodation—is based on wishful thinking and an illusion. It betrays an ignorance of the real nature of communist imperialism.

The brutal truth is that those regimes are in a state of permanent civil war with their own people. They are doing everything in their power to destroy the Free West: the very continued existence of which is a threat to the security of their party leaderships.

The policy of detente is doomed to failure because it is based on the continuing denial of human dignity, civil liberties and political freedoms to 3,000 million human beings. It is a contemptible betrayal of all the ideals of freedom for which the West should stand, whether they are motivated by political or religious beliefs.

In a few days time, the second round of talks on the conference for co-operation and security in Europe take place in Vienna. There is a possibility that the precious principle of self-determination will be denied to the 132 million people of central and eastern Europe: that this will be endorsed in international law by western leaders and policed jointly with the Soviets in some European security council.

Some gullible western leaders have endorsed the Soviet propaganda claim that the cold war is over and the era of detente will bring in a period of peace.

However, in the communist countries themselves the secret police have increased their savage repression of dissidents, even those who merely seek to attain their rights under communist laws! As western appeasement in the 1930s demoralised the anti-Nazi German opposition movement so today, western appeasement is doing exactly the same thing to all the anti-communist opposition movements in the countries of the communist world.

While we know that the governments of the communist states are terrified of the people and need Berlin walls and iron curtains to prevent them running away, ironically the western leaders are also terrified of the people. This is because it is the people of the captive nations who have threatened their appeasement illusion so often. Today's Munichers were shocked at the tediousness of the East German workers being so militant in 1953; Poles and Hungarians being violent

in 1956 and the Czechoslovaks really did set back such policies in 1968 by being troublesome. Some almost resent the fact that the people of Vietnam fight on and that the people of Taiwan even exist at all!

Where the people of a communist divided nation are free, as in the case of the Republic of China, most western governments simply ignore them: throw them out of the United Nations and placate the oppressors of the Chinese people.

Why are free elections not held in Hong Kong?—because the people might reject the communists utterly as in Berlin?

In this great contest between liberty and tyranny in our time, there must be negotiation, but negotiations which benefit our side not theirs. On the crucial question of intent, a choice must be made: one either supports the regimes or the peoples.

Some say that we can best help the people by mellowing the regimes. They may be right. They may be wrong. The fate of Dubcek is not too encouraging.

Where we must be careful, is in being gracious enough to pay tribute to western leaders who show courage and vision in these matters. The expulsion of 107 Soviet spies from this country was not an act of appeasement. The Soviets did not win the first round at Helsinki.

Now in reaching a decision as to what our broad aims are as a world organisation, I do not think that this is complicated. We surely want to see the U.N. Charter actually implemented throughout the World. We want the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights similarly carried out.

On this very point, Solzhenitsyn wrote in the same statement:

"The U.N. did not even trouble to make its best document for the past 25 years, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, obligatory for governments and a condition of their entry—and thus left the people at the mercy of governments they had never elected."

I believe that the people of the captive nations seek what every other nation seeks: self-determination, peace, prosperity and the withdrawal of foreign troops. Their peoples will evolve political administrations and economic systems of their own choosing, and probably aspire to neutrality.

In helping the people of the captive nations, we will make no concession at all over the continuing denial of their rights.

We will not betray them for some bogus international agreement.

We will not be party to any agreement which endorses the existing status quo in return for worthless and unenforceable promises.

We will never recognise the de jure political administrations in the Baltic States imposed on them as a result of Nazi and communist infamy.

We will never accept the Brezhnev doctrine and we demand its renunciation by the Soviet government.

We will never cease to deplore the continuing existence of regimes which make it impossible for the citizen to fulfill his life in freedom.

We will continue to attack the appalling waste of human talent that repression causes.

We will never agree to half Europe being denied its religious, moral, political and cultural heritage.

We will never agree to the Conference on Security and Co-operation becoming a new super Munich.

We may not have the power in the West to enforce self-determination in the communist countries, but it is within the power of our governments to refuse to approve of the endless denial of democracy and liberty to the people of those nations.

To Solzhenitsyn I would say that the anti-appeasers and the anti-Munichers of today have now joined themselves together on an international scale. We have combined

our strengths together to counter this global tyranny.

You may ask what manner of men we are. The answer is that we are the servants of the people in whom we trust and from whom all true and legal power comes.

We put our trust in people, not party leaders or governments.

We are patient, steely determined and prepared to wage a terrible and prolonged war of attrition. We hope, by God's grace, that our weapons will only be words, and the power of our ideals.

We have little or no power over governments, but by our tongues and pens we seek to influence them.

We do not presume to know what the future holds, and we promise no short term or easy solution, but with a mighty unified effort throughout the world, we believe that we will triumph with human nature, truth and reason on our side.

Solzhenitsyn you may ask what motivates us.

I would reply that we believe that acting together we will only conquer fear, not with a greater fear, but with love.

That we will never defeat irrationality with the denial of reason, but with reason.

We will never supplant inhumanity with a great inhumanity but with humanitarianism.

We will never defeat lies with greater lies, but with the truth.

We will never achieve spiritual victory unless we have faith.

We can only defeat daily terror by daily courage.

We will only achieve the brotherhood of man with tolerance and understanding.

We will only attain liberty with the consent of those who seek it.

We will only be worthy of serving the people if we show compassion and humility.

We will never build a world at peace spiritually, if all we offer is more matter than the materialists.

We will never restore human dignity without demanding justice.

We will never attract men of goodwill if we preach any form of hatred of nation, religion or race.

But above all, we will never keep silent in the face of tyranny. We will never rest in exposing lies, and we will speak the painful truth at no matter what cost to ourselves.

You all know that previously in history, the appeasers failed and war broke out. Today for the sake of humanity, the anti-appeasers must not fail this time. The Munichers of today must be defeated for the consequences of either a nuclear war or slavery under tyranny is too dreadful to contemplate.

I am compelled to ask you all to make a supreme personal effort in order to avoid catastrophe and to secure peace for us and our children.

Now let us depart to every corner of the world determined to play our individual part in furthering liberty—knowing that we are not alone, and that we have many allies.

One of our best allies are the captive nations themselves. We will work for their liberty too for there can only be peace through freedom.

## AN AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE LOOKS AT THE IRISH QUESTION

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to my colleagues' attention an article printed in the February 10, 1973, issue of "The Irish People"—a news-

paper geared toward the Irish community of New York City.

The article presents an effective argument of the faults of present American policy in Northern Ireland and the effect of the British occupation there. Frequently, the public condemns the Irish Republican Army as brutal and savage, but rarely do we hear of the atrocities committed by the British. The uprisings presently taking place in Northern Ireland are not by a small number of ruthless, insane individuals; it is a movement by a very large and intelligent group.

Americans must remember that there are two sides to every coin and that an argument that looks at only one side, like a coin with only one face, will not buy anything.

The article follows:

**AN AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE LOOKS AT THE IRISH QUESTION**

(By Professor Edward F. Leonard of Iona College)

There is a great deal of honest misunderstanding of the Irish Question in the United States today as is evinced by both the policies of the American press and of the United States government. We cannot expect more reasonable conduct from either quarter unless and until we have a clearer understanding of the facts.

Ireland is, by nature, one country, whose only boundary is the sea. The artificial, foreign-imposed partitioning of this island nation has proven nothing but tragic for all concerned.

The injustice and conflict resulting from English rule in Ireland are the most deplorable in the Western world. It is heartening to see the most Irishmen and Irish-Americans follow the lead of the Republican movement in rejecting the differences carefully fostered by an alien government, which have divided a minority from a majority in the past. We must, however, condemn internment without charge or trial, drum head courts, and the denial of basic civil, natural, historic and human rights under the various "Coercion Acts", most notorious of which is the infamous Special Powers Act. The inhuman torture of helpless men and women who ought to be treated as Prisoners of War under the rules of the Geneva Convention is inexcusable; such treatment might be expected in oriental despotisms but not at the hands of an allegedly-Christian, civilized, Western nation. The one sided nature of sweeps through, attacks upon, and harassment of nationalist areas and people gives the lie to any claims of governmental neutrality.

There must be a real truce, the release of all interned and sentenced Irish political prisoners, everywhere, and the immediate withdrawal of the British Army to their barracks pending their orderly and complete removal from all of Ireland.

Americans must come to understand the nature of both the conflict and the belligerents in Ireland. The current conflict in the so-called "North" of Ireland is a legitimate extension of the continuing Irish War for Independence. A de facto state of belligerency does exist in those six of divided Ulster's nine counties known as "Northern Ireland." Reginald Mauding, the British Defence Minister, has publicly told the world that "the British Army is at war . . . in Northern Ireland." The belligerents in that unhappy war are the Irish Nation and the British Empire, represented in the field respectively by the "Provisional" Irish Republican Army (IRA) and the British Army (and their auxiliary forces).

The British Army and its allies in Ireland in 1969-73 (?) are performing essentially the same function that the British Army with its Hessian mercenaries and Tory allies performed in America in 1775-83, namely to

try to hold for the British Empire an overseas possession within which years of English mis-rule had driven the inhabitants to rebellion. The belligerent Irish Freedom Fighters (like the Hungarians of 1956) are committing an act of self-defense, for reasons more compelling even than those enumerated in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776. They are following a noble tradition in asserting their right to national freedom and sovereignty. They are asserting it in arms; they are asserting it in blood.

To say that the "Provisional" IRA is anti-British is to state the obvious. We must look deeper and discover that these men are sincere, genuine nationalists who not only reject the tyranny of the red flag of England, but also reject the even more iron tyranny of the red flag of atheistic-Marxism. Their Chief of Staff, Sean Mac Stiofain, said in an interview in the New York Times, Nov. 7, 1971, "we are very anti-Communist." Clearly then, the "Provos" intention is not to impose new masters, but to expel old tyrants.

The Cause of Irish Freedom, though inspired in part by the ideals and example of the American Revolution, is a purely Irish movement. Its roots are in ancient Ireland and Patrick Pearse is its guiding light. The only "ism" involved here is nationalism. On page 2 of the October 1971 issues of An Phoblacht (The Provisional Irish Republican newspaper) there is a statement of the Irish Republican Publicity Bureau dated 26-9-71 which says that the Republican Movement stands for a republic, based on "the proclamation of 1916 and on Christian principles." It goes on to say, "Accordingly, we reject . . . atheistic Marxism . . . and we are confident that the overwhelming majority of the Irish people will reject this alien philosophy." The Provisional Republican plan for Provincial assemblies so eloquently explained by Senator John E. Flynn in the Nov. 11, 1972 issue of The Irish People (p. 17) is the most effective and progressive plan for the decentralization of government and the protection of local and minority rights, liberties, and interests in a free and united Ireland in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity. Ireland must have a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This, as Thomas Jefferson said, is the sum of good government. What the "Provisional" IRA is fighting for is the restoration of a united, independent, Irish Ireland; not free merely, but Gaelic as well, not Gaelic merely, but free as well.

"The Provisional" Irish Republican Army is the legitimate military arm of that physical force Irish Republican movement which seeks to establish in fact the all-Ireland, Irish Republic as proclaimed by Patrick Pearse on Easter Monday, 1916, ratified by the overwhelming (80%) majority of the Irish electorate in the general election of 1918, and established de jure by the First Dail Eireann in 1919. It represents, in arms, the legitimate aspirations of the Irish people to national freedom and sovereignty.

In order to bring on a lasting peace as the first step in building a new Ireland, the following must happen:

The Irish, like all other nations, must be guaranteed exercise of the right to determine their own future without let or hindrance. There must be a firm commitment from the British government to withdraw all their armed forces from Ireland by a specific date. With malice toward none and charity for all there must be a general amnesty for all Irish political prisoners, wherever incarcerated, and for all men on the wanted lists.

It is the lesson of history that the only solution to the Irish Question is a free and

independent, united Ireland. In the interest of peace and justice, therefore, we must all work for the most expeditious establishment in fact of an all-Ireland, 32-county, Irish Republic of all of the Provinces of Ireland.

IRA Chief Mac Stiofain has said (An Phoblacht, March, 1970): "The people of Ireland will never have the equal rights and opportunities, the civil and religious liberties guaranteed to them by the men of 1916 until British rule has been completely overthrown and a free Gaelic Republic of all Ireland firmly established."

"The Irish Republic was proclaimed by the only way possible—by force of arms—and only by force of arms can the republic we seek be established."

If indeed this is the lesson of history, that there is no other way than physical force, then the opinions of a candid world cannot but wish for Victory to grace the arms of the Irish Republican movement, the "Provisional" IRA. But, the United States is not without influence, as we demonstrated with a mere passive policy of disapproval during the Suez Crisis in 1956. In the interest of a speedy, just, and honorable end to this terrible conflict in Ireland we must therefore call upon the Congress and government of the United States to recognize the truth about the dangerous state of affairs in Ireland, and to use their influence, good offices, and resources, always consistent with the security interests of the United States, to bring a speedy and equitable solution to this unhappy conflict, and to aid in the establishment of a free and independent, united Ireland. What each and everyone of us does counts; you can make the difference.

I propose a program of five (5) points for Americans interested in aiding the cause of peace (which, incidentally, is here in the best interests of the United States) and in aiding the Cause of Irish Freedom:

- (1) Recognize that the current conflict in Ireland is a legitimate extension of the continuing Irish war for independence.
- (2) Recognize that the only real solution to the Irish question is a free and independent United Ireland.
- (3) Recognize and insist upon the right of the Irish people to national self-determination.
- (4) Give all legitimate support to those sincere Irish Nationalists who are striving for the establishment in fact of a free Gaelic federated all-Ireland, 32-county, united Irish Republic, based on Christian principles and on the proclamation of 1916.
- (5) Know only one name and definition of freedom, the Fenian definition: It is Washington's definition, it is Adams' and Jefferson's; it is Tone's definition, it is Mitchell's Davis', Lalor's, Lincoln's, and Ross'; it is Patrick Pearse's definition and it is Sean Mac Stiofain's definition. Let it be our definition, real and complete freedom.

**INEQUITIES IN STATE WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAWS**

**HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues in this distinguished body are well aware, gross and pervasive inequities exist in the disparate State workers' compensation laws. As reported by the National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws, established pursuant to the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, the existing State workers' compensation laws fail to provide prompt, adequate and equi-

table protection to workers and the families of workers injured, maimed or killed on the job; and as a result, many workers or their families have been denied workers' compensation benefits. In these times of economic uncertainty and galloping inflation, we must not place such an inordinate burden on our most precious natural resource, the American worker.

In an effort to correct this serious problem and afford uniform standards for the payment of benefits to injured workers, I have had the privilege to co-sponsor with my distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor, the Honorable CARL D. PERKINS, H.R. 8771, the National Workers' Compensation Standards Act of 1973. That piece of legislation has the stated purpose of "establishing minimum standards of adequacy and fairness for State workers' compensation programs and procedures by which such standards may be implemented."

To emphasize the injustices practiced upon workers by diverse State workers' compensation laws, I would like to insert into the RECORD and commend to the attention of each Member an article in the September 4 edition of the Washington Star-News:

**WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAWS**  
(By Sylvia Porter)

More than two years ago, the Wall Street Journal's long-time Midwest managing editor suffered a broken neck and dislocated spinal cord in a tragic auto accident. Outcome: quadriplegia, or paralysis from the chest down.

Human toll aside, the cost of his medical treatment and rehabilitation has been about \$75,000 to date—almost all of it paid by workmen's compensation (the Illinois editor was on a recruiting trip when the accident occurred). Somewhat miraculously, this man is back on his job today.

Labor Day is traditionally a time for hailing the American worker's achievements over the years—and our workmen's compensation laws certainly belong high on any list of these achievements.

But as I read about the editor in a recent issue of Business Insurance magazine, I wondered: What if this accident had occurred in a state with less liberal workmen's compensation rules?

If the State had been Tennessee, he would have been guaranteed only \$5,000 in medical benefits during the first two years—unless he went to court for more—and the maximum income benefit would have been \$55 a week. If the accident had happened in Louisiana, only a \$2,500 medical benefit would have been guaranteed.

Our compensation laws are wildly arbitrary and vary dramatically from state to state.

Each year millions of workers need medical treatment and 2.3 million miss at least one day of work because of an on-the-job injury. Each year, 14,200 lose their lives, and 90,000 become permanently disabled. In 1972 alone, more than \$3.2 billion in workmen's compensation benefits were paid under federal-state workmen's compensation laws—nearly half of the sum is medical and hospital payments.

Here are some answers to questions which affect you.

**Q.** How many Americans are covered and who is eligible?

**A.** About 73 million—82 percent of our work force—are covered, according to the Insurance Information Institute. Eligible are workers who become partially or totally disabled because of an accident or injury on the job, no matter who is to blame. The interpretation of "on the job" varies, but in

some states, illnesses incurred on the job are covered, too.

**Q.** Who isn't covered?

**A.** The rules vary from state to state, but among the least covered occupations are agricultural work, domestic work, work for religious, charitable or nonprofit organizations, "casual" labor, self-employment, workers in small firms.

**Q.** How much do benefits run?

**A.** Normally, the maximum benefit is between 60 and 80 percent of the predisability wage. In one-third of the states, there is an extra allowance for workers who have dependents, which brings typical benefits to 60-65 percent of take-home pay. Typical maximum benefits for temporary total disability are \$40 to \$175 a week, according to your state.

**Q.** What types of benefits are paid?

**A.** The biggest chunk goes to make up for income lost due to illness or disability incurred on the job. The next biggest chunk goes for medical costs. The rest goes for death benefits paid to survivors.

**Q.** How long are benefits paid?

**A.** In two out of three states, benefits are paid as long as your disability or illness lasts—possibly your lifetime.

**Q.** How quickly are compensation claims paid?

**A.** Usually within two weeks after the claim is filed.

**Q.** Who pays the claims?

**A.** Private insurers—to whom employers pay insurance premiums—pay nearly two-thirds of the benefits. State insurance funds pay 23 percent of the benefits and employers pay the rest via self-insurance plans. The average cost to employers in covered employment is about 1 percent of payroll.

**Q.** Can you collect both Social Security disability benefits and workmen's compensation at the same time?

**A.** Yes, if the combination does not exceed 80 percent of your predisability monthly earnings. After that, Social Security payments are cut to keep the total at the 80 percent mark. Social Security disability benefits alone now amount to more than \$4 billion a year.

**OTHER GOVERNMENTS FOLLOW THE UNITED STATES IN CREATING OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT**

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, more than 7 years ago the Committee on Science and Astronautics and its Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development began work on the concept of technology assessment. Through many years of careful study and consultation with some of the most thoughtful and knowledgeable people in the country, this concept evolved into legislation and eventually—last October—into public law. As a result, Congress has created an Office of Technology Assessment as a new mechanism to help it in making decisions on matters involving a strong technological component.

Interestingly enough, since that time the idea has spread not only through this country but around the globe. In fact, a number of other governments are in the process of adopting such a process as a component of their business. The

German Bundestag is in the process of doing this. The Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry has set up a Technology Assessment Office, as has the Japanese Science and Technology Agency. The Swedish Parliament is considering the formulation of an Office of Technology Assessment. Reports from Russia indicate that a committee has been formed within the government to consider the establishment of a technology assessment unit. Last fall NATO devoted the entire proceedings of its Advanced Study Institute in Milan to this matter. It has become a topic of study by UNESCO, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Council of Europe and the new Internal Institute for the Management of Science and Technology in Vienna.

The most recent example of the international spread of technology assessment was reported on July 18 in the Washington Post in a dispatch from London, where a new Council for Science and Society is being set up to "examine selected projects on the frontiers of science and technology, draw up a balance sheet of human benefits and costs" and otherwise look for "important social consequences for good or ill." While the new council is not a part of the government apparatus in England, its members are prominent persons whose influence reaches into both the government and private sector.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a certain irony in the fact that the Congress of the United States, which created and fostered technology assessment among the parliaments of the world, has yet to fund its own office and permit it to become operational while similar entities in other parts of the world are already beginning to function. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will not let this situation continue much longer and that appropriate funding will be forthcoming soon in the Legislative Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, the news story concerning the new council in Britain follows: [From the Washington Post, July 18, 1973]

**TO JUDGE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF SCIENCE**  
(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

LONDON, July 17.—Some of Britain's leading scientists today launched a pioneering effort to predict and control the social fallout from scientific research.

The new Council for Science and Society will examine selected projects on the frontiers of science and technology, draw up a balance sheet of human benefits and costs and propose ways to ease or inhibit consequences threatening the quality of life.

The council includes two Nobel Prizewinners and 31 other distinguished figures from a wide array of disciplines. It is believed to be the first of its kind in the world.

It represents a striking departure from the conventional view that scientists should pursue knowledge for its own sake and let the rest of society worry whether it is used or abused.

Although its founders describe it as a "modest proposal," the council could prove to be as important in history as the organization of the Royal Society, 300 years ago. That was Europe's premier scientific body and it played a key role in bringing the industrial revolution to Britain first. Appropriately, the new council announced its formation at the Royal Society's headquarters in Carlton House Terrace here.

In effect, the new council is not trying to push the scientific genie back in the bottle, but tame it instead. It appears at the very moment when, throughout the rich West, there is increasing skepticism toward and fear of the scientists' product.

Chairman of the council is Sir Michael Swann, a zoologist, who is also chancellor (in American terms, president) of Edinburgh University and chairman of the British Broadcasting Corp., one of the most influential posts in Britain.

"Science and technology have done some magnificent things," Sir Michael said today. "But they often produce uncomfortable side effects. Very often, we then do something about this, but it is too late."

Among the first subjects that the council expects to examine is research into the control of human behavior, especially mood-changing drugs, and the hunt for techniques to determine in advance the sex of infants.

In a prepared statement of objectives, the council says:

"It is not committed to any view of scientific optimism or pessimism about the future of man . . . It will try to identify areas of research in science and technology which could have important social consequences for good or ill, but which are not yet fully explored; to study these objectively; to attempt to foresee what their consequences might be; whether they could be controlled, and how; and to publish responsible reports designed to stimulate wide public debate . . . In this way it hopes to foster an active corporate social conscience in which the British scientific community can work."

Some of the founders expect that their group will be labelled, a "doom watchdog," a reference to the popular belief that uncontrolled science and technology are leading man to exhaust the planets natural resources and extinguish life.

To avoid any hint of government control, the council is getting its funds from independent, private sources. It is now backed for three years by a grant of about \$200,000, from the Leverhulme Trust, a foundation created by the former head of Unilever, a giant international conglomerate.

The council stems from growing discomfort among many scientists over the unforeseen consequences of their discoveries. By the time these dangerous side effects become apparent, vested interests in government, industry and elsewhere are exploiting the discoveries, and it is difficult to check their malign effects.

In an early discussion of the problem, a group of scientists and others cited as examples the uncontrolled development of antibiotics, computer data banks, plastic containers and the contraceptive pill.

The council members recognize that the spread of knowledge is worldwide, that even if Britain works out successful techniques to restrain the baleful effects of a new discovery, other nations may plunge ahead heedlessly. But, if the council works well here, the hope is that it will become a model for other nations, much like the Royal Society three centuries ago.

Sir Michael, the chairman, described his group as "slightly establishment," but promised that younger scientists would be called in as a balance, to perform the actual research into research.

The group's secretary and lone paid member, Dr. Jerome Ravetz, offered a crucial distinction. He said the council is "of but not in the establishment."

He meant that its members all had reputations valued by men of power and influence, but that many were capable of an unestablishment rocking of the boat. Ravetz, a leader in the campaign against the Concorde, is himself an example. Born in Philadelphia, he has been trained as a philosopher and mathematician and now is a senior lecturer in the history of science at Leeds University.

Other council members are Maurice H. F.

Wilkins, Nobel laureate in medicine; Denis Gabor, Nobelist in physics; Sir Bernard Lovell, the astronomer; Conrad H. Waddington, geneticist; Anthony Storr, psychiatrist; Dr. Alexander Comfort, poet, novelist and gerontologist; Edward Crankshaw, the historian; and Asa Briggs, vice-chancellor of Sussex University and social historian.

The council also includes an engineer, biochemist, biophysicist, social psychologist, engineer, three big businessmen and Lenin Peace Prize winner, physicist Eric H. S. Burhop.

The council will not examine controversial projects that have already ripened, like nuclear fast breeder reactors. Nor does it intend to look at those that appear to be a long way from maturity. But the difficulty of deciding what is and is not ripe was illustrated by a difference openly discussed before reporters over research into creation of test-tube babies.

Dr. Robert G. Edwards of Cambridge and Patrick C. Steptoe of Oldham General Hospital in Lancashire have produced some striking results, conceiving an embryo in the laboratory. But their experiments have aroused widespread fears of genetic engineering, of a dictatorial government producing a race of serfs.

Council member John H. Humphrey, deputy director of the National Institute for Medical Research, insisted, "We have got to look at Edwards and Steptoe."

Chairman Swann, however, demurred. "It may not be a social problem for some years to come," he said.

Ravetz, the new group's secretary, observed that if Britain's technology ministers had had a council assessment available, development of the Concorde might have been halted long ago.

He suggested that the council's researchers might well examine controversial scientific concepts, trying for example to define "acceptable risk," and look into the effects on privacy of new developments in electronics.

Ravetz will interview scientists, writers and others over the next few months and propose projects for the council's work. Its members will then select six for their first three years. A few experts in each field, drawn from outside the council, will make reports. These, with their recommendations for control measures, will ultimately be issued under the council's name.

The council is closely modeled on the lines of a paper written by Paul Sieghart, a retired London lawyer, and published in September in *Nature*, the science journal. Sieghart, the new council's vice-chairman, called for "a body organized by the scientific community itself and expressly charged with the task of informing the public in general, and the organs of government in particular, at the earliest possible time, of all scientific work likely to have important social consequences for good or ill."

## RECOGNITION OF FRANK WILLS

### HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, when I appeared recently on the nationally televised public broadcasting news interview program "Black Perspective on the News," I was asked by one of the journalists, Robert Jordan of the Boston Globe, why more acclaim has not been given to Frank Wills, the black security guard who discovered the Watergate break-in.

I agree with Mr. Jordan that Frank

Wills is the "forgotten man" of the Watergate affair, and I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues several accounts of his activities since June 17, 1972.

The May 13, 1973, Washington Post Potomac magazine contained a lengthy piece on Mr. Wills. Perhaps the most telling insight into the man came in the following passage:

Wills' friends still sometimes call up and ask, "Is the hero in?" and when something appears about it on TV, they coyly say, "They're talking about you." I say, "Not me, I did my part, I'm finished with it." again—

Yet could he have it to do all over I would do it five times over if I had to. I'm glad I did it, I have no regrets.

And the reason is duty, a strong sense of doing the job correctly, a concept that Wills returned to often.

I think I was doing my duty, I was doing a job . . . It was part of my job . . . If you're on a job to do something, you just do it. If you're proud of your job, of what you're doing, the rest will take care of itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several articles on Mr. Wills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1973]

#### WATERGATE PRODUCES ONE HERO

"My friends think I'm a great celebrity, a great detective," said Frank Wills, a 25-year-old security guard from North Augusta, S.C. who works in Washington. "Down home, I'm big stuff." Mr. Wills went on. "People I know call me up and say 'How's the hero?' Mr. Wills said that "it was just part of my job" when, on the morning of June 17, 1972, he discovered that a lock had been tampered with on a door near the offices of the Democratic National Committee headquarters in the Watergate complex. He informed the local police, who arrested the Republican operatives who had broken in. Since then, Mr. Wills said, he had changed security jobs in order to get a \$5-a-week raise, bringing his present weekly salary to \$85. An unidentified Democratic party spokesman said: "We have talked about doing something for him but we haven't been able to find him. I mean, we would at least like to say thank you."

[From the Chicago Daily News, June 18, 1973]

#### WATERGATE AND "FRANK WHO?"

(By Ellen Warren)

Years from now, if people still sit in their living room and drink cocktails and play trivia, they'll profit from remembering the name Frank Wills.

Right now, at least, it looks like 25-year-old Wills must resign himself to the small print in the footnotes of history books.

He is the \$80-a-week security guard who discovered the Watergate break-in that signaled the White House head-rolling that has become another chapter in American political corruption.

"Frank Miller, Frank Miller," shouted a little boy, running up the steps after Wills, waving a piece of paper. Sign this, sign this, Frank Miller."

Quite obviously, Wills has a long way to go to overcome his obscurity.

Step one of the process is making paid speeches around the country to remind people just who Frank Wills is.

So, it was in a fitting remembrance of the one-year anniversary of the Watergate bur-

glary Sunday that Wills was in Chicago to receive the Social Justice Award and a \$500 check from the Concerned African Methodist Episcopal Ministers of Metropolitan Chicago.

Wills seemed genuinely embarrassed by the praise that the ministers and congregation at the Bethel AME Church, 4448 S. Michigan, heaped upon him. He was hailed as a model for young black men.

Some 300 people gave Wills a standing ovation as a pleased Washington attorney, Dorsey Evans, looked on.

The church presentation, and an earlier affair in Detroit, were Evans' ideas.

He is a savvy and eloquent lawyer and public relations man who talks of movies starring Frank Wills, television appearances, souvenirs.

"Until Frank hired me about five weeks ago he hadn't made one appearance," Evans said, agast.

Wills now is an \$85-a-week security guard for a Washington (D.C.) realty firm.

He said he didn't realize that the Watergate break-in was anything more than a routine burglary until three days after it happened. A friend of mine called me and told me my picture was in the paper."

Fame is fleeting, and despite Evans' lofty plans for his client, Frank Wills has other goals: "I'd like to get me a restaurant, cook me some good old soul food and make some money."

[From the Washington Star-News]

HE SOUNDED THE ALARM AT WATERGATE

(By Jerry Oppenheimer)

Frank Wills, the obscure \$30-a-week security guard who discovered the now infamous Watergate break-in last June 17, is alive and well and working in another Washington office building—as an obscure \$35-a-week security guard.

It was Wills' chance discovery of a piece of tape attached to a Watergate basement door latch during a routine patrol that led to the arrest of five political espionage agents who broke into Democratic National Committee offices and to a scandal that today is shaking the foundations of the White House itself.

For Wills, a 25-year-old native of North Augusta, S.C., his effort has resulted in little more than a commendation from the Watergate management, a few yellowing news clippings and about two dozen letters from people around the country—mostly Democrats—thanking him for doing his duty.

"It was just part of my job," he said yesterday in his tiny furnished bachelor apartment in Northwest Washington that he shares with his cat, Tuffy.

Like the case itself in the initial stages, a veil of mystery surrounded Wills in the weeks after the break-in.

Under orders from the police, he refused to discuss the case with anyone. And as the names of people like Mitchell, Segretti, Stans, Dean, Magruder, Haldemann and Ehrlichman, among others, began to emerge in the ever-widening Watergate investigation, the name of Wills was lost.

Wills himself added to the aura by unexpectedly quitting his job at the Watergate only a short while after he received a promotion to sergeant and a pay raise, which he described yesterday as "50 cents before taxes." He now works in a Connecticut Avenue building—still as a security guard but receiving \$5 a week more than he did at Watergate.

At the time he quit his job, he also moved out of his one-room apartment in the Dupont Circle area without leaving his landlord a forwarding address. And he had an unlisted telephone.

Among the men who worked with him at the Watergate there was talk that Wills dropped out of sight because he feared for his physical safety.

There were also rumors around the guards, Watergate locker room that someone had slipped him a bundle "to keep quiet" and that he was living the high life on a Caribbean island.

Others with less colorful imaginations felt he had just plain tired of the publicity and the hounding of reporters "who were camping on his doorstep."

Sitting shirtless and in bare feet in his apartment yesterday, Wills laughed about all the talk.

"I was never afraid, and there was never any pressure put on me by anyone, Democrat or Republican," he said. "All of my friends, though, were concerned about my safety. They were worried about the Cubans. Some of the nice people who wrote to me told me to 'watch out,' and my mother called me long distance and told me to be careful. But I thought it was all really fun."

Wills explained that he had quit his job with General Security Services, Inc., at the Watergate simply because he was not making enough money, that he left his apartment because the owner planned to renovate the building and that he never listed his number in the telephone directory.

Wills came to Washington from Detroit about two years ago after a stint as a store detective there. He was subpoenaed to testify at the Watergate trial in January. His testimony concerned what happened in the pre-dawn hours of last June 17.

It's a story he will never forget, he said. And he recalls the now well-known details with gusto.

"I started to make my rounds, beginning in the basement and working my way up. That's when I first saw the door with the tape on the lock, the door leading to a fire stairwell that goes directly to the Democratic offices." (Placing tape on a door latch prevents a door from locking.)

Wills, figuring the tape had been placed there earlier in the day by building engineers or workmen, removed it, continued on his rounds and found nothing else amiss.

After a snack at the Howard Johnson Motor Inn across the street, he began his second rounds of the night. He again found the door latch taped.

"I got scared," he said. "Something told me not to take the tape off this time. I knew someone had gotten in. I just knew it. I didn't have a gun, just my can of Mace and a nightstick, so I was afraid to go up the fire stairway because I didn't know who might be there. I went back and called the police."

A few minutes later, Wills recounted, three policemen led by a sergeant appeared. He showed them the taped door and they moved up the stairway. Wills then heard the buzzer at the guard desk signaling that someone wanted to be let out of the building. He went downstairs.

By the time he arrived back on the sixth floor where the Democratic offices were located, it was all over. Wills had missed all the action.

More police had arrived by that time, and in their midst were five "very well-dressed men in handcuffs." One of them "asked me nicely for a glass of water. Nothing else was said to me." Wills identified the speaker as former CIA agent and Nixon campaign security adviser James McCord.

Wills tells the story over and over to his friends. "They think I'm a great celebrity, a great detective. Down home I'm big stuff. People I know call me up and say, 'How's the hero?'"

The other day an official at Democratic headquarters, now located across town from the Watergate in the Airline Pilots Association building, told a reporter that the guard was "probably the greatest Democrat—if he is a Democrat—of all time" and should receive some special recognition from the party, like a cash reward.

But the committee official couldn't remember Wills' name.

Frank Wills said that even though he got a lot of satisfaction from catching the Watergate saboteurs, as any good Democrat would (he voted for McGovern), he conceded that a reward would be something he could not refuse.

Two days after the break-in, he recalled proudly, he did get a pat on the back from Mrs. Jean Westwood, the former Democratic National Committee chairman, and he feels that had served him well.

Right now, Wills said, there are other things besides rewards bothering him, like the state of the country.

"What's happening today?" he said. "I think there's a breakdown in the political system. The American people are just not aware of what's really happening. I've seen it first-hand and it's opened my eyes real wide. I really feel sorry for the people who look at Watergate and say it's just politics."

Wills said that because of all he's been through since last June, "I'd like to get into politics myself. It seems real interesting. I'd like to get people to see things in an entirely different way—all this cheating has just turned the people off."

#### ACTS OF HEROISM OF PUBLIC SERVANTS DESERVE RECOGNITION

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 10 of this year, I introduced a bill to provide for the awarding of a Medal of Honor each year to one policeman and one fireman from each State. I introduced this bill because I feel the acts of heroism performed by our police and firemen in the routine everyday performance of their duties are no less praiseworthy than those performed by the soldier on the battlefield, and this kind of public recognition is long overdue.

Since I introduced this bill, I have written to the law enforcement agencies in the State of Maryland requesting the names of officers who have been commended for their outstanding service. The response to this request has been heartwarming and I include a partial list of those officers at this point:

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND,

College Park, Md., August 17, 1973.

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Longworth Building  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOGAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the awarding of a Medal of Honor for Police Officers who have performed their duties to the highest degree of excellence.

I would like to bring to your attention the performance of University Police Officer Sally Henning who effected single-handedly the arrest of two (2) armed robbers immediately after the robbery.

I am enclosing a photocopy of an article which appeared in the May-June 1973 issue of the Campus Law Enforcement Journal depicting Officer Henning's actions. I feel that she is most worthy of receiving your Medal of Honor.

Thank you for your interest in law enforcement and consideration of this nomination.

Sincerely,

JERROLD L. WITSLIL,  
Director, Department of Public Safety.

**OFFICER SALLY HENNING PLACED IN NOMINATION FOR IACUSD ANNUAL RECOGNITION AWARD**

(By Jerrold L. Witsll)

On April 7, 1973 at approximately 8:40 p.m., an armed robbery took place in Hagerstown Hall, a high rise residence hall on our College Park Campus. The two assailants were armed with a revolver and a tire iron. Three students were robbed at gun point and reported the incident to the University Police Dispatcher moments after the assailants fled the building, giving an accurate description of both men.

Officer Private First Class Sally Diane Henning responded to the dispatch and as she neared the dormitory complex observed the two assailants. She notified the Dispatcher and immediately vacated her cruiser to approach the suspects. As she neared the two men they attempted to flee into the crowded student areas of the complex and escape apprehension.

It was at this point that Officer Henning's actions qualify her for the award. Rather than risk losing sight of the suspects while awaiting the assistance of other officers, Officer Henning elected to apprehend them by herself.

With total disregard for her personal safety, Officer Henning approached the suspects and commanded them to halt and placed them both under arrest. A search of the assailants revealed no weapon but did disclose a quantity of ammunition and the wallet of one of the victims. The tire iron and a revolver holster was found on the seat of the suspects' vehicle which they had just left when Officer Henning first observed them. Both suspects are waiting trial and are being held on a bond of \$25,000 each. Their criminal records indicate that they are not new to the business of armed robbery and assault.

During the past several months the University has experienced a number of armed robberies during which some of the victims have been beaten with weapons and threatened that they would be shot. Officer Henning was fully aware of these facts when she approached the assailants. I might add that Officer Henning stands 5'4" tall and weighs 115 lbs. while assailants towered over her and presented quite an ominous appearance.

The arrest of these two individuals not only resolved one robbery but appears to be tying in with a number of other robberies and crimes on campus as well as the identification of a possible third suspect in the above robbery.

FOREST HEIGHTS POLICE DEPARTMENT,  
Forest Heights, Md., August 13, 1973.  
HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,  
Congressman, Fifth District, Congress of the  
United States, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOGAN: In regards to your letter of August 6, 1973 I am enclosing a copy of a letter of commendation recently presented to one of my men per your request. I am very gratified to know that there are representatives in Congress such as yourself who are genuinely interested in the advancement and professionalization of law enforcement and in seeing that police officers who risk their lives daily in the performance of their duties are honored. As you know, my Department is a small agency but my men are dedicated to serving the criminal justice system and the community with the highest degree of professionalization possible. I wish to thank you for the honor you are affording us, if I can be of any future assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

HARRY J. POLIS,  
Major, Chief of Police.

FOREST HEIGHTS POLICE DEPARTMENT,  
Forest Heights, Md., August 1, 1973.  
Officer ROY LEE WARNER,  
Forest Heights Police Department,  
Forest Heights, Md.

DEAR OFFICER WARNER: This letter is to commend you for the outstanding job you did on the morning of July 6, 1973 at 0200 hours when you gave chase to armed robbery suspects who had committed a street robbery at Livingston Rd. and Indianhead Highway, Forest Heights, Md. and apprehended them in the District of Columbia. You showed great courage and good judgment in making the apprehension, and I feel that you have certainly distinguished yourself among your fellow officers and the community that you serve. I hope that you will continue to do the same fine job that you have done in the past.

Sincerely,

HARRY J. POLIS,  
Major, Chief of Police.

**THE VALUE OF STRATEGIC BOMBING—A CONTINUING DEBATE**

**HON. SAM NUNN**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, now that the bombing in Cambodia and Southeast Asia has been terminated, I believe that it is in order for Congress and the American people to consider all aspects of conventional bombing, including not only its effect on past military activities, but also its role in the future.

To that end, I feel that the bombing survey article which appeared in the Air Force magazine, June 1973 points out several aspects of our conventional bombing capability, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT THE BOMBING SURVEY REALLY SAYS  
(By Maj. David MacIsaac, USAF, Associate Professor of History, USAF Academy)

"Bombing surveys after World War II showed that in industrial countries output expanded and morale rose as the bombs fell."—I. F. Stone, *The New York Review of Books*, January 25, 1973.

If you think the sentence quoted above is far out, then turn to pages 161-162 of David Halberstam's *The Best and the Brightest* (see USAF Gen. T. R. Milton's review in our "Airman's Bookshelf," April '73 issue) and read about "the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey . . . which proved conclusively that the strategic bombing had not worked; on the contrary, it had intensified the will of the German population to resist. . . ." These are two recent examples of the misreading, misuse, and/or misrepresentation of the findings of the USSBS that critics of our involvement in Indochina are feeding an unwary public. For these critics, the implications are simple: (1) strategic bombing in World War II was ineffective and wasteful, and (2) bombing in Indochina therefore was unwise, unprofitable and futile. This is worse than generalizing from particulars; it's more like arguing that one apple plus one orange equal two lemons.

Air Force people who find history irrelevant to current events far outnumber those of us who think the others have a screw loose for thinking as they do. Nonetheless, they are and probably always will be a commanding

majority. One price the service pays for this attitude is the ability of the Stones and Halberstams to get us at a disadvantage on what should be our own ground.

**THE U.S. STRATEGIC BOMBING SURVEY**

Early in 1944, a group of officers working with Gen. Muir S. "Santy" Fairchild in Washington, D.C., set in motion an idea that was to culminate later that year in the establishment by President Roosevelt of a Presidential Commission to investigate the effects of strategic bombing in the war against Germany. An impartial, civilian-dominated commission, the airmen argued, should direct such an evaluation, to assure that the findings would not be taken as self-serving arguments construed by the Army Air Forces. Gen. "Hap" Arnold cleared the idea with Gen. "Tooney" Spaatz, the theater air commander, and then with his own colleagues on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Finally, in October, the President obtained the agreement of Franklin D'Olier, President of the Prudential Insurance Co., to act as Chairman of the commission.

Before the war in Europe was over, well over 1,000 people (a third of them, including most of the decision-makers, were civilians—experts in structural damage, economic planning, manufacturing, transportation, psychology, etc.) were assigned to the Survey. The quality of men who formed the Survey's top echelon is revealed clearly by their illustrious careers both before and after: Henry C. Alexander, D'Olier's Deputy, later President of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.; Paul H. Nitze, later Secretary of the Navy and Deputy Secretary of Defense, recently a principal negotiator in the SALT talks; George W. Ball, later Under Secretary of State and Ambassador to the United Nations; J. Kenneth Galbraith, internationally known economic philosopher and former Ambassador to India.

Divided into teams essentially on the basis of particular industries, the USSBS set to work both in England and on the Continent well before hostilities ended. Many were shot at; five were killed in the line of duty; in several instances Survey teams liberated targets in advance of the ground forces. They measured effects, interviewed survivors at the highest (e.g., Speer and Goering) and lowest levels, impounded records, and even tangled with the Russians in Berlin. Returning to England and later Washington, they sifted and cross-checked evidence, argued occasionally among themselves, but eventually came to a consensus: "Allied air power was decisive in the war in Western Europe." To be sure, the Chairman's report noted instances where airpower might have been applied more effectively (against synthetic-rubber production and the electrical power net, to cite two examples), but the final report stated emphatically:

"Nevertheless, it was decisive. Its power and superiority made possible the success of the [Normandy] invasion. It brought the economy which sustained the enemy's armed forces to virtual collapse [even if it is true that in the prevailing circumstances] the full effects of this collapse had not reached the enemy's front lines when they were overrun by Allied [ground] forces."

When I. F. Stone says that "bombing surveys after World War II showed that . . . morale rose," and when Halberstam asserts that strategic bombing "intensified the will of the German population to resist," they are both, at the very least, badly informed. USSBS European Report No. 64b, *The Effects of Strategic Bombing on German Morale*, stated clearly that "Bombing seriously depressed the morale of German civilians," and that "Bombing did not stiffen morale." The quoted remarks of both Stone and Halberstam are buried amid arguments about bombing in North Vietnam. Neither writer seems to recognize that in the process of

proceeding from conclusions to supporting evidence, he has succeeded admirably in either ignoring or misrepresenting the very evidence he would call to our attention.

The Chairman's report on the effects of strategic bombing in Japan had no such qualifications as did the report on Europe: "Based on a detailed investigation of all the facts, and supported by the testimony of the surviving Japanese leaders involved, it is the Survey's opinion that certainly prior to 31 December 1945, and in all probability prior to 1 November 1945, Japan would have surrendered even if the atomic bombs had not been dropped, even if Russia had not entered the war, and even if no invasion had been planned or contemplated. . . . By July 1945, the weight of our air attack had as yet reached only a fraction of its planned proportion. Japan's industrial potential had been fatally reduced, her civilian population had lost its confidence in victory and was approaching the limit of its endurance, and her leaders, convinced of the inevitability of defeat, were preparing to accept surrender. The only remaining problem was the timing and terms of that surrender."

And, if this statement does not in itself say enough about the specific issue of morale effects, the interested reader can either go further in the same report (pp. 20-22), or sample USSBS Pacific Report No. 14, *The Effects of Strategic Bombing on Japanese Morale*.

#### MUDDIED WATERS

World War II was scarcely over before those who, in military historian Noble Frankland's memorable phrase, prefer to feel rather than to know about strategic bombing, began to muddy the waters. First in the lists was British Adm. Sir Gerald Dickens with his "Bombing and Strategy: The Fallacy of Total War" (London: Sampton, Low, Marston, 1947), criticizing the very idea of strategic bombing as a legitimate means in war. Another Englishman, the renowned military historian, theorist, and critic, Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, added fuel to the fire in his "The Second World War" (New York: Hawthorne, 1969, first published in London, 1948), and "The Conduct of War, 1789-1961" (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1961). General Fuller roundly castigated strategic bombing—his target was the area bombing policy of RAF Bomber Command—as contributing to a dehumanization of warfare that he traced to the decline of aristocracy and the effects on warfare of general conscription, introduced by the French *levée en masse* of 1793. Concerned to show that strategic bombing up to the spring of 1944 was "an extravagant failure," he cited statistics compiled by the USSBS and questioned whether the resources that went into strategic bombing might have been better or differently invested (in landing craft, transport aircraft, anti-submarine aircraft, etc.).

In our own country, the so-called B-36 vs. supercarrier controversy of 1949 sparked similar attacks, of which Marshall Andrew's *Disaster Through Air Power* (New York: Rinehart, 1950) enjoyed a brief notoriety. These and subsequent critics, when they did review the evidence, generally fell back on one of two devices: (1) rather like Fuller, they cited statistics applicable to the early years of the war, before the weight of the bomber offensive could make itself felt, and then drew conclusions (morals?) that they applied to the entire war; or (2) they cited comments from various of the USSBS reports on particular target systems (aircraft factories, oil, chemicals, etc.), suggesting that better target selection could well have produced more striking results more quickly. [Ed. note: For a grotesque example involving both devices, see the author's "New Look at Old Lessons" in the September '70 issue of this magazine.]

As to the first technique, what almost all

critics fail to acknowledge is that of all the bombs dropped over Europe in World War II by the USAAF and RAF (2,770,540 tons), only 17.48 percent were expended prior to January 1, 1944 and only 27.7 percent prior to July 1, 1944. In other words, almost three-quarters (72.3 percent) of the bombs were dropped in the closing ten months of the war (July 1944 to April 1945) when the bombers were finally cut loose in force to drive home the attack on Germany. (The comparable figures on Germany alone were 1,419,604 tons, 18.2 percent, 29.8 percent, and 70.2 percent.)

Output expanded as the bombs fell, Mr. Stone tells us. Presumably, he is referring to the continual expansion of German aircraft production from 1939 to September 1944 when it peaked out—even though it was first attacked in early 1943. The bombing surveys he so glibly quotes, however, remind us that of the entire effort in 1944 (1,593,736 tons) only 38,220 tons could be directed against that industry. This represented a mere 3.9 percent of the USAAF effort and 0.5 percent of the RAF effort. What we are not told is how target priorities established by the Combined Chiefs of Staff and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower (relating to Overlord, V-1, and V-2 sites, etc.) prevented the air commanders from pressing the attack against aircraft production and aviation fuel sources. When General Spaatz at length prevailed upon General Eisenhower in May of 1944 to allow at least an occasional attack against the synthetic oil refineries in Germany, the results for Germany were catastrophic. "I shall never forget the date May 12," Albert Speer was later to write in his memoirs.

"On that day the technological war was decided. Until then we had managed to produce approximately as many weapons as the armed forces needed, in spite of their considerable losses. But with the attack of 935 daylight bombers of the American Eighth Air Force upon several fuel plants in central and eastern Germany, a new era in the air war began. It meant the end of German armaments production." (*Inside the Third Reich*. New York: Macmillan, 1970, p. 346.)

Any attempt to suggest that "output expanded" during the last ten months of the war—in any industry—runs smack up against all the available evidence.

The second technique of occasional critics—quoting selective comments from various USSBS reports—can be grossly misleading. Of the 208 reports completed on Germany, only No. 1, 2, and 3 purport to speak for the Survey as a whole; all the others are, in fact, supporting documents, prepared by specialists in discrete fields, and not subject to comparison and cross-checking by the Survey's board of directors. Therefore, instances can be shown where specialists (in synthetic-rubber production, for example) expressed amazement that particular targets in their own area of expertise were either so long "ignored" or not hit at all. No one with knowledge of the campaigns has ever denied that this sort of thing occurred. To expect it not to have happened in what was, after all, an improvised air war, is surely to rate the judgment and clairvoyance of the bomber commanders on an impossible scale.

#### THE PROBLEM TODAY

The real problem our service faces with the Stones and Halberstams is less their misrepresentation of the World War II evidence than it is their real intent—to criticize (when not condemning) the Air Force role in Indochina over the past decade. This, I would submit, they are free to do if the spirit so moves them. But we must not let them get away with drawing comparisons between the two wars on some presumed basis that the two have enough in common to warrant comparison.

For openers, and to cite the obvious, there are some very real differences between total and limited war—and, hence, in the goals

objectives, and restrictions applicable to airpower. Take, for example, the effects of bombing over North Vietnam. At no time (except perhaps for a week or so last December) were the North Vietnamese ever subjected to anything even approaching what the Germans and Japanese had to contend with in World War II.

Or turn the question around and look at it from the viewpoint of the aircrews and air commanders. Over Germany and Japan no impediment whatsoever was placed in the way of attaining the first priority in an air offensive—air superiority. In Indochina, certain enemy airfields and AAA sites were ruled out of bounds from the beginning. In World War II, target selection was in the hands of experienced air commanders (or at least the theater commander). In World War II, air tactics were decided by airmen. Whether the measure is of goals, objectives, targets, or tactics, it's difficult to see what was comparable in the two wars beyond the basic facts that airmen and aircraft were involved in both.

The restrictions imposed on air activity in Vietnam will not be quarreled with here, nor need they be. But their very existence must be acknowledged. And with the acknowledging comes the awareness that the air war in Indochina was unique, requiring justification or attack on its own terms. This will not eliminate controversy, but it will surely legitimize it. At the same time, it will protect the hard-earned record of World War II from being sullied by those who usually have something else in mind to start with anyway.

#### HOW TO STOP INFLATION

#### HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, every public opinion survey taken recently has shown that inflation and the high cost of living the No. 1 concern of Americans. However, many people do not really understand the true cause of inflation and the only way in which it can be stopped. My friend Leonard Read of the Foundation for Economic Education—FEE—has prepared an excellent paper entitled "How to Stop Inflation."

I am including the text of his paper in my remarks today; I hope my colleagues in the Congress will benefit from Mr. Read's statement.

The excellent paper follows:

#### How To Stop Inflation

To know truly is to know by causes.—Francis Bacon.

How to stop inflation? Remove the cause! Stopping inflation is as simple and as difficult as that. Everyone says he's against inflation; yet, what do we find? Nearly everyone overlooking the sole remedy and, instead, conjuring up schemes to soften inflation's disastrous effects. Interestingly, all schemes or nostrums which ignore the cause, if and when adopted, sink us ever deeper into the mire. As if inflation weren't bad enough, most proffered "cures" would worsen the situation!

Many years ago a professor of economics told a group of us about his experiences at the University of Heidelberg during the German inflation. Faculty members were paid twice a month, then each week, then each day. Finally, they were paid in the morning, rushing the checks home to their frauen before going to their classrooms. Why? Prices were multiplying many times each



day, so shop in the morning! There came a time—August 1923—when 100 billion marks would not buy a loaf of bread.

What was this professor's recommendation to those in our group who foresaw similar problems in our own country? His advice was to out-produce inflation! Imagine a professor of economics not understanding that all production creates its own purchasing power!

A few thoughts inspired by the professor's naive thinking: Production involves the efficient combination and use of scarce resources, in the process paying for each resource a price high enough to pull it away from other owners and other uses. To produce more housing, for instance, involves paying higher wages, higher prices for lumber, hardware, masonry, and the like, to attract those scarce resources from other uses. Meanwhile, each supplier of such resources has the additional income to spend, a process sometimes expressed as Say's Law: "Production creates its own purchasing power."

The truth is that inflation does not result from the lack of housing or other goods or services. It is nothing more nor less than the printing of what the government has declared to be legal tender, that is, printing ever-increasing quantities of fiat money. Unless house-building or other productive activities stop those printing presses—an absurdity—then trying to out-produce inflation is as futile as trying to out-run one's own shadow. So the professor's cure is on a level with most remedies now being dinned into our ears.

It is not that the inventors of these schemes agree with inflation. Quite the contrary! Rather, it is that they see no way to be rid of it; inflation is here to stay—even worsen—thus, why not find a way to prosper and thrive in a monetary holocaust! The fact that this requires non-existent skills in legerdemain deters them not.

Two such schemes recently have come to my attention. The first proposes that all contracts—loans, for instance—be repaid (legally enforced) in dollars of the same purchasing value as when contracted. If the value of the dollar should decline at the rate of 15 per cent a year, then a 10-year loan of a thousand dollars would be repaid in the amount of more than \$5,000, plus interest.

Even in the face of the current inflationary pattern, what borrower would be willing to sign such a contract? Only the person who cannot see "beyond the end of his nose." There would be little if any futures trading; indeed, contractual relations would all but cease, production would decline at a frightening rate. Further, there is nothing in this scheme to halt the outpouring of fiat money; it would go on its merry way and, because of the fall off in production, the dollar would buy far less than were the scheme never adopted. Approval? Indeed, not!

The other scheme requires that all business ventures be compelled to adopt the "profit-sharing" procedure—employees as well as entrepreneurs sharing in the gains. This is inspired by some remarkable successes such as Lincoln Electric of Cleveland. The assumption is that if Jim Lincoln could, by this arrangement, earn a great deal for himself, pay higher wages than others, and undersell all of his competitors, so could everyone else—hundreds of thousands of businessmen from hamburger stand owners to General Motors. Simply pass a law and make every entrepreneur operate like Mr. Lincoln!

Overlooked is the fact that only one Jim Lincoln ever existed. There are no two entrepreneurs who operate their businesses alike, nor could they do so if they tried. Each is novel to some extent; and consumers—that's all of us—are thus advantaged.

Any profit-sharing arrangement should, in all fairness, be also a loss-sharing arrangement. But most wage earners would shy away

from any employer who required employees to share any losses his business might incur. Why? Tens of thousands of businesses fail annually, as everyone knows.

Were profit-sharing made compulsory for everyone, production would dramatically decline, just as in the first scheme. There would be other results, no less disastrous.

Out-producing inflation or fulfilling contracts at a constant purchasing power or forcing every business to engage in profit-sharing are no more than "pipe dreams." Adoption need not be feared. These schemes merely illustrate how people avoid pinpointing the cause of inflation and, thus, propose remedies which compound the problem.

However, what do we find in the day-to-day world of "practical" politics? The worst of all possible schemes: price control and rationing as edicts by the Federal government and wage controls in the hands of labor unions. Below-market prices and above-market wages! Inflation is not questioned; we have instead only futile attempts to escape the effects, which make the effects increasingly disastrous. In what way? Production is both diminished and distorted. Figuring out how to out-scheme the political schemers takes the place of discovering how best to satisfy consumer preferences. Schemers with political and coercive power make schemers of every one of us they over-power.

To illustrate: By reason of governmental intervention, the supply of gas and oil is curbed and the demand increased. What to do? Ration the fuel! To the station attendant say, "Fill 'er up." "Sorry, only \$3 worth to a person." So the car owner takes what he can get and goes to another station repeating, "Fill 'er up." Gas wasted from station to station! Eventually, all the gas is gone, but consumers still have "gas money" burning holes in their pockets. The best way to ration gas or any other scarce resource is to let the price rise to a point where the supply is sufficient to meet the demand.

We need only come to our senses to stop inflation; nothing is required beyond discovering its cause and then being rid of it. The cause? *Over-extended government.* To repeat what many of us have written over and over again: when the costs of government rise beyond the point where it is no longer politically expedient to defray the costs by direct tax levies, governments all over the world resort to an expansion of paper money—inflation—as a means of making up the difference. Inflation dilutes and depreciates the medium of exchange as a means of syphoning private property into the coffers of government! Here we have the cause, so simple to see through. But being rid of the cause is not simple. Why the difficulty?

The difficulty is rooted in an unintelligent interpretation of self-interest. Today, all of us without exception are feeding more or less at the Federal trough. True, there are a few who are force-fed, not dipping into the trough willingly. Finding it necessary to live in the world as it is, they participate in the deficit-burdened, socialistic mall system—to name but one of many examples. But most citizens today—a number perilously approaching 100 per cent—mistakenly feel that they have a vested interest in the continuance of one or more, if not all, Federal "programs" that go to make up the deficits that can be met only by inflation: fiat money made possible by legal tender laws.

Perhaps this citizen only wishes to be paid for not farming, another to receive social security or Medicare, still others to be protected against competition, or to have their education subsidized, or a Gateway Arch for their home town, or whatever. It would take

<sup>1</sup> For a more complete explanation of the cause, see my pamphlet, "The Essence of Americanism." Copy on request.

a book just to list the titles of all the Federal handouts and discriminatory edicts.<sup>2</sup> Anyway, count the persons you know who completely ignore the "gray train," who would concede nothing to government beyond a peace-keeping, justice-dispensing agency of society, who are free from the feeling that they have a vested interest in this or that deficit-creating, political gimmick. They are "as rare as hens' teeth!"

If an individual could perfectly identify how his self-interest is best served, he would be all-wise. However, I am not alluding to perfect wisdom but to that level of intelligence any adolescent should possess. Most youngsters know that their self-interest is not advanced by stealing—living off the fruits of the labor of others coercively exacted. They would not regard face-to-face thievery as in their own interest. And there are thousands of high school students who are bright enough to see that there is no distinction between pointing the gun oneself and getting the Federal government to do the "stick up." The loot would be ill-gained in either case. Self-interest is not served by either method. One need not be overly brilliant to see this.

Yet, what do we find? Millions upon millions identifying self-interest with legal plunder! The more political largess they can get—regardless of the force used—the better.

It is not that these people, many of whom are college graduates, could not rise above this infantile level of thinking; they could if they would, but they don't. Further, these millions do not see how their self-interest is subverted rather than served by this socialistic plundering, and they cannot be expected to understand why inflation is not also identified with their self-interest. They see inflation, if they see at all, as the means of filling the thousands of troughs from which they feed without either thought or effort. They love the role of parasites!

Given these millions who thoughtlessly behave this way, plus the political exploiters of nonsense, the situation, on the surface at least, looks hopeless. Stopping inflation appears to be impossible, and certainly this would be the case were it a numbers problem. But, thank heavens, it never has been a numbers problem, is not now, nor will it ever be. It is strictly a matter of inspired and intelligent leadership.

Statesmen—in and out of office—are more and more in evidence, persons who think for themselves and stand forthright for their enlightened convictions. These few—thousands, of course—understand that self-interest is to be identified with individuals in the role of hosts—producers, not parasites. They also know that inflation is deadly—for parasites cannot exist without hosts. As the troughs empty, attrition increases, especially among the parasites.

As this natural aristocracy—comprised of men of virtue and talent—approaches the pink of condition, rises to the top in thinking how self-interest is best served, the nonsense is stopped dead, then subsides! Your role and mine? Try one's best to be this kind of an exemplary aristocrat. This, I submit, is the sole formula to stop inflation.

#### SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, the July 29 Scranton Sunday Times con-

<sup>2</sup> See *Encyclopedia of U.S. Government Benefits*, a tome of more than 1,000 pages with over 10,000 "benefits." (Union City, N.J.; Wm. H. Wise and Co., Inc., 1965.)

tained an interesting column by Joseph Oravec on the school prayer issue. As the sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 84, the constitutional amendment to restore voluntary prayer to our public schools, I believe Mr. Oravec's column deserves the attention of my colleagues, who may be called upon to cast votes on this matter in the months to come, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

CITY DESK NOTES  
(By Joseph Oravec)

Sen. Richard S. Schweiker of Pennsylvania is the author of one of seven proposed amendments on school prayer presented on Friday before a Senate subcommittee.

Schweiker said the U.S. Constitution should be amended to "defend the right of those students who wish to pray." He said he did not believe the Constitution denied the right of free, voluntary prayer in public schools.

As is known, prayers in school have been banned since June 25, 1962, when the Supreme Court held 6 to 1 that the use of an official prayer in New York State public schools was unconstitutional.

Explaining that "the problem resulted from what I believe to be the supreme option of declining to pray," Schweiker added:

"But just as we defend their right not to pray, so should we defend the right of those who wish to pray."

And that's the way it should be. For example, students must attend gym classes. Those who have physical ailments report their difficulties and are excused from participation. Yet, those who wish to participate in gym, swimming, or whatever are not denied. The same principle applies to those at church services. Only those who wish, sing.

Back in November, 1971, Bruce Schneider and Tom Dorris of the North American Newspaper Alliance wrote in an article that prayer proponents note that "the world is crumbling morally and that God is needed now more than ever."

The Rev. Richard Constantinos, Episcopal vicar in Stanhope, N.J., was quoted thus: "It's not religion. It's something else. There's a strong sense of the minority imposing its will on the majority and the majority is becoming more and more powerless."

Back in that 1971 period, the Rev. Raymond Crawford, a Baptist minister in Netcong, N.J., which lost a court battle to return prayers to its public schools, said, "When you see that pornography is in, that it's all right to go naked at Woodstock, that it's all right to burn the flag, that obscenity is OK, then there is something wrong."

There was a moral crisis. It's still with us. Mrs. Ben Ruhlman of Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, in 1971 took up the fight for public school prayer when her 14-year-old son complained that "they were locking God out of (his) school."

She told a Wall Street Journal reporter at that time that "our students are brainwashed on the idea that (the purpose of) school and college is to educate and make a well-rounded person of each student. How can this be without God at the center of our lives? We teach sex, driver education, math and science. We teach communism and atheism, all of Stalin's and Lenin's works, but the most important part of health study is left out—we need prayer and Bible study which gives you peace of mind."

In recent years many people have forgotten or were not reminded by their teachers that Washington prayed, Lincoln prayed and many other leaders of this nation invoked the help of God.

Wonder what opponents of public prayer

would reply to the question of "why the opposition?" from Washington, Lincoln, Eisenhower, Kennedy, our recently returned prisoners of war, the men who were captured aboard the Pueblo, Gen. George Patton, who requested a chaplain to draft a Christmas prayer for his troops.

Benjamin Franklin at the Philadelphia Convention in 1787 in a motion for prayers said, "I have lived, sir, a long time; and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth; that God governs in the affairs of men."

Perhaps, teachers in the schools, colleges and universities of this nation—as well as its leaders and legislators—should refer often to Franklin's words.

If they had, there might not have been a Watergate.

#### CAMPAIGN REFORM

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the host of campaign abuses that seem to have been a hallmark of the 1972 Presidential campaign has pointed out to us, all too clearly, the need for campaign reform. Several approaches have been suggested for placing restraints on campaign contributions and expenditures in an effort to minimize the influence of wealthy contributors on elections. I believe that one of the strongest proposals introduced to date is the Udall-Anderson Clean Elections Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

I would like to share with my colleagues a series of editorials which appeared on WCBS-TV by Sue Cott, which addresses itself to the need for campaign reform and discusses the merits of the Udall-Anderson approach in particular. I believe that Ms. Cott has done a real service to the viewing public in her acute analysis of the problem and by focusing attention on the efforts that are underway in the Congress to restore meaningfulness and integrity to our elections process.

Sue Cott's remarks on campaign reform follow:

#### CAMPAIGN REFORM

The catalogue of campaign horrors revealed since Watergate vividly dramatized something that had been known or suspected for a long time, namely that the way money is raised in campaigns tends to corrupt American politics.

During the last few weeks Americans have heard lurid tales of Nixon campaign fund raisers putting the squeeze on American Airlines when that company was seeking a favorable decision from the Administration, of other corporations and industries with business before government agencies similarly being approached for Nixon reelection funds, of a variety of unsavory, illegal activities financed with vast amounts of unreported cash collected from large contributors, many of whom have, or hope to have, friendly dealings with the Administration.

Even before the Watergate hearings, an indictment was handed down charging John Mitchell and Maurice Stans—the two top figures in the Committee to Reelect the President—with conspiring to influence a Securities and Exchange Commission investigation of Robert L. Vesco in return for a \$200,000 contribution.

The problems inherent in financing cam-

paigns with large contributions from special interests are nothing new. Theodore Roosevelt asked Congress in 1906 for a law that would have freed candidates of political indebtedness to such campaign donors. T. R. never got his law and since then the cost of campaigning has skyrocketed.

A look at the total campaign expenditures for Presidential election years just since 1952 shows this startling increase, from \$140 million in 1952 to \$400 million in 1972.

The increasingly lavish amounts collected and spent on elections compounds the possibilities for corruption. Obviously some new ways of decreasing the influence of wealthy contributors on politics has to be found. Some restraints on contributions and spending are necessary.

It has been argued that limiting the freedom to spend money in campaigns impinges on constitutional rights of free speech. We agree that citizens should be allowed to express themselves in campaigns by giving money to the candidates of their choice, and that candidates should be allowed to spend money to make their views known.

The question is how much money. Beginning tomorrow we'll look at some answers. If Watergate has taught us anything, it is that money contributed and spent in a campaign without any restraints is a clear and present danger to democracy.

The Senate passed a bill last week that goes a long way to correcting the campaign finance abuses the Watergate scandal has unearthed. One of the basic questions raised by Watergate has been how to prevent candidates from being politically obligated to special interest groups that make large contributions to their campaigns. For years, wealthy contributors have tended to dominate campaign financing, with a relatively few donors financing almost 90 percent of federal campaign expenses. That means a few very rich contributors, representing large corporate interests that deal regularly with federal agencies, often expect sympathetic treatment and favorable rulings in return for their campaign largesse. The Senate bill seeks to insulate candidates against this pressure by drastically curtailing the amount of money that can be given by any one contributor. The new ceiling is set at \$6,000 per individual contribution to both a primary and a general election campaign. That's quite a contrast to the several hundred thousand and million dollar contributions given to candidates in recent elections by individuals.

Another provision of the bill would stem the floodtide of unreported cash that Watergate revealed had inundated the Nixon campaign in 1972. No cash contributions above \$50 are to be allowed. And to make it difficult to cheat on this provision, the bill includes a strict limitation on campaign spending, and requires full disclosure of every dollar spent.

As big an improvement as this bill is over the present system, it still hasn't completely prevented the powerful monied interests from throwing their weight around in campaigns. Voluntary political action groups representing these interests can still make contributions to an indeterminate number of state and local committees, each of whom can contribute \$6,000 to the candidate of choice. But no bill that accepts the premise of financing campaigns exclusively through private contributions can hope to close loopholes through which vested interests can crawl. That's why we think that serious consideration must be given to public financing of political campaigns. Tomorrow we'll do just that.

Money has been called the mother's milk of political campaigns. It's true that money is important if a campaign is to be run effectively. The question is how best to assure that candidates have enough money to make themselves and their views known without selling their soul to wealthy financial sup-

porters in the process. Of course not every large contributor exacts a political pay-off and not every candidate can be bought, but there's no question that the present system puts a terrific strain on candidates. Financing campaigns exclusively through private contributions simply tends to place candidates in moral jeopardy. How can candidates avoid the pitfalls and temptations posed by predatory contributors? Part of the answer, it seems to us, lies in some form of public financing of campaigns.

Proposals for the subsidizing of campaigns through public funds are now before committees of both houses of Congress. We think one of the best ideas comes from Representatives Morris Udall, Democrat of Arizona and John Anderson, Republican of Illinois. Their plan would provide a matching federal subsidy for each private contribution of \$50 or less. But only serious candidates who raise a certain amount of private contributions would qualify for these matching public funds. That way candidates would have to demonstrate their appeal before public funds would be available to them. We also like the Udall-Anderson plan because it will encourage candidates to seek support from small contributors.

Some people may object to their tax money being spent to help elect politicians, so low have office seekers sunk in popular esteem, but unless the public supports candidates, others, with private interests to protect, will be there to pick up the tab.

What do Stewart Mott, Clement Stone and Nelson Rockefeller have in common? Well, they are all millionaires, but more than that they are all big contributors to political campaigns. Herbert Alexander of the Citizens Research Bureau estimates that the Rockefeller family has contributed at least \$25 million to political campaigns, including their own, in the last twenty years. Stewart Mott contributed over half a million dollars to the McGovern campaign and Clement Stone over \$2 million to the Nixon campaign in 1972. In fact, Mr. Stone recently said he would be willing to give \$10 million to a campaign to change the course of history. The question is should the course of American political history be for sale to the highest bidder?

Now, of course there is a difference between an individual millionaire who takes a personal interest in politics and corporate chiefs and union leaders who make big contributions to the campaigns of candidates friendly to their interests. But should a person or a family with enormous wealth be completely free to give any amount at all to back a particular candidate or cause? We think not because if millionaires can give unlimited amounts to campaigns, then they can buy influence for their personal views out of all proportion to the vast majority of Americans. And that's simply not democratic.

Of course, rich people will always have political influence beyond their numbers simply because they are rich. And they'll always be able to give more easily to campaigns than other people, even if the amounts millionaires can give are in order.

One good approach, adopted by the Democratic Party in New York State, would be to impose strict limitations on the amounts that candidates or their families can spend on their own campaigns. Of course, there's a partisan motive involved. The Democrats are worried about Gov. Rockefeller's seemingly bottomless campaign treasury. And some may argue that if the Democrats were as rich as Rockefeller they would be singing a different tune. Nonetheless, their point is a valid one. Big money—from any source—distorts democracy.

## RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY RETIRED ENLISTED ASSOCIATION

### HON. PETE V. DOMENICI

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am pleased at this time to call to the attention of my colleagues two resolutions which were adopted by the Retired Enlisted Association at its 1973 national convention in Denver, Colo.

These resolutions reflect the position of the Retired Enlisted Association on blanket amnesty for dissenters and deserters of the Vietnam era and our servicemen missing in action. These issues are quite understandably of great concern to the members of the Retired Enlisted Association.

It is my feeling, Mr. President, that regardless of their individual persuasion on these issues, Members of Congress should earnestly consider the position of this organization which is so intimately involved with these two important national issues.

I ask unanimous consent that these two resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETIRED ENLISTED ASSOCIATION, INC.,  
Colorado Springs, Colo.

#### OUR MISSING-IN-ACTION SERVICEMEN

Whereas, Article 8, Section b of the January 27, 1973 Agreement of Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam and supplemental agreements of June 13, 1973 stated "that the parties shall help each other to get information about those military personnel and foreign civilians of the parties missing in action, to determine the location and take care of the graves of the dead so as to facilitate the exhumation and repatriations of the remains, and to take any such other measures as may be required to get information about those still considered missing in action. For this purpose, frequent and regular liaison flights shall be made between Saigon and Hanoi," and

Whereas, Only two trips have been made to North Vietnam since this agreement, and

Whereas, No arrangements have yet been worked out for the return of the remains of the 55 men North Vietnam claims died in captivity and no prisoners held in Laos have been sent back, and no accounting made of the dead.

Therefore, Be it resolved, by the Retired Enlisted Association, Incorporated, in National Convention assembled at Aurora, Colorado, June 23, 1973, that we request the Congress of the United States to take the necessary action to insure compliance with the aforesaid agreements, and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America; and Members of the United States Congress.

RETIRED ENLISTED ASSOCIATION, INC.,  
Colorado Springs, Colo.

#### NO BLANKET AMNESTY FOR DISSIDENTS AND DESERTERS OF THE VIETNAM ERA

Whereas, Birthright is not a right of self-indulgence but rather a trust of honor and integrity and American freedom is a privilege which can be lost, and

Whereas, Though compassion is a wonderful quality, granting amnesty to dissenters and deserters of the Vietnam era would certainly cause discipline in the Armed Forces to deteriorate and national security to be endangered later by thwarting the possible use of the draft during some future emergency, and

Whereas, The deserters have committed a military crime and should be required to stand a military court-martial.

Therefore, Be it resolved, by the Retired Enlisted Association, Incorporated, in National Convention assembled at Aurora, Colorado, June 23, 1973, that we oppose blanket amnesty and believe each case should be reviewed on its own merits, and

Be it further resolved, that we petition the President of the United States of America and the Congress of the United States of America to not grant a blanket amnesty to dissenters and deserters of the Vietnam era, and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America, and Members of the United States Congress.

## PUBLIC SERVANT RECOGNIZED

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this is not a time when public officials, be they at the national, State, or local level, are held in especially high esteem.

I think it especially appropriate, therefore, that diligence of hardworking public servants be recognized whenever possible.

I am inserting for publication in the RECORD a short news item which brings attention to the diligence of one local official in my district, the County Clerk of my home county in Wisconsin, Marathon County.

Many of us, I think, have found it somewhat difficult to determine how revenue sharing funds have been used since the program passed last year. As you know, municipalities are required to publicize their use of revenue sharing funds in local newspapers. Going far beyond minimum requirements, Marathon County Clerk Ray Ott systematically compiled a comprehensive report covering every municipality within Marathon County. That action was most useful in laying out in one place the use of revenue sharing funds in the entire county.

I insert below the story which appeared in the Wausau Daily Record Herald on August 8, 1973, as an example of the kind of hard work done by many public officials which all too often goes unnoticed and unrecognized.

The story follows:

#### OTT FILED ONLY REPORT

Under the law, every municipality which receives revenue sharing funds from the federal government must publicize in a newspaper their planned use report. Many municipalities have failed to do so, according to reports.

In Marathon County, Clerk Ray Ott prepared a comprehensive report covering all the municipalities.

Today he learned he was the only clerk in the United States to do so. He received this word from Graham W. Watt, director of the Office of Revenue Sharing. In commending Ott, Watt wrote in part:

"Many local governments were understandably confused by the planned use report. Your efforts in compiling the pertinent information for your county is an indication of the conscientiousness with which you must perform your duties. No other county clerk in the entire United States has furnished a similar report."

#### TRIBUTE

### HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. McSPADEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial reprint from the Pryor, Okla., Daily Times, of August 22, 1973, written by William A. Reynolds, copublisher, first pointing out that I, too, like Senator INOUE, seek and yearn for that day when we will all be brothers and sisters:

#### THAT LITTLE JAP

The reference of John Wilson, Watergate attorney, to Senator Daniel Inouye as "that little Jap" may have reverberation 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."

#### WHAT HAPPENS NOW?

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Watergate scandal has dominated our minds

for the past few months. But now that the scandal is being exposed to the public, our Nation and its people must seriously consider an alternative to the system that created Watergate.

I am referring to the imbalance of power between the three branches of Government, especially between the legislative and executive branches. For years the Congress has been conceding increasing amounts of its power to the executive branch.

It is time for the Congress to retrieve its lost powers and restore the balance of power so that a threatening situation like Watergate will never occur again.

In this respect I submit the following broadcast by Ivan Shapiro, president of the New York Society for Ethical Culture. The broadcast, which follows, was heard over WQXR and is entitled, "What Happens After Watergate?"

#### WQXR—VIEWPOINT

#### WHAT HAPPENS AFTER WATERGATE?

(Address by Ivan Shapiro, President, New York Society for Ethical Culture)

TAPED JULY 3, 1973.

We will be in the midst of Watergate for a long time yet, but one thing is apparent. The immediate threat to liberty is over, at least for the next few years. The Soviet-style activities and the mentality of the Administration, have been brought into the open, and the wrongdoers are on display before an angry public. Our rescue came just in time. We have learned that attempts were made to corrupt or pervert the functions of at least five non-political government agencies. In addition, the criminal acts which have already been confessed by members of the President's entourage include illegal wire tapping, bribery, attempts to tamper with judges, perjury, obstruction of justice and burglary. The range of crimes, the variety of agencies affected, and the number of participants doubtless will grow as the investigations continue. But no matter what is revealed, this is past history and poses no immediate threat.

But if our rescue is to endure beyond the life of this Administration, you and I must make our voices heard, demanding that our elected representatives do their jobs. This means, first, that they may have to confront squarely and wisely the matter of impeaching the President of the United States and removing him from office. The White House's illegal activities came dangerously close to being a coup d'etat—a clandestine effort to supersede the existing structure of our government. If the President was a consenting party, he is of course a malefactor. If he had no knowledge of what his personally chosen cabinet members and closest assistants were doing, under the cloak of his authority, then he abdicated his powers and responsibilities and left this country without an elected leader.

The Nixon Administration did not create the circumstances in which a Watergate could occur. The President's remoteness from the Congress, from his critics and from reality itself was the legacy left by President Johnson and perhaps by Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower as well. George Reedy, the press secretary for President Johnson, wrote a book in 1970 in which he described the isolation-chamber atmosphere of the White House, the atmosphere of a king surrounded only by his fawning courtiers. Watergate is the result of both the growth of presidential power—the President's practice of ruling by memo and by executive

order—and also of the inability of Congress to maintain and to exercise the powers granted to it by the Constitution. Therefore, the larger job which faces our representatives is to revamp the machinery of Congress, to enable it to fulfill the role required of it. For instance, Congress must have its own staff of civil servants equipped, and of adequate strength, to furnish Congress with the facts needed for a real policy making role, without being dependent upon the executive branch. In addition, the Office of Management and Budget must be brought wholly within the control of the Congress. We've always known that whoever exercises the power of the purse and the power to make war is the ruler. It took the English two revolutions to get this power out of the hands of the monarch and into those of Parliament, and the framers of our Constitution themselves fought one bloody revolution on this very issue. They were terrified of the possibility of presidential tyranny and they foresaw just the kind of activities that fill this morning's newspapers.

Watergate is a warning to us that if we treat the presidency with reverence rather than with respect, if we view the President as being our monarch instead of being our most important servant, if we permit his power to go unexamined and unchecked, radio talks such as this will not be heard for long. America is not the place for treating the President's critics as the nation's enemies, or for spying on such opponents and destroying them. The wrongdoers have been caught and doubtless many will be punished. But if it again becomes possible for a President to rule as a tyrant, it will be because you and I have not assured ourselves of having representatives in Congress who are capable and desirous of discharging their Constitutional responsibilities to us.

#### TWO CITIZENS OF ONTARIO, CALIF., TO RECEIVE HONORS FOR VOLUNTEER WORK

### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, recently I was reflecting on the vast amount of volunteer time that dedicated citizens spend making our Government work. I was thinking particularly of the tens of thousands of citizens from every walk of life who spend countless hours of their own time serving without remuneration on local boards of education.

Later this fall, the Ontario-Montclair Teachers Association of Ontario, Calif., will be holding a special recognition day honoring two community leaders for their many years of devoted guidance to their school district and community. The two persons being honored are Mrs. Mary Stern (William) and Harold "Tony" Zenz.

Mrs. Stern will be completing over 19 years on the Ontario-Montclair School District Board of Education. Mr. Zenz will be completing 13 years on the same board. Mr. Zenz has been president of the board for 10 years, and Mrs. Stern has been secretary of the board for 18 years.

A partial listing of the endeavors of these two people lends support to the old saying, "If you want something done, give it to someone who is busy."

Mrs. Stern has played an important role in PTA, Service Club, Ontario Police Community Action Committee, Parks and Recreation, League of Women Voters, Womans Club, American Association of University Women, Assistance League, Cancer Fund, United Fund, Den Mother, American Field Service, and even helped in establishing the public library in her old hometown of Marshall, Tex.

Mr. Zenz is a Mason, chairman of the finance committee of the United Methodist Church, Upland, secretary of the flood control board, county planning director, vice president of the board of trustees, San Antonio Community Hospital, member of the Friends of Ontario International Airport, former member of Toastmaster, served on board of YMCA, treasurer of Inland Action, Inc., vice chairman of Juvenile Justice and County Probation Commission, past president of chamber of commerce.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished records of these two outstanding citizens deserve our recognition.

#### NELSONVILLE'S FIRST PRESBYTERIAN IS 100 YEARS OLD

### HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a most noteworthy anniversary being observed in Nelsonville, Ohio, which is located in the heart of southeastern Ohio.

The birthday to which I am referring is the 100th anniversary of the laying of the foundation of Nelsonville's First Presbyterian Church. Actually the land for this fine old church was secured in 1869 and building plans began shortly thereafter. Funds for construction of the church were provided through private contributions and public sales.

The entire building has a touch of southeastern Ohio to it: the foundation stone is from nearby Sugar Grove; the architecture was done by a firm in Marietta; and much of the woodwork is of native timber.

In a service commemorating the anniversary of the church, Rev. John Lloyd Evans—who has devoted 50 years of outstanding service to the First Presbyterian Church—provided the congregation with an extensive history of the church. I found this information both enlightening and interesting. One particular passage was especially significant. Essentially, the Reverend Evans placed the well-being of the church in the hands of the membership, and in so doing advised them:

So I would recommend that each member of the church, and as the years go by, you young people as you grow up, watch the

church. After a storm walk through and see that it is all right, because anxious eyes and careful scrutiny has been given to this church practically every day for all the one hundred years of its existence. Eternal watchfulness will keep the church where it is now.

It is my pleasure to join with all those who have saluted the First Presbyterian Church on its anniversary and I know that the House of Representatives seconds my wish for many more years of service to mankind.

#### THE TRUE MEANING OF "PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE"

### HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, little noticed by the American people in general was the fact that the principle of "peaceful coexistence" was incorporated into the Soviet-American Accord reached last summer in Moscow. In the mind of the average American this means that we will not attack each other with military forces. But what does it mean to the Soviet leadership? What does it mean as regards wars of "national liberation?" How does it apply to the "class struggle?" A member of my staff has put together what I consider to be a very succinct statement on how the Soviets view such things. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

President Nixon's visit to Moscow in May resulted in the signing of two agreements with the Soviet Union, the ABM treaty and the five-year interim agreement on offensive systems. The culmination of lengthy SALT negotiations, they have received wide attention and although reservation has been expressed by Senator Henry Jackson during the Senate debate now under way, their reception has been mostly positive.

The President signed two other important documents with Leonid Brezhnev: a "Declaration of Basic Principles of Mutual Relations Between the USA and the USSR" and a joint communique on problems of mutual interest. The texts of both of these were carried in full in the press but scarcely commented upon, at least here at home. On July 20th the *New York Times* reported from Europe ("Soviet-American Accord Embitters NATO Officials"),<sup>1</sup> however, that reaction was critical.

Both the declaration and communique deserve a second look.

In the declaration of principles both parties agreed:

They will proceed from the common determination that in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence. Differences in ideology and in social systems of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are not obstacles to the bilateral development of normal relations based on the principles of sovereignty, equality, noninterference in internal affairs and mutual advantage.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Flora Lewis, "Soviet-American Accord Embitters NATO Officials," *New York Times*, July 20, 1972, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *New York Times*, May 30, 1972, p. 18.

Is peaceful coexistence—a Marxist-Leninist concept, in fact—suitable, one may well ask, as a basis for "normal" relations?

An indication of what the communists have in mind when they speak of normal relations may be found in a recent book<sup>3</sup> by G. Arbatov, the Soviet expert who is Director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute [for the Study] of the USA.

In discussing how the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a ruling party, approaches the problem of relations with a capitalist state (as any other ruling Communist Party would), he emphasizes the problem's unique complexity. He points out that communist foreign policy must discover "forms and ways of assistance by the victorious proletarian class [the Soviet proletariat, in this case] to the revolution in other countries."<sup>4</sup>

The working class and each of its Communist Parties, whose outlook is by definition internationalist, must render this assistance as their duty. According to Arbatov, even after having conquered power and built the new society in a country, the working class cannot consider its historic task completed. In terms of international class solidarity, this task, in Lenin's words, is "To do the maximum realizable in one country for the promotion, support and stirring up of revolution in all countries." [Lenin's own emphasis]<sup>5</sup>

As communist spokesman, Arbatov, understandably, denies that this is tantamount to export of revolution, or even its instigation ("podtalkingivaniye"), and that it leads to blatant interference in internal affairs of other countries. Communist assistance is justified, he says, since it is a reaction to the capitalist "export of counter-revolution." (For instance, assistance by a capitalist (free-enterprise) government to any non-communist government confronted with internal aggression led by local communists supported by "foreign" communists—the situation in Greece following World War II.)

This assistance formula offered by Arbatov represents "the dialectical unity of peaceful coexistence of states with divergent social systems and the revolutionary process." Communist-controlled states are thus able to coexist peacefully with their capitalist counterparts while "promoting, supporting and stirring up" the revolutionary process in those countries by all available means short of conventional armed conflict.

The dialectical concept of peaceful coexistence—to which the Marxists-Leninists constantly assert their commitment—as a specific form of revolutionary class struggle in interstate relations has disturbing implications for any kind of negotiations with communist-controlled states.

#### TRIBUTE TO LOGAN COTTON

### HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the South Bay area's most eminent citizens, Logan Cotton, will be honored with the City of Hope Award on Thursday, September 13, 1973. I want to join with the other members of the community in congratulating him on this well deserved accolade.

<sup>3</sup> G. Arbatov, *Ideological Struggle and Contemporary International Relations* (Moscow: 1970).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 285.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

Born at the turn of the century in Ohio, Mr. Cotton moved to the South Bay area in 1925. He graduated in 1927 with bachelor of arts and bachelor of science degrees from the University of Southern California.

This award represents the significant contributions that Mr. Cotton has made to all South Bay communities. He is the former mayor and city councilman of Hermosa Beach, past president of the South Bay Shrine Club, and past president of the Redondo Beach Round Table. He has been particularly active in working with retarded children in the South Bay area.

Mr. Cotton has also been a member of the California Republican State Central Committee. He was chairman of the public and business affairs committee of Kiwanis International. He was chosen to make an inspection trip of Radio Free Europe in the Iron Curtain countries.

He is on the board of trustees of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church. Additionally, he is a former instructor of accounting and economics at Loyola University. He also serves on the advisory board of California State College at Dominguez Hills.

For these many reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the honor which is being bestowed upon Mr. Cotton.

#### VERRIDE OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL ACT VETO

### HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the House will have the opportunity on September 12 to override the President's veto of the Emergency Medical Services Systems Act, S. 504. The Senate voted 77 to 16 to override the veto on August 2.

One of the benefits of this legislation would be to bring emergency health care services to the rural areas of the United States, as well as to the outlying territories such as Guam, where it is sadly lacking. In many remote areas, health services are nonexistent, and emergency medical services are not available. As a result, many persons injured in accidents and especially those suffering from heart attacks die needlessly for lack of proper emergency treatment.

The establishment of programs for the training of personnel in emergency procedures as well as for the purchase of necessary equipment is beyond the financial scope of many rural, as well as inner city, governments and organizations. S. 504 would provide a modest amount, \$185 million, to help local governments and nonprofit groups start such programs. The bill would also prevent the administration from closing Public Health Service hospitals without legislative authority.

It is vital to the health and well-being of the people living away from urban areas, as well as those residing in the inner recesses of large cities, that improved emergency services be made available to them. The bill has the backing of all sectors of the American public; it is up to the House to see that their will is expressed at this time.

I call on my colleagues to give their support toward overriding the veto of S. 504 on September 12. An affirmative vote by the House will reassure the American people that the Congress is sincerely interested in their well-being.

#### THE SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME

### HON. RICHARD C. WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, among the mysteries of American health care, few are as persistently complex as the disease known as sudden infant death syndrome—SIDS.

SIDS has been defined by the International Guild for Infant Survival as "the death of an ostensibly healthy infant or young child which occurs suddenly and unexpectedly and which remains unexplained after postmortem examination." Every day between 40 and 60 mothers put their child to bed for a nap or for the night and later, in the morning, or when checking, find their child dead. Because SIDS always occurs while the baby is sleeping, it is often referred to as "crib death" or "cot death".

Excluding the first week of life when many infants die from complications of prematurity, birth defects, or from postnatal asphyxia, SIDS is the leading cause of death in infants under 1 year of age. It is second only to accidents as the largest cause of death to children under age 15. Each year it is estimated that SIDS claims the lives of 10,000 infants in the United States, or about three per 1,000 live births.

Perhaps the most serious problem inherent in studying the etiology of SIDS is the fact that the study begins with the child already dead. Unlike a disease such as cancer or tuberculosis, SIDS cannot be studied until after it has occurred; death is instantaneous and without warning. It is therefore impossible to observe the direct forces or interrelationships leading to the death. The best means of studying the pathology and etiology of SIDS is through an autopsy of the body.

At the moment, serious and tragic injustices often occur because parents of SIDS victims are falsely accused of child abuse. Dr. Abraham B. Bergman, M.D., president of the National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death, points to a recent California case in which a young couple was taken to jail while their baby's body still lay in the house. The parents were charged with involuntary manslaughter but the charges were

eventually dismissed by a municipal court judge. Dr. Bergman, in discussing the event, said:

It was clearly a case of ignorance and prejudice against a couple who were young and poor and couldn't defend themselves.

Public awareness of SIDS has been rapidly increasing, largely due to the efforts of independent volunteer agencies such as the International Guild for Infant Survival, the National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death, Inc., and the media of congressional hearings.

As a result of hearings held before the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, the Senate passed legislation during the last Congress that directs the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to designate the disease of highest priority in intramural research and in awarding research training grants; to develop, publish, and distribute literature to be used to inform the public concerning SIDS; to develop reliable statistical procedures and to designate SIDS as a cause of death in the International Classification of Diseases; and to encourage the availability of autopsies of children who die of SIDS and to release the autopsy results to the parents. No action was taken on the resolution in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation encompassing the provisions of the Senate-passed resolution, and in addition, provides financial assistance for research activities for the study of SIDS.

The point is not that possible child abuse should be ignored but rather that unwarranted criminal investigations should not occur. The parents are already undergoing severe emotional pain. As one witness said in hearings last year, the parents "have enough to do just attempting to maintain their sanity and marriage while trying to explain to their not-too-understanding relatives how their happy, healthy infant could possibly have died."

We are only beginning to understand SIDS. What is important is that serious research begin at once, not only to save lives among infants but to protect parents in the event that tragedy does occur.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, provides the means by which this research may begin, and a protective device for those parents who are falsely accused of neglect because of the public's lack of knowledge and awareness of SIDS. I urge the House to follow the Senate's past action and urge the Congress to enact legislation enabling this research to begin.

#### A SALUTE TO GRAHAM T. NIXON

### HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, the 93d Congress is now considering many legislative proposals which relate to the important area of public health.

It is therefore timely that I share with my colleagues as a salute to a retiring Arkansas leader in this field.

The Arkansas Hospital Association, one of our outstanding organizations, has recently lost the services of a dedicated servant, Mr. Graham T. Nixon, who was forced to resign his position as executive director due to reasons of health.

Mr. Nixon had headed the Arkansas Hospital Association since December 1, 1958. During his 14-year tenure as executive director, he led the association through its development into a formidable force in the health care field in Arkansas. He participated as an active member of numerous health care committees on the State, regional, and national level, and maintained an active role in the American Hospital Association. Mr. Nixon was the first State association executive to serve on the American Hospital Association's Council on Government Relations.

His record of public service includes membership in the Arkansas State Legislature.

Mr. Nixon plans to retire with his wife, Clara, to the countryside outside Austin, Ark.

The administration of health care was well served by Mr. Nixon, and I know that all members of the Arkansas health community share with the President and the Board of Directors of the Arkansas Hospital Association the sincere feeling of regret at the loss of his service.

INDOCHINA POLICY—LETTER  
FROM THE PRESIDENT

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you and my colleagues will recall that on June 28 I inserted a copy of a letter I addressed to the President dealing with the continuing problems in Indochina.

During the recess, by letter dated August 13, 1973, I received a response from the President.

To make the record complete, I am inserting the President's response as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., August 13, 1973.

Hon. BEN B. BLACKBURN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I have read with interest your letter to me as well as your speech to the House on June 25 expressing your reservations concerning the Administration's Indochina policy. I appreciate your views. Your firm support in the past has helped us greatly in achieving a responsible peace in Indochina.

Through patience and strength, substantial advances have been made toward lowering the hostilities and establishing stability in Southeast Asia. As you acknowledge, the Agreement on Vietnam has allowed the return of our POW's. It has also resulted in a substantial reduction in fighting and has left the government of South Vietnam in a strong political and military situation.

While the other side's performance so far has been far from adequate, it is imperative,

I believe, that the South Vietnamese not take dramatic military actions which would discredit their comparatively good record in implementing the peace Agreement. This record, for example, will have a strong bearing on chances of favorable legislative action on urgently needed economic assistance. Given the mood of Congress, South Vietnamese restraint will also better protect our option, if necessary, to take appropriate countermeasures against any massive ceasefire violations by the other side, and thus enhance the deterrent effect of this contingency on the Vietnamese Communists. A comparatively clear record by South Vietnam, furthermore, builds our case for restraint by Hanoi's principal allies against providing the kind of support the DRV would need for a military takeover in the South.

Provided Saigon continues to receive substantial economic assistance and Hanoi is restrained by its own allies and our own ability to react, I am fully confident that the South Vietnamese will survive indefinitely against the North. However, each of these factors is dependent to varying degrees upon Congressional support for our Indochina policy, which in turn is affected by the Government of Vietnam's image in keeping the peace.

In this light, I hope you will reconsider your decision to terminate your support of a prudent yet vigilant Administration policy in Indochina. I urge you to join with us in supporting these small nations which need our help and in working toward a lasting peace in the area.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

CIVIL AIR PATROL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in these times of runaway inflation and increased Government spending, it is indeed a pleasure to remember that there are some organizations that save the U.S. Government money. The Civil Air Patrol is retained by the Air Force for search and rescue missions. It has been estimated that, if the Air Force were to perform these vital services, it would cost the Air Force an additional \$10.5 million. As Commander of the Congressional Squadron of the Civil Air Patrol, I am proud to insert the following article from the Civil Air Patrol News in the RECORD:

CAP SAVES AF \$\$\$\$ ANNUALLY

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The following is the first in a series of subjects on CAP Background Data (see Commander's Column in July 1973 issue of CAP NEWS) which will appear in the next five issues of your Civil Air Patrol NEWS. We suggest that you clip this article for your personal files. The subject for this month is CAP versus Military Flying Costs).

MAXWELL AFB, ALA.—Since most of CAP's reimbursable flying training activities (search and rescue test exercises, flight clinics, air mobility exercises, etc.) are aimed at improving the overall capability of CAP to perform aerial search and rescue, the reimbursement made for authorized flying training must be included in the total amount it costs the Air Force to retain CAP for search and rescue purposes.

National Headquarters generally weighs the annual CAP SAR flying hours against the total annual Air Force aviation fuel and oil (POL) reimbursements to compute a realistic hourly cost to the Air Force. The average

hourly cost to the Air Force for CAP conducted search and rescue missions over the past three years was \$7.25. This cost is affected by many variables, and is not constant for all locales or in comparing any two specific missions.

In addition, CAP is reimbursed for communications and ground POL expenses. This came to \$2.25 per SAR mission flying hour making the total cost \$9.50 to the Air Force to retain CAP as a search and rescue force.

Though little statistical information is available on what it would cost the Air Force to fly this same number of hours in SAR, using its own personnel, equipment and supplies, cost figures for a missing F-111 mission in which the military did participate have been computed. An analysis of this mission performed in January 1971 reveals that it cost the military an average of some \$400 per flying hour. Aviation POL reimbursements to CAP in this particular mission averaged some \$5 per flying hour.

If the Air Force had to fly the 27,400 hours CAP flew on SAR missions in 1972, the cost would have been nearly \$10.9 million. The reimbursable costs to CAP that year were \$260,300; in effect, saving more than \$10.5 million.

FOOD SUPPLEMENTS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge immediate hearings and prompt action on legislation which would once and for all prevent the Food and Drug Administration from infringing on the rights of consumers to purchase safe food supplements for their own consumption without hindrance or restriction. Such legislation, in the form of H.R. 643, has been languishing before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for months, without receiving even an initial hearing.

The past decade has witnessed a veritable explosion of freeze-dried, fabricated, frozen and "fast" foods. While most of these products are high in polyunsaturated convenience, many are woefully low in real nutritional quality. We are experiencing the strange phenomenon in the United States of a standard of living which has soared to the highest level in the world, while the quality of our diets has steadily deteriorated.

Americans consume over 8½ billion gallons of soft drinks yearly, and triple that amount of coffee. We eat more than 8½ billion hot dogs a year, and each man, woman and child swallows an average of 10 pounds of potato chips. Hamburger and french fries establishments have proliferated along our highways and become a way of life. Cookbooks are regular bestsellers in the United States, fad diets make millionaires of their inventors and losing weight is the No. 1 American preoccupation. We have reached the point where many of our eating habits are determined more by expensive advertising campaigns and enticing packaging than by taste or nutritional value.

The food products on our grocery shelves have been stabilized, colored, emulsified, preserved, canned, frozen, freeze-dried, engineered, gas ripened, reconstituted, bleached, refined, and ad-

ditive-filled. The route traveled by our food from the field or farm to its final destination on the table is a long and arduous one, often consisting of hundreds or thousands of miles, with a serious and significant loss of nutrients along the way.

We have little control over the distance our food must travel before it reaches the grocery store shelves, and little control over the treatment and processing most of our foodstuffs must undergo before we buy them. We do have the opportunity to insure that the American consumer is guaranteed the privilege of replacing these lost vitamins and nutrients if he so desires. H.R. 643 would insure the availability of vitamins and food supplements for those nutritionally aware consumers who seek to overcome the widespread deficiencies in our food.

It is quite clear in my mind that the FDA should not make a regulation that interferes with the proper nutrition of the American people. It is our obligation to stop the FDA from limiting our freedoms without justification.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking today about vitamins, minerals, and food supplements—not drugs. We are discussing the lack of vital nutrients in American diets which we have little power to control. In short, Mr. Speaker, we are discussing an issue of urgent national import which deserves the promptest attention of Congress.

#### DOES IRS HAVE A HEART?

### HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of criticism leveled from time to time at the way our Internal Revenue Service treats some of our taxpayers. Some of the complaints are no doubt justified, but I thought my colleagues might enjoy hearing of at least one instance when this Agency did its job in a manner for which it should be complimented and, in addition, went out of its way to help a taxpayer. The following is a letter I received from one of my constituents praising what might be termed the public's least loved Government agency—the Internal Revenue Service:

HOLLYWOOD, FLA.

Congressman J. HERBERT BURKE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have a set income so each year to save expenses, my wife and I prepare our own income tax return. We felt that it was simple, with just the average deduction, interest, etc.—no chance of making a mistake—well this, for the return shown below, we discovered, via a notice from the IRS, that we had made quite a mistake, when we received a check for over \$62.00.

The IRS discovered that our listed deductions weren't as much as the standard allowable deduction, so gave us the benefit and returned the difference. They could have kept it and I would never have known the difference.

I hope you will express my thanks to the proper and responsible people, not only be-

cause I received a refund that I could surely use, but because it is indicative of an efficiently operated department.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM W. BAUGH.

#### RECLAMATION—AN INVESTMENT IN SOCIETY

### HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the National Water Commission, created by the act of September 26, 1968, has completed its report, transmitted it to the Congress and expired as contemplated by the act. Each Member of the House and Senate has received a copy of the report and there has been an opportunity to examine its many conclusions and recommendations.

As the Commission clearly and succinctly sets forth, seven major themes emerge from the report. These themes are given meaning by literally hundreds of individual recommendations. Only the most subjective and biased can disagree with these themes and I certainly do not disagree. Unfortunately, detailed consideration of the report discloses that the Commission's recommendations do not always logically implement its central themes. This is particularly evident in the case of the Commission's fifth theme in which the Commission states the belief that "sound economic principles should be applied to decisions on whether to build water projects"—a completely supportable premise which no one can dispute.

It is therefore quite interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see what the Commission does with this theme. It proceeds to completely subvert it by the narrow and restrictive assumption that the only objective of water resource development is a net increase in goods and services available to consumers—consistent with protection of environmental values. This is the classic, shortsighted, cash flow, national efficiency economics that has been implicitly rejected by the Congress on most projects authorized for development in the last 40 years. It assumes that our society is fully homogeneous and that all elements of production, labor, capital and management are fully mobile.

In other words, it overlooks and ignores the diversity of our social and economic order and expressly assumes that anything good for one region of our country is attained at the expense of another region. In short, it denies the value of regional economic strength and effectively eliminates this important element from the decisionmaking process.

Those of us who have been close to water resource decisionmaking for any considerable period of time have heard this argument many times before. In fact, the relative validity of this assumption has been at the heart of the ongoing debate over the standards and principles for evaluating water resource projects which has been under consideration by

the Water Resources Council for the last 3 years. Many observers of this dialog, including some Members of Congress, have viewed the standards and principles issue as being one of the discount rates. While discount rates are admittedly important to economic evaluation, I believe that the rejection of benefits stemming from regional improvement and the social betterment of affected citizens is an issue of equal or greater relevance.

This matter, perhaps more than any other, is at the root of my disappointment with the overall effort of the Commission. While not the only case, it is a classic example of the tendency of the Commission to take a "finger to the wind" approach to its duties. While the enabling act does not explicitly so require, one hoped that the Commission would pursue, develop and propose a well-reasoned national policy for water resource development. Unfortunately, it has chosen to compile an uncoordinated array of objections and complaints that have been around for years. Absent from the report is any assessment of the role or contribution of water resource development to our economic and social well-being, much less any assessment of the likely consequences of following its many recommendations.

One can only regret that the Commission, despite the expenditure of many years of time and many millions of dollars, failed so completely to understand the dynamic nature of our economic order and chose to pursue a course based on the cliches, truisms, and conventional wisdom of 10 or more years ago. No place is this approach more evident than in the treatment of the role of irrigated agriculture in the nationwide scheme of things.

The Commission obviously approached its analysis of the Federal reclamation program from the mistaken assumption that it, the reclamation program, has as its primary purpose the production of commodities for their own sake. Now, at the time the Commission was structuring its study this was not a valid premise. In 1902, when the Federal Reclamation Act was enacted, this Nation was not a commodity-short country and, until recent weeks, there has been no time since when we were short of commodities except for a limited period during the dark days of World War II. The justification for this program, at the inception, at all times since the inception and to this day, is the stimulation of regional economic strength and well-being. The program has well-served the American people in this regard. Vast areas of the otherwise inhospitable West are today contributing to our overall economic strength and diversity—as the direct result of irrigated agriculture brought into being through reclamation law. Mr. Speaker, reclamation-based communities are taxpayers—not tax consumers as are so many of our communities whose existence is based on utilization of non-renewable resources. Land and water are constantly renewable and once they are melded into a workable production matrix their capacity to continue working effectively and economically is without limit as to time.



This circumstance alone is ample to refute and deny the premise of the Commission that there is no justification for public support of programs of this character. Now, admittedly, the Commission does not state its case in these terms—preferring to characterize such support in the more inflammatory manner by labelling it as a Federal "subsidy." If an investment in the well-being of a major segment of our society is a subsidy then all of government is a subsidy and we can leave it at that.

While I stoutly deny that the reclamation program must rely on its ability to produce commodities for its justification, as the Commission report insists, I would like to point out something that happened to the Commission report on the way to the printer. It must be a source of chagrin and dismay to the Commission to observe that events have overtaken its report. Instead of the embarrassment of riches of agricultural commodities for which the Commission blames "subsidized irrigation," what do we find today to be our true situation? I doubt that a single one of my colleagues need to be reminded by this Member that we are all besieged by complaints of shortages, spiralling prices caused by limited supplies and projections of worse yet to come in the basic foodstuffs upon which the American consumer depends for his daily diet.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to dwell on the awful mess that has befallen our national food industry. It is on a par with the rest of our economy insofar as the individual that must work for a living is concerned. I am compelled, however, to express my total disagreement with, and disdain for, the point of view that would have us scrap one of the few time-tested and proven public institutions that has a capability to help us out of the mess in which we find ourselves. This is what the National Water Commission would have us do with respect to the reclamation program. It can expect no help in this regard from this Member.

#### TRY BICYCLING—FOR FUN AND RELAXATION

### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment to inform you and our colleagues of the notable achievement of Dr. Allan Abbott, a member of the emergency room staff at St. Bernardine's Hospital in San Bernardino, Calif. Dr. Abbott, a resident of Crestline, in the district represented by our able and distinguished colleague Mr. PETTIS, last month set a new world speed record for unlimited speed on a bicycle—an almost unbelievable 138.674 miles per hour.

I am indebted to Mr. Phil Fuhrer, a sports writer at the San Bernardino Sun-Telegram, for my information about this new record.

If cruising along at 138 miles per hour on a bicycle sounds a little bit dangerous to you—kind of a sink or Schwinn proposition—let me assure that Dr. Abbott is still in one piece, and unharmed by his experience. And the previous record-holder, Jose Meiffert of France lived to tell about it when he set his record of 127.34 miles per hour in 1962. Of course, he was killed in a subsequent attempt to break his own record, but nothing is completely safe.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am not particularly anxious to ride at 138 miles per hour in a car, let alone a bicycle. But I am happy to offer him my congratulations on his new record, and I would like to offer him some advice as well: I hope he keeps his job in the emergency room at St. Bernardine's. The job goes well with his hobby.

#### WHOSE OX IS BEING GORED?

### HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, recently the syndicated columnist William F. Buckley placed in his column a letter he characterized as being from a thoughtful lawyer in Arizona. It concerned a subject very much in the headlines these days, the rights of a Senate committee to investigate wrongdoings in the executive branch of our Government. The matter is of more than passing interest since this man was condemned for his investigation in which he used much the same approach that the Watergate investigators are using. Many of the same issues were raised. The letter, as reproduced in the column in the Washington Star-News of September 4, 1973, follows:

#### WHOSE OX IS BEING GORED

(By William F. Buckley)

"While we tend sometimes to overemphasize the importance of current events," he writes, "nevertheless, history books will some day record a most dramatic period in the course of the nation.

"A group of willful men conspired to subvert the democratic process, but fortunately were caught in the act and exposed.

"They were highly educated (most of the prominent figures were lawyers educated to revere and respect the law). Many were associated with the President himself. Some traveled with the President regularly and advised him in delicate matters involving relationships with China and Russia which would determine the future of the nation, and in a larger sense the world.

"Most were young, highly committed in political life, and of the same political party. They had come into government during a landslide election, and held high appointments in many branches of the U.S. government. Many were close social friends. Some were classmates in school.

"Some went by code names, gave code names to their groups and their projects; they used couriers instead of mail; they stole records and made copies; they used false pretenses of all sorts; they made elaborate plans to transfer money and documents, and made telephone calls from public phone booths instead of their offices.

"When all this began to come to light, a special committee of the Senate was appointed to investigate. One member, a lawyer, took the lead. He was fearless in his demand for a full public disclosure from every witness to the scheme, and explained that the true function of a Senate committee was not only to seek facts for future legislation, but also to focus the public spotlight on wrongdoing, and wrongdoers, that they might be judged by the people. As to those who refused to testify on constitutional grounds, he was disdainful. He contended that this position was a sham, that if they really didn't have anything to hide, they would come forward and cooperate with the committee, and thus, the American people could not be blamed for inferring guilt from their silence.

"He attracted great attention; from that moment on this obscure lawyer was known by everyone.

"His name was Joe McCarthy."

#### 93D CONGRESS BUILDING CONSTRUCTIVE RECORD OF LEGISLATION AND REASSERTING CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, although the President has criticized the performance of the 93d Congress to date as "disappointing," an assessment of the accomplishments and achievements of this Congress indicates this will be an historic Congress—and much already has been accomplished.

In this connection I place in the Record herewith my recent newsletter Capitol Comments, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the work of the Congress.

The newsletter follows:

#### 93D CONGRESS BUILDING CONSTRUCTIVE RECORD OF LEGISLATION AND REASSERTING CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

As Congress reconvenes following the August recess, the Democratic Leadership has taken sharp issue with a statement by President Nixon describing the work of this Congress as "disappointing". The Leadership and other Members of Congress have pointed out that the President, through his concentration on the Watergate scandal, his vetoes of bills passed by Congress and the termination of more than 100 programs established by Congress, has tended to stalemate government in many areas.

Although the Senate Watergate TV hearings have attracted the attention of many Americans for several weeks, the more than 50 other committees of the Congress have quietly moved forward with their legislative work and more than 100 important bills have been passed—including the Economic Stabilization Act of 1973 which provides the President with continuing authority to impose economic controls to prevent inflation. Other important bills enacted by this Congress in its first seven months include an increase in Social Security benefits, the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1973, Rural Electrification Act Amendments, a four-year Omnibus Farm bill, Public Works and Economic Development Act, of 1973, Crime Control Act of 1973, the Minimum Act of 1973, and the Older American Benefits Act, Public Works appropriations and

other annual departmental appropriations bills. Defense and Foreign Aid are as yet to be considered.

The Leadership has also pointed out that this is an historic Congress because it has assumed the difficult task of reasserting the constitutional powers and responsibilities of the Congress in both domestic and foreign policy.

This has included the termination of the bombing in Southeast Asia by Congressional action and the passage of legislation by both Houses to halt the massive and illegal impoundment of funds appropriated by the Congress for vital and important domestic programs.

Both Houses of Congress have also set a spending ceiling substantially less than that recommended by the President, who insists on lecturing Congress on fiscal responsibility. The House bill sets a ceiling \$1 billion 600 million lower than that recommended in the President's budget and the Senate has set a ceiling \$700 million less than the total Federal budget requests.

The Leadership has emphasized that the differences between Congress and the Administration relate primarily to priorities—not to the amount of expenditures. In other words, one question is whether Congress should accept the Administration's recommendation for a \$5½ billion increase in military spending with the United States out of the war in Southeast Asia—and whether increased foreign aid—including aid to the warlords of Hanoi-North Vietnam—recommended by the Administration should be approved when vital and important domestic programs are being terminated.

Research indicates that the Administration is financing precisely the same types of programs and projects in other nations that it proposes to terminate at home.

Many feel that the President's attack on Congress is obviously designed to divert attention from the disclosures of the Watergate hearings. As a result of disclosures and investigations, a total of 16 persons have been convicted, pleaded guilty or indicted in the District of Columbia and three states—New York, California and Florida.

Those involved include the former Attorney General of the United States, the former Secretary of Commerce, and more recently indictment of the President's chief administrative assistant in California.

As one Congressional leader commented recently, "Watergate is just the tip of the iceberg and investigations by Congress and the Justice Department must be carried through to conclusion to restore the people's confidence in the government."

Despite the continuing conflicts between the Executive and the Congress, there are indications that with a more cooperative staff in the White House, there will be a better working relationship between Congress and the President.

Certainly this would be desirable and helpful in the public interest in arriving at mutually acceptable compromises, understandings and agreements. Congress, however, does not exist to rubber-stamp Executive recommendations—it is the responsibility of Congress to make independent judgment and set national priorities.

#### OFFICERS HONORED

### HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding efforts of Prince Georges County police officers

in redirecting the lives of youthful offenders from crime to responsible citizenship.

Six police officers were recently honored for their contribution to this program: Darrell Griswold, Edward Forbes, James Murray and Gerald Howard, all of Forestville, Md., John Fasick of Laurel, Md., and Thomas Van Valkenburgh of Greenbelt. These men were recommended by fellow officers and the public, and were acclaimed by the Maryland Association of Women Highway Safety Leaders.

I take great pride and pleasure in adding my congratulations to these fine law enforcement officers for the truly remarkable achievements which they have accomplished in the rehabilitation of these young offenders.

#### THE PUBLIC SPEAKS OUT IN SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITALS

### HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed to learn that the President has seen fit to veto the Emergency Medical Service Systems Act. It is clearly the intent of the majority of the House and the Senate that the Federal Government involve itself in the very important business of saving lives that are currently being lost because of the lack of immediate medical attention when they need it most—at the point of injury.

Another of my concerns with the President's action on this bill is the fact that he is hereby ignoring the intention of Congress to keep the Public Health Service Hospitals open. These hospitals play a substantial role in health manpower training and health research and provide facilities for a wide variety of health programs serving those people who cannot afford to purchase these services independently.

I would like to submit the following letters and statements expressing the concern of the public and of public officials of the State of Washington for the continued operation of the Public Health Service Hospitals. I believe that they clearly indicate the need for these facilities and the services they provide.

The letters and statements follow:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
BLACKFEET INDIANS,

Seattle, Wash., January 31, 1973.

BROCK ADAMS,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: I am writing this letter to you asking for your assistance, in a matter of vital importance. This concerns the closing of the Public Health Service Hospital, here in the city of Seattle.

It seems whenever there is a cut back in Federal aid, it is always the poor that is hit the hardest. If this hospital was closed, many people would suffer, for the need of Medical assistance.

They cannot afford health insurance, so I cannot think of any other solution, but to keep the Hospital open, for their conven-

ience. I also believe that many people would suffer an untimely end, for the lack of medical attention.

I know what illness is Mr. Adams, and I feel a very great concern for these poor people. It would be impossible for them to get medical help without available finances.

Mr. Adams, I hope that you will be able to lend us your assistance in this very important matter.

Hoping to hear from you at the earliest possible convenience, I remain.

Sincerely,

CECELA M. BARNHIT

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S  
AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION—LOCAL 3,  
Seattle, Wash., April 17, 1973

The Honorable BROCK ADAMS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: The Seattle Public Health Service Hospital, known among seafaring people for many years as the "Marine Hospital", has been expanded to care for Indian people, Aleuts, Eskimos, and many others. In the fishing industry there are a number of people working on processing floaters who, at times, will qualify for coverage.

Many seamen-fishermen have this protection, including vessels whose owners are not financially able to provide the kind of coverage now provided by this hospital. They roam the Pacific Ocean from California to Oregon to Washington to Alaska and back.

Other organizations and associations have outlined many other reasons for keeping this hospital open, however we call this to your attention as it is most serious to the people above mentioned.

We urge your active and strong support in whatever way you care to support this fight for the retention of this hospital.

Sincerely yours,

JOE JURICH, Secretary.

MARCH 9, 1973.

STATEMENT CONCERNING CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL, SEATTLE, WASH.

The University of Washington Association of Women Medical Students protests the cuts in funding for health and social services in the proposed federal budget.

The proposed closing of Public Health Service hospitals will seriously impair good health care delivery. The PHS Hospital in Seattle provides services for many workers and poor people as well as back up services for free clinics and for native Americans. The other hospitals in our area, already crowded, cannot compensate for the loss of the PHS Hospital.

The PHS Hospital is an excellent teaching facility. About one-fifth of our medical students are assigned to the PHS Hospital for clinical clerkship. Closure of the hospital would create crises both in funds for faculty and in the numbers of patients available for instruction.

The proposed federal budget will drastically cut research and training grants. These cuts would force the dismissal of 81 faculty members and 374 researchers, seriously compromising the quality of the University of Washington Medical School as a teaching and research facility.

The proposed budget would also halve the funds that have been used to financially aid minority students at the UW Medical School. Proposed cuts in funding for maternal and child health, comprehensive health services, prevention of lead poisoning, and rat control programs would have their predominant effect on those who have least access to health care and training, and so disproportionately affect poor people, particularly minorities and women.

The PHS Hospital should not only be kept open, but it should be modernized and its services expanded. We urge you to support a

federal budget that will recognize the importance of comprehensive health care and preventive medicine for all sectors of our population.

ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN  
MEDICAL STUDENTS,  
*University of Washington Medical,  
School, Seattle Washington.*

KING COUNTY COUNCIL,  
*Seattle, Wash., March 15, 1973.*

The Honorable BROCK ADAMS,  
*House of Representatives, House Office  
Building, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. ADAMS: The King County Council in regular session on March 12, 1973 passed a Memorial to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare from the State of Washington requesting that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare use all resources at its disposal to keep the Public Health Hospital in Seattle open and properly funded.

Attached hereto is a copy of the above mentioned Memorial.

Very truly yours,  
LEE KRAFT, *Council Administrator.*  
Attachment.

MEMORIAL.—TO THE HONORABLE RICHARD M. NIXON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AND TO THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED AND TO THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

We, your Memorialists, the County Council of the County of King, State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully present and petition as follows:

Whereas, the Public Health Service has the responsibility and obligation for the care and treatment of many categories of beneficiaries living in Montana, Idaho, Alaska and Washington, including Indians, seamen and some groups of uniformed service personnel and their families, and furnishes primary back-up service for the fifteen Free Clinics in the Seattle area; and

Whereas, following a public hearing in Seattle in April of 1972, a Congressional Committee found that there is a continuing need for a Public Service Hospital in this area; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States committed itself to maintain and expand Public Health Service Hospitals in Senate concurrent Resolution No. 6, 92d Congress, First Session, September 23, 1971; and

Whereas, the Public Health Care Coalition made up of representatives of the uniformed services, the Free Clinics, Indian, and employees of the Public Health Service Hospital as well as other interested persons, have proposed the following goals:

(1) The Public Health Service Hospital should be kept open; until such a time that an alternative system beneficial to the citizens can be established; and

(2) The Public Health Service Hospital should be renovated and modernized to improve the present health care services;

(3) Services of the hospital should be extended consistent with health needs of the 1970's. These include family medicine, drug and alcohol programs, day care for workers and patients, transportation, extended care at home and in nursing homes, family planning, extension of services to the Free Clinics, etc.;

(4) A council representing employees beneficiaries, and the community at large should be formed to assist in planning the hospital's priorities and needs in the future, as well as participating in preparation of a budget; and

Whereas, the goals and objectives of the Public Health Care Coalition have the en-

dorsement of the Puget Sound Comprehensive Health Planning Council; and

Whereas, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is continuing to cut back service through negative funding and now proposes to eliminate inpatient operations as of July 1, 1973.

Now, therefore, your Memorialists respectfully request that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare use all resources at its disposal to keep the Public Health Service Hospital in Seattle open and properly funded to assure that the above objectives be fulfilled and that our Congressional Delegation from the State of Washington in the Senate and House of Representatives use every available avenue to bring about the fulfillment of this petition.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled, and to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
*Olympia, Wash., February 21, 1973.*

HON. BROCK ADAMS,  
*Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: I have the honor to transmit a certified copy of House Resolution No. 73-24 which was adopted by the Washington State House of Representatives on February 20, 1973.

Very truly yours,  
DEAN R. FOSTER, *Chief Clerk.*

Enclosure.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

House Resolution No. 73-24 by Representatives Maxie, Eng, Douthwaite, O'Brien, Chatalas, Sommers, Valle, Ceccarelli, Charnley, and Williams

Whereas, The Public Health Service has the responsibility and obligation for the care and treatment of many categories of beneficiaries living in Montana, Idaho, Alaska and Washington, including Indians and some groups of uniformed service personnel and their families, and furnishes primary back-up service for the fifteen Free Clinics in the Seattle area; and

Whereas, The Congressional Committee consisting of Congressmen Brock Adams, Paul Rogers, William Roy and John Schmitz, after holding public hearings in Seattle in April of 1972, found that there was a continuing need for the Public Health Service Hospital in Seattle and that it should remain open; and

Whereas, The Health, Education and Welfare Administration is continuing to reduce service through inadequate funding, thus lowering employee morale and undermining the health care delivery system; and

Whereas, The Public Health Care Coalition proposal, containing the following goals and objectives, has the endorsement of the Puget Sound Comprehensive Health Planning Council that:

(1) The Public Health Service Hospital should be kept open;

(2) The Public Health Service Hospital should be renovated and modernized to improve its health care delivery;

(3) The Public Health Service Hospital's services should be extended, consistent with the health needs of the 1970's. This includes family medicine, drug and alcohol programs, day care for children of workers and patients, transportation, extended care at home and in nursing homes, family planning, obstetric-gynecology services and extension of services to the Free Clinics;

(4) A study should be made of the unmet health care needs in our region which a modernized and expanded Public Health Service Hospital could serve;

(5) A council should be formed representing beneficiary groups, Public Health Service Hospital workers and the community, with the authority to help plan the hospital's future, determine priorities for the services it provides, and prepare the budget;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives do hereby request that our Congressional Delegation in Washington, D.C. take all steps necessary to facilitate and insure the continued delivery of high quality medical care at the Public Health Service Hospital in Seattle; and

Be it further resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives transmit a copy of this Resolution to each member of Congress from the State of Washington.

## STATES CHALLENGE PRESIDENTIAL IMPOUNDMENTS

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, the issue of Presidential impoundment of congressionally appropriated funds has become a critical one, both for us as legislators and for numerous potential recipients of Federal aid across the Nation.

Both the House and Senate have now adopted anti-impoundment bills. Along with this, many States have filed suits against various executive branch agencies and President Nixon claiming these impoundments are illegal and unconstitutional.

The Committee on the Office of Attorney General (COAG) of the National Association of Attorneys General, located in Raleigh, N.C., has compiled a thorough list of these suits.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to include for the RECORD the current list of impoundment cases now pending in the courts:

### IMPOUNDMENT CASES IN COURT MULTI-SUBJECT

*State of Georgia v. Nixon et. al.* (filed February 28, 1973—U.S. Sup. Ct.). State asks leave to file complaint against the President, the Secretary of Transportation, the Acting Commissioner of Education, the Acting Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Asks court to enjoin defendants "from impounding or withholding from the State of Georgia any sums of money, obligational authority, or other fiscal assistance or grants to which it is entitled under the above described programs . . ." (COAG has copy of Motion for Leave to file Complaint, and of Brief).

Status: The case had been scheduled to go before the Justices on July 9. The U.S. Department of Justice has requested a delay to file responses. The Attorney General's office expects that pleadings will be in by the end of July.

Contact: Assistant Attorney General Alfred Evans, Telephone: (404) 656-3330.

### AGRICULTURE

*Berends v. Butz* (USDC-D. Minn.; 357 F. Supp. 143, 1973). Class action by four farmers for injunction, declaratory judgment and

relief in nature of mandamus, concerning emergency loan program under consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, 7 USC sec. 1961, and the Disaster Relief Act of 1970, PL 91-606. On June 26, 1972, Butz designated area as "emergency loan" area. On December 27, he directed cessation of acceptance of application. On February 15, 1973, the court issued a temporary restraining order to resume acceptance but not processing of applications. Court held that defendants have unilateral, ministerial duty to implement the loan program; its termination violated the federal statutes, regulations and due process. Defendants ordered to process applications submitted before June 30, 1973.

Contact: Vance Opperman (Private Attorney) Tel: (612) 277-7621.

*Dotson v. Butz* (USDC—D.C.; Civ. No. 1210-1973, Judge Gash). (Subject not known).

Status of Case: preliminary injunction issued June 20.

*Pealo v. the Farmers Home Administration* (USDC—D.C., Civ. No. 1028-19B, Judge Ritchey). Impoundment of funds for Interest Credit Loans.

Status of case: July 31, ordered to process loans. The Rural Housing Alliance says the agency has not complied with the order and has asked that it be held in contempt of court. Judge Ritchey said he wasn't "interested in this extreme course" of a contempt citation, but ordered the telegram sent.

#### EDUCATION; MULTI-SUBJECT

*Commonwealth of Pennsylvania et al. v. Weinberger, Ottina and Ash.* (USDC—D.C.; filed April 25, 1973). Challenges impoundment of federal funds under eight programs:

- (1) Title I of ESEA, 20 USC sec. 241 a. et seq.; (Assistance to schools with high concentration of low-income children);
- (2) Title II of ESEA, 20 USC sec. 821-827 (instructional materials);
- (3) Title III of ESEA (model programs);
- (4) Vocational Education Act, 20 USC sec. 102(b), (programs for academically or economically handicapped);
- (5) Part B of VEA, 20 USC sec. 1261-1264 (career training programs);
- (6) Part F of VEA, 20 USC sec. 1341 (home-making education);
- (7) Part H of VEA, 20 USC sec. 1371-74 (work-study programs);
- (8) Adult Education Act, 20 USC sec. 1201-122.

A total of \$2,651,891,000 has been appropriated by Congress for funding these programs through June 30, 1973; defendants had allotted only \$2,271,409,789 of this. (COAG has Complaint).

Status of case: (1) A preliminary injunction was issued June 28, setting aside the total sum appropriated. (2) Order was issued June 29 allowing a class action; Pennsylvania is representing all states which have not filed separately. (3) Both sides have moved for summary judgment.

Deputy Attorney General Adams notes that the attorney for the defense, in oral argument, effectively admitted that the language of the underlying legislation is mandatory rather than discretionary. The defense memo in opposition to the motion for preliminary injunction dealt solely with Art. II powers to impound funds for the purposes of controlling inflation, holding down taxes, securing the national defense, and protecting the national interest in foreign affairs.

Contact: Deputy Attorney General James R. Adams. Telephone: (717) 787-4099.

*State of Alabama ex. rel. William J. Bazley v. Weinberger and Ottina* (USDA—M.D. Ala., No. 4103-N). Impoundment of funds under ESEA, VEA, and AEA.

Status: A preliminary injunction issued on July 18.

Contact: Assistant Attorney General Myron Thompson. Telephone: (205) 269-7738.

*State of Alabama ex. rel. William J. Bazley v. Weinberger and Ottina* (USDC—M.D. Ala., No. 4101-N; filed June 29). Challenges impoundment of funds under Title III of the National Defense Education Act and Title III of the Higher Education Act.

Status: A temporary restraining order has been issued. Preliminary injunction issued.

Contact: Assistant Attorney General Myron Thompson. Telephone: (205) 269-7738.

*Minnesota ex. rel. Warren Spannaus, Attorney General, v. Weinberger and Ottina.* (USDC—D. Minn.; File No. 4-73, Civ. 313; filed June 14). Concerns impoundment of funds under Title III of NDEA and Title I, Part A of ESEA.

Status: Preliminary injunction issued June 27.

Contact: Special Assistant Attorney General Thomas R. Muck; Tel: (612) 296-2961.

#### EDUCATION; TITLE III OF NDEA

*State of Arkansas v. Weinberger and Ottina* (USDC—E.D. Ark., filed May 15, 1973). Action seeking mandamus to compel the Secretary of DHEW and the Acting U.S. Commissioner of Education to allot Arkansas' share of funds under Title III of the National Defense Education Act. Funds had been appropriated by Public Law 92-334, as amended. Title III provides 50 percent reimbursement funds for laboratory and other special equipment. (COAG has copy of complaint).

Status of Case: (1) on May 24, a motion for a preliminary injunction was filed; (2) on June 22, the motion was granted; (3) on July 3, the injunction was dissolved on motion of the Attorney General, relying on HCR 636 to maintain availability of funds. The case is now proceeding to trial on its merits. Assistant Attorney General Powers comments that the defense filed a 52-page brief in response to the motion for injunction and that it was "extremely broad and theoretical".

On June 26, Oklahoma filed a motion to intervene; this has not been ruled on. (No change in status).

Contact: Assistant Attorney General Lonnie A. Powers. Tel: (501) 376-3871.

*State of Kansas ex. rel. Attorney General Vern Miller v. Weinberger et. al.* (USDC—Kansas, No. T-5346; filed May 18). Concerns impoundment of Title III funds.

Status: Temporary injunction signed June 30.

Contact: Assistant Attorney General Kurt Schneider. Tel. (913) 296-2215.

*(Illinois) Bakalts v. Weinberger and Ottina.* (USDC N. Dr. Ill.; filed June). Concerns impoundment of funds under Title III of the National Defense Education Act, 20 USC sec. 401 et seq.

Status of case: (1) A temporary restraining order was issued on June 29; the terms and conditions of the TRO ordered DHEW to issue a grant award for the sum claimed. (2) Nevada, Michigan, Texas and Missouri interpleaded on June 29. (3) Hearing on motion for preliminary injunctions set for September 20. (4) On August 16, a meeting of intervenors will be held in Chicago (apparently, the number of intervenors has increased), bringing material with them; those who cannot attend will send position papers.

Contact: Allen D. Schwartz, Legal Advisor for the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Tel.: (312) 793-2236.

*Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Weinberger et. al.* (USDC—D.C.; No. 1308-73; filed June 28). Impoundment of funds under Title III.

Status: Temporary restraining order granted June 29. Hearing July 19 on preliminary injunction. Order granting summary judgment to plaintiffs issued June 29. Court reviewed Title III—A of NDEA, and found that "the Commissioner is obligated to allot all of whatever remains after he has reserved whatever amounts he chooses within those limits prescribed by Congress [up to 16 percent of total appropriation]." The appropriation for FY 1973 was by means of a

Continuing Resolution, calling for amounts at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate. The term "Not in excess of" does not give defendants discretion. The court said that "control of federal spending is an entirely laudable objective, but there is no authority either in Article II of the Constitution or in the case law, for the defendants' position that they may achieve this by refusing to comply with the terms of a statute." (COAG has copy of opinion).

Contact: Assistant Attorney Andrew M. Wolfe. Tel.: (617) 727-2216.

*State of Maine and Carroll R. McGary, Superintendent of Public Instruction, v. Weinberger, Ottina and Ash.* (USDC—Maine; Civ. No. 14-52; filed June 28). Action concerning impoundment of \$265,000 in Title III funds.

Status: A temporary restraining order was issued June 29. Maine has received a notification of grand award, showing that the funds have been set aside pending final court action. (no change in status).

Contact: Deputy Attorney General John W. Benoit, Jr. Tel.: (207) 289-3661.

*State of North Carolina, ex. rel. Attorney General Robert Morgan, Dallas Herring, Chairman, State Board of Education, and A. Craig Phillips, Superintendent of Public Instruction v. Weinberger, Ottina and Ash.* (USDC—E. D.—N. Car.; filed June 29). Seeks declaratory judgment, injunction, and mandamus. (COAG has complaint).

Status: No further action.

Contact: Deputy Attorney General Andrew A. Vanore, Jr. Tel.: (919) 829-7387.

*State of Washington, ex. rel. Superintendent of Public Instruction v. Weinberger et al.* (USDC—D Wash.; filed June 28). Concerns Title III funds.

Status of Case: June 28; court ordered temporary restraining order; July 11, a preliminary injunction was issued.

Contact: Special Assistant Attorney General James B. McCabe, 404 Olympic National Building, Seattle, 98104. Tel.: (206) 624-8888.

Note: Mr. Kenton Pattle, Vice-President of the National Audio-Visual Association, Telephone: (703) 273-7200, reports that injunctions in impoundment suits concerning education, obtained prior to June 30—the end of the Fiscal Year—enjoyed \$13.3 out of \$50 million in impounded funds.

#### LIBRARIES—EDUCATION

*Louisiana v. Weinberger, Ottina and Ash.* (USDC—E. D. La.; filed 29 June, 1973). Plaintiff seeks declaratory judgment, mandamus and injunctive relief to compel allotment of funds appropriated by Congress under: (1) the Library Services and Construction Act of 1956, 20 USC sec. 351 et seq.; (2) Title III of the National Defense Education Act, 20 USC 401 et seq. (COAG has copy of Complaint; Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction; Order of Court).

Status of Case: On 30 June, the Court issued a Temporary Restraining order requiring the defendants to allot to Louisiana funds for FY 1973. A hearing on motion for preliminary injunction is set for September 12.

Contact, Assistant Attorney General Kendall L. Vick. Telephone: (504) 527-8375.

*Oklahoma v. Weinberger.* (USDC—W. D. Okla.; filed June 30, with Michigan and New Mexico as intervenors). Impoundment under LSCA.

On June 30, the court directed defendants to set aside the full amounts which had been impounded nationwide and to issue grant awards to Oklahoma and the two intervenors, Michigan and New Mexico. On July 23, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Nevada, Washington, Kansas and Texas were permitted to intervene as plaintiffs and came within the scope of the prior mandatory injunction, postjudgment. In the June 30

order, Judge Chandler said that "Insofar as defendants have followed this policy to impound funds appropriated for formula grant programs such as those programs presently at issue, they have violated the clear mandate of the AB discussed herein, the United States Constitution, the Administrative Procedures Act, and their own regulations." (COAG has copy of declaratory judgment, permanent injunction and mandatory writ.

Contact: Assistant Attorney General Paul C. Duncan. Telephone: (405) 521-3921.

*State of Alabama ex. rel. William J. Bazley v. Weinberger and Ottina* (USDC—M.D. Ala., No. 4104-N.) Impoundment under LS CA.

Status: A temporary restraining order has been issued. Preliminary injunction issued.

Contact: Assistant Attorney General Myron Thompson. Telephone: (205) 269-7738.

#### EDUCATION: VETERANS

*National Collegiate Veterans Association et. al v. Ottina et. al.* (USDA—D.C., civil No. 349-73; filed Feb. 22). Seeking declaratory and injunctive relief to compel defendants to accept, process and approve applications under sec. 420 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, 20 USC sec. 1070e-I, for veterans' cost-of-instruction payments. Complaint was amended to include Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Community College Section, California School Boards Association, as plaintiffs. (COAG has copies of: Complaint; Motion to File Amended Complaint; Motion for a Preliminary Injunction and Memorandum in Support of Motion; Order Granting Motion; and Order to Dismiss.)

Status of Case: (1) Preliminary injunction granted on March 27. (2) Case dismissed as moot on May 24, because the Department was accepting and processing applications. Plaintiffs granted right to reopen case if payments were not made.

Contact: W. Thomas Jacks, (Attorney with Public Citizens, Inc.) Tel.: (202) 785-3704.

#### FOOD STAMPS

*Bennett v. Richards* (USDC—Minn.). Impoundment of food stamp funds.

Status: Preliminary injunction granted June 26.

Contact: Robert Peets. Tel.: (415) 642-4911.

#### HEALTH MANPOWER ACT

American Association of Colleges of Podiatric Medicine (D.C.—D.C., Judge Hart). Impoundment under Comprehensive Health Manpower Act of 1971 (medical schools).

Status of case: preliminary injunction issued June 27; briefs due in September.

*National League for Nursing v. Ash.* (D.C.—D.C.; Civ. No. 1316-73, Judge Pratt). Concerns closing of eight public health service hospitals.

Status of Case: preliminary injunction issued June 29.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION

*National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, et. al v. Weinberger.* (USDC—D.C., No. 73-1014.) concerned impoundment of funds under the Second Morrill Act, 7 USC sec. 322 and the Bankhead-Jones Act, 7 USC sec. 329.

Status: Case dismissed as moot on June 29. Defendant informed the court that all currently authorized funds had been certified to the Treasury and were being disbursed.

#### HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

*State Highway Commission of Missouri v. Volpe et. al.* (USCA—8th Cir.; No. 72-1512). The Court of Appeals affirmed the ruling of the district court (USDA—W. D. Mo.); enjoining defendants from withholding from the state the authority to obligate its apportioned funds under the Federal-Aid Highway Act, 23 U.S.C. sec. 101 et seq. (347 F. Supp. 950). (COAG has copies of com-

plaint, USDC ruling, appellee's brief in USCA, and opinion.)

Status of case: The Highway Commission Counsel reports that William Appier, of the U.S. Department of Justice, assured him that he would let him know by July 1 if the U.S. was going to appeal. No notification has yet been received, although the period for appeal has not yet expired. The state notified the federal Highway Administrator on July 11 that it expects the money to be issued without contract controls.

Contact: Robert L. Hyder, Chief Counsel, Missouri State Highway Commission. Telephone: (314) 751-2551.

*South Carolina State Highway Dept. v. Volpe et. al.* (USDC—S. Car.; filed July, 1973). Similar to Missouri case.

Status: U.S. Dept. of Justice has filed brief. On July 9, the Chief Highway Commissioner of South Carolina informed Assistant Attorney General Joseph Good that he had received Memo. 30-3-73 from the U.S. Highway Commissioner that, in effect, releases the balance of 1973 funds for South Carolina.

Contact: Assistant Attorney General Joseph C. Good, Jr. Telephone: (803) 758-3385.

#### HOUSING PROGRAMS

*Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, et. al., v. James T. Lynn, Secretary of HUD, et. al.* (USDC—D.C.; filed June, 1973). Plaintiffs seek to enjoin defendants from refusing to accept or process applications, or to issue feasibility letters or commitments, for subsidiaries of projects under sec. 235, 236 and 101 of the National Housing Act, 12 U.S.C. sec. 17152, 17152-1 and 17015. Brief argues that: (1) irreparable and immediate injury will be done to the plaintiffs if a preliminary injunction is not issued; (2) the defendant's actions are unlawful, as they contravene Congressional intent and are in violation of their own regulations; (3) the government's usual threshold arguments (sovereign immunity, political question, justiciability) are inapplicable; (4) the defendant's actions are an unconstitutional assertion of legislative authority by the executive; and (5) this action discriminates against minority groups, because they suffer disproportionately from substandard housing, in violation of civil rights statutes. (COAG has copy of Complaint, Motion for Preliminary Injunction, and Brief.)

Status of case: The end of July, the court held for the Commonwealth and ordered defendants to begin processing applications. Defendants filed motion for stay pending appeal; this was denied. Appeal will be argued in October, in the court of appeals.

Contact: Assistant Attorney General Michael L. Golden. Telephone: (215) 238-7351.

[Note: The City of Camden has filed a similar suit].

#### INDIAN EDUCATION

*Minnesota Chippewa Tribe v. Carlucci.* (USDC—D.C., 41 LW 2625, April 25, 1973). Suit to compel President to appoint members of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education under Title IV of PL 92-318. Court held that: (1) plaintiffs have standing as they are the intended beneficiaries of the Act; (2) the case does not involve a political question or an "executive" act; the President has no discretion to decide whether or not to appoint; (3) relief is not possible by suing another person, because only the President may appoint the Council.

Status: In a separate order, the case was dismissed as moot, because the Council had been appointed.

#### MENTAL HEALTH

*National Council of Community Mental Health Centers v. Weinberger* (USDC—D.C. No. 1223-73). Class action on behalf of all parties who have applied for grants under B or F of the Community Health Centers Act, 42 USC sec. 2681 et seq.

Status of case: On August 3, Judge Gesell

ordered processing of applications, required compliance with IB order by September 1, 1973 and denied a stay, saying that "these cases should move to higher courts for prompt, definitive determination shown of the confusing inconsequential defenses so typical of Government legalese these days." The 10-page opinion held that "Money has been appropriated to achieve the purposes of the Act and the defendants are given the non-discretionary statutory duty to spend those funds for grants that meet the . . . lawful criteria embodied in rules and regulations promulgated to achieve the purposes of the Act. The defendants have no residual constitutional authority to refuse to spend the money." (COAG has copy of order and opinion). Jerome S. Wagshal notes that: "With respect to 1974, although the Court technically denied relief as premature, it can be hoped that the Executive will apply the principles of the decision to fiscal 1974."

#### OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

*Local 2677, the Am. Fed. of Gov't Employees v. Phillips.* (USDC—DC; April 11, 1973). Suit to enjoin the dismantling of OEO by defendant, the acting director of OEO. Plaintiffs contended that Sec. 2(a) of the 1972 Amendments, whereby the Director "shall" carry out programs, prohibits termination. USDC granted motion for summary judgment. (Opinion reported Congressional Record, daily ed., April 12, 12161).

Status: (not ascertained).

Contact: (not ascertained); May/73 Clearinghouse Review lists plaintiffs counsel as G. R. Graves, 625 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.; John M. Ferren, 815 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. and others).

*West Central Missouri Redevelopment Corporation v. Schultz* (D.C.—D.C.; Judge Jones—Civ. No. 1237-33).

Status of case: preliminary injunction is sued June 29.

*Local 2816, OEO Employees Union v. Phillips.* (USDC—N.D. Ill. No. C-500). Plaintiffs allege that defendants violated sec. 3(c) (2) of the 1972 Amendments requiring the Director to make available \$328,900,000 for sec. 221 programs. Court ruled that this section is concerned only with amounts which Congress has authorized to be appropriated, and there is no appropriation for fiscal 1967. Clearinghouse Review (May, 1973), say that "on the basis of the evidence . . . the court held that the functioning of OEO would continue as provided by law through fiscal 1973 unless Congress acted to discontinue it, and accordingly denied the plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction.

Status: (not ascertained).

Contact: (not known).

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

*Mason v. DeGeorge et al* (USDC—Md.; filed May 2, 1973). Suit by Md. Secretary of Employment and Social Services to compel DHEW to pay state for past expenditures made under the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act. State officials submitted to defendants estimates of expenditures for the fourth quarter of FY/73; defendants refused to authorize payment until they have investigated certain past expenditures for which state has already received funds. (COAG has copy of complaint).

Status: Preliminary injunction granted May 31; argument will be July 16th.

Contact: Deputy Attorney General Henry R. Lord. Tel. (301) 383-3737.

#### WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

*New York City v. Ruckelshaus.* (— F. Supp. — USDC—D.C., Civil No. 2466-72 May 8, 1973.) This was a class action on behalf of New York municipalities; the City of Detroit was an intervenor. The court ruled that Environmental Protection Agency must allocate among the states the sum of \$5 billion for FY 1973 and \$6 billion for FY 1974, pursuant to sec. 205(a) of the Water Pol-

lution Control Act Amendments of 1972. The court rejected contentions that it lacked jurisdiction because of sovereign immunity, or because the action failed to present a justiciable case. The court reviewed the legislative history of the Act and found it was intended to require the Administrator to allocate the full sum authorized. The court noted it was not being asked to determine whether EPA should spend the money, but rather whether the Administrator should make available for obligation the sums authorized to be appropriated. (COAG has copy of decision).

Status: Has been appealed.

*State of Minnesota v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Robert W. Fri.* (USDC—Minn., No. 4-73 Civ. 133, — F. Supp. —, June 26, 1973). Concerns impoundment of funds under the FWPCA. The court reviewed the language of the Act and its legislative history and concluded that "it is clear to the Court that the Administrator should allot all of the authorized funds." While the Congress tried to give the Administration discretion, it was intended "that this discretion be exercised at the obligation stage of the process." (COAG has copy).

Status: Has been appealed. State will file respondents brief by September 14. Oral Argument will be held week of October 14, in St. Paul.

Contact: Special Assistant Attorney General Eldon G. Kaul, Tel.: (612) 378-1320.

*Campaign Clean Water Inc. v. Ruckelshaus* — F. Supp. —, No. 18-73-R., D. Va., June 5, 1973. In a decision on impoundment of FWPCA funds, the district court judge held that, although the Administrator had some discretion at the allotment stage, the drastic reduction in available funds was a violation of the intent of the Act and constituted an abuse of discretion.

Status: A motion for Stay of Appeal was denied on June 8, and an appeal was taken. The briefing schedule will be completed in August.

Contact: W. Thomas Jacks (Attorney with Public Citizens, Inc.) Tel.: (202) 785-3704.

*State of Maine, ex. rel. Attorney General Jon Lund, and State Board of Environmental Protection v. Rikert Fri, Acting Administrator, and John R. McGlennon, Regional Administrator.* (USDC—Maine, Civil No. 14-51; filed June 28). Concerns impoundment of \$29 million in FWPCA funds.

Status: A temporary restraining order was issued on June 29. On July 6, U.S. Attorneys sought to get TRO removed, on the grounds that the funds would not lapse, and it was unnecessary. The court denied their motion and they are taking an appeal to the circuit court.

Contact: Assistant Attorney General Lee Schepps. Tel.: (207) 289-3361.

*George E. Brown, Jr. v. Ruckelshaus* (USDC—Cent. Dr. Cal.; filed January, 1973.) Concerns impoundment under IWPCA. *City of Los Angeles v. Ruckelshaus* filed with Brown.

Status of case: Defense filed motion to dismiss; plaintiffs motion for summary judgment was denied. Decision is expected in October.

Contact: Nancy Mullins. Tele. (202) 225-6161.

*Martin-Trigona v. Ruckelshaus* (USDC—N.D. Ill.). Impoundment of funds under FWPCA.

Status of case: Stay has been ordered pending appeals of summary judgment.

*State of Texas v. Ruckelshaus* (USDC—W. D. Texas, Cir. No. A 73 CA 38; filed —). Concerns impoundment of funds under FWPCA. Plaintiff contends that defendant has no discretion at the allotment stage. (COAG has: Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment; Affidavit in Support of the Motion; Plaintiff's Memorandum in Support of

the Motion; Plaintiff's Memorandum in opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss). Oklahoma intervened in case.

Status of Case: Action pending on plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and defendant's motion to dismiss.

*Mayor Morton Salkind v. Ruckelshaus* (USDC—N.J.). Impoundment under FWPCA.

Status of case: action pending on defendant's motion to dismiss.

*Hubert Klein v. Ruckelshaus.* (USDC—D.C.).

Status of case: dismissed for lack of standing.

#### WELFARE

*State of Minnesota ex. rel. Vera J. Likins, Commissioner of Public Welfare and Attorney General Warren Spannaus v. Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of DHEW; Clyde Downing, Acting Regional Commissioner, and George P. Shultz, Secretary of the Treasury,* (USDA—D. Minn.). Concerns funds under Title 42 USC, Social Service programs for needy persons. As well as impoundment, case involves refusal to pay certain past and future costs of welfare programs, (case still in pre-trial stages.)

Contact: Deputy Attorney General Eric Schultz. Tel. (612) 296-3201.

#### YOUTH CORPS

*Community Action Program Executive Directors Association of N. J. v. Ash et al.* (D.C.—N.J. Civ. No. 899-73; Judge Garth). Impoundment of neighborhood youth corps funds.

Status of case: on June 29, ordered release of \$239 million funds; on July 10, court of appeals denied request for stay of order July 10, the Labor Department authorized regional officers to proceed with hiring.

#### YOUNG BASEBALL TEAM

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues the recent accomplishments of a young baseball team from my district.

The Prince Georges County All-Star Little League Senior Division fielded a team that, on August 18 of this year, worked its way into the finals of the world championships. In doing so it was necessary for them to first win their district championship, the State championship, the division II championship, and finally the eastern regional championship.

The Prince Georges County team met a powerful team from Taiwan in the world series championship but lost in a great game 4-0. The fact that this team held the team from Taiwan scoreless for four full innings is quite an achievement in itself.

I am very proud of these boys who represented their league in the world championships. This is the first time in the history of Little League Senior Division World Series games that a team from Maryland has represented the eastern region. By becoming U.S. champions and second in the world, I believe these boys have done an outstanding job of representing their league and I extend my personal congratulations to them.

#### NOISE BOYS AND HONEST ABE

### HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that a recent tongue-in-cheek column by the distinguished columnist, Jenkins Lloyd Jones, nevertheless helps to place in perspective the type of ready-made, on-the-spot comments of our various TV news analysts who are always ready to take apart, analyze, and debunk virtually every public statement—particularly of our President and other Republican leaders.

Mr. Jones' column suggests the type of phony analysis which might have occurred if these TV oracles were around when the late President Abraham Lincoln delivered his historic Gettysburg Address.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to attach Mr. Jones' article for the benefit of my colleagues and others who may have missed reading this perceptive and highly entertaining column in the September 1 issue of the *Washington Star-News*:

NOISE BOYS AND HONEST ABE

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

"... and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

"Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. I'm Everett Eyebrow in Washington and the Blue Network has just brought you live the speech of President Lincoln at the dedication of the Gettysburg Military Cemetery.

"To analyze the President's remarks I have in the studio my colleagues, Samuel Stiletto and Dirk Smirk. On the split screen you can see the President getting into his carriage and the—well, I thought—rather disappointed listeners dispersing. But that's just one man's opinion and I'd like to hear from Sam."

"You'll have to make that two men's opinion, Ev. You heard the small smattering of applause and I think the television audience was probably as surprised as the Gettysburg crowd that the speech was over almost as soon as it began."

"Dirk?"

"We've got to be fair to the President, Ev. After all, he followed Edward Everett's brilliant two-hour speech, and, obviously, he couldn't top one of America's great orators. Besides, every time Mr. Lincoln tries to get eloquent he seems to come out stilted."

"Right you are, Dirk. Take the way he started his remarks—'Fourscore and seven.' Every man willing to be clear would have simply said, 'Eighty-seven.' And I thought he was groping for words at times, like 'We cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow.' That's saying the same thing two different ways. Don't you agree, Sam, that although the speech was short there was some padding in it."

"Exactly. Take 'government of the people, by the people, for the people.' 'Popular government' would have said it all in two words, and 'democracy' in one. But what disappointed me, Ev, was not what the President said, but what he didn't say. Eh, Dirk?"

"That's the big point, Sam. Here's the country in an awful mess after two bloody years. People are looking to the President for a way out. They are rioting against the draft in New York City and a lot of disgusted soldiers are going over the hill and heading

west. Just what did the President give the people this afternoon, Ev?"

"You can't say that he didn't give them a few fancy phrases, Dirk. Like 'unfinished work so far nobly advanced' and 'great task remaining before us' and 'last full measure of devotion.' But what meaningful and relevant guidelines did he give us for either winning this war or ending it? Yes, Sam."

"I thought it ironic and more than a little impertinent that Mr. Lincoln should come to Gettysburg with vague generalities. There were no vague generalities about what happened there. More than 23,000 of our lads were killed or wounded and here is Gen. Lee, back in Virginia with his army intact. I'd say we're just about where we were two years ago. How about it, Dirk?"

"That's probably why the speech was so short, Sam. Let's be fair to the President, if you'd make as much of a fiasco out of this war as he has what could you do but make a short speech? We get a new commanding general every couple of months and he takes a new army across the Potomac and loses it. What can Mr. Lincoln really say to the people, Ev?"

"I suppose he could say, 'keep on dying,' Dirk, but neither he nor anyone else would want to put it so bluntly. So he says it is for us, the living, to be dedicated, that we must take increased devotion, that we must highly resolve. All this adds up, of course, to more of the same. I wouldn't want to put any words in the President's mouth but it seems to me that what he really implied this afternoon was, 'Hang on, and maybe I'll think of something.' Your turn, Sam."

"Well, I think, again, that we've got to be very fair to the President. I maintain he was not entirely responsible for the war. He was a country lawyer, a circuit-riding joke-teller and one-term congressman who was hurled by a series of accidents into the pinnacle of power at a time when a cool head and skillful hand were desperately needed. I think he was tired, but one more performance like this afternoon could finish him. What about you, Ev?"

"I'm sorry our time is up because I think Sam really put his finger on it. But, in line with giving the President his due, there was one part of his speech to which no one will object—that line where he admitted that the world will little note nor long remember what he said."

"And now an important message from Chompies Dog Food. . ."

#### PRESIDENT NIXON REPUDIATES OPPONENTS OF HOME RULE

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly encouraged by President Nixon's renewed support for self-government for the District of Columbia. This strong support from the White House should help guarantee passage of the home rule bill when it reaches the House floor September 24 and 25.

President Nixon's statement that the Nelsen commission recommendations "would greatly strengthen the capability and expand the authority of the city's government" is most welcome. The House bill enacts 70 percent of the major legislative recommendations of the Nelsen commission. The "rapid action by the Congress" urged by the President can be achieved by passage of H.R. 9682, the

House District of Columbia Committee's bill for "Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization."

Senate adoption of the District of Columbia home rule by a vote of 69 to 17 last July 10 should be followed by overwhelming House approval in 2 weeks. The President's pledge today "to work—to achieve true and effective self-government for the District of Columbia," is good news to us all, and a clear repudiation of the opponents of home rule in his own party.

#### CONCERN FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

### HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency has been conducting hearings throughout the Nation regarding programs in urban areas to reduce pollution by automobiles. The agency held hearings in the Chicago area during August and just completed hearings in the District of Columbia.

Many of the proposals by various city and State governments involve restricting the use of the automobile for private transportation. However, many persons with physical handicaps must rely on private automobiles for the simple reason that the kinds of mass transit that may be available to you or me is not equipped for the physically handicapped. While I do not object to necessary restrictions to alleviate pollution, I am concerned about the needs of the physically handicapped.

I have written letters expressing my concern to officials of the Environmental Protection Agency. I urge my colleagues to join me in alerting this agency to the needs of the physically handicapped.

The letters I have written are:

SEPTEMBER 6, 1973.

Mr. JAMES MACDONALD, Director, Enforcement Division, Environmental Protection Agency, Region V, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR Mr. MACDONALD: I realize that the official comment period regarding the transportation control plan submitted for the Chicago area to meet the air quality standards imposed by the Clean Air Act ended on August 11. However, I hope that in your agency's consideration of these and other transportation control plans you will take into account the special needs of the physically handicapped. Many of the proposals which I have seen to reduce auto emissions in urban areas involve restricting the use of the automobile in order to encourage greater use of public transportation.

While I do not object to necessary restrictions to alleviate pollution, it is important to recognize that persons with mobility limitations must rely on private automobiles for transportation.

I am confident that, aware of the exceptional needs of this special category of individuals, your agency will be able to devise adequate pollution control measures which avoid imposing undue hardship on the physically handicapped.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. O'BRIEN,  
Member of Congress.

SEPTEMBER 6, 1973.

Mr. JOHN R. QUARLES, Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. QUARLES: I understand that the Environmental Protection Agency is currently holding hearings regarding the transportation control plan submitted by the District of Columbia, Virginia and Maryland, to meet the air quality standards imposed by the Clean Air Act.

I hope that in your agency's consideration of these and other transportation control plans you will take into account the special needs of the physically handicapped. Many of the proposals which I have seen to reduce auto emissions in urban areas involve restricting the use of public transportation.

While I do not object to necessary restrictions to alleviate pollution, it is important to recognize that persons with mobility limitations must rely on private automobiles for transportation.

I am confident that, aware of the exceptional needs of this special category of individuals, your agency will be able to devise adequate pollution control measures which avoid imposing undue hardship on the physically handicapped.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. O'BRIEN,  
Member of Congress.

#### FOOD PRICES AND THE ELDERLY

### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, runaway inflation and soaring food prices are playing havoc with the lives of our constituents. Low- and middle-income families are having their buying power reduced, in some instances below the poverty level, through diversion of increasing percentages of their incomes for food items. Those on small, fixed incomes, especially the elderly and the disabled, find themselves forced to live lives of destitution and misery. Yet, despite the mounting evidence that serious ills beset our country and our economy, the administration continues to assert that incomes have more than kept up with prices and we never had it so good. In fact, I have been informed, after making extensive inquiries, that there has been only a 1-percent increase in the overall food budget of the American family.

Mr. Speaker, this simply is not true. Instead of the much-publicized 17.6 percent of income many of our families are spending over one-third of their budgets for food. A rough extension of the figures of a Department of Labor survey indicates that during recent years, even after full allowance is made for increases in earned income, some families have to spend as much as 13 percent of their incomes more just to maintain diets they enjoyed in 1960-61. Others are experiencing increases ranging from 11 to 3 percent.

Tom Buckley, in last Friday's Times, describes very vividly just how the economic squeeze is affecting New York City's elderly. For the information of my

colleagues, I am inserting his article into the RECORD.

The article follows:

**POVERTY AND PRIDE TRAP CITY'S AGED**  
(By Tom Buckley)

Many of the old people who shop at the A. & P. at First Avenue and 90th Street stand in front of the meat cases for long periods of time, like children gazing through a toy store window.

Some of them shuffle through the plastic-wrapped steaks and chops, as though they could taste them with their fingertips.

Occasionally, an old man or woman will bring a small package of chopped meat close to his eyes, to read the smudged price label, and, more often than not, put it back.

At the checkout counter they put down their purchases—two cans of spaghetti perhaps, a head of celery, a couple of potatoes, a package of tea bags. Their attention never wavers as the clerk rings up the total, and then arthritic fingers dig reluctantly into worn change purses and wallets to pay the bill.

In his office a couple of days ago, Eamon Murphy, the store manager, shook his head. "There's not much they can buy, and that's the truth," he said.

"Old people sometimes steal food," he went on. "It's never very much—a small package of chicken maybe—and I don't think very many do it. A woman could leave it in her shopping bag or a man could drop it in his shirt".

"What can you do?" he said. "When I catch them, I tell them that we can't run the store that way and if they won't stop, then please not to come back. Sometimes they get very emotional. They cry and say they're sorry."

About 13 per cent of the city's 8 million are 65 or older, a figure that increased from about 10 per cent in 1960. They tend to be concentrated in the inner boroughs, and in the old Yorkville section, where the A. & P. is situated, the number of aged persons may be double the citywide average.

Many cling to their tenement apartments on the side streets, despite rising rents, the decay of the buildings and the occasional harassment of landlords, as old people do throughout Manhattan, Brooklyn and the Bronx.

Aside from the handful of affluent elderly who clip their coupons in their cooperatives, the most fortunate of the old people in Yorkville are the 700 or so who have been able to get low-rent apartments in the Stanley M. Isaacs Houses at 91st Street and First Avenue.

There they can pass their final years in comparatively safe and decent surroundings. In the project's senior center there are social activities, a clinic, and, most important these days, a cafeteria that serves a hot lunch for 35 cents.

Like virtually all of the city's senior citizens, the residents of the Isaacs Houses are entirely dependent on their monthly Social Security checks. The amounts they receive differ, but the nationwide average, according to the Social Security Administration, is \$159 for a single person and \$273 for a couple.

In comparison, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor says that the minimum budget level for a retired couple living in this area, which has a cost of living about 13 per cent higher than the national urban average, works out to \$323.33 a month for a couple and something like \$200 for a single person.

**INFLATION HURTING MORE**

The Social Security Administration points out that its benefits have risen 51.8 per cent since 1969, which is, in fact, at a faster rate

than the cost of living. Benefits will be increased another 5.9 per cent next year.

However, the picture is confused by the fact that until the past 18 months the inflation was disproportionately high in the service sector of the economy, which has comparatively little impact on the lives of older persons, while since then the sharpest increases have been in food and rents.

"From July, 1972, until last month," a spokesman for the Bureau of Labor Statistics said, "meats rose 18 per cent and fruits and vegetables 17 per cent. Old people can't help but be aware of that. They've got to eat every day. It's not an expense that can be deferred, like buying a car, say."

"You can't buy shoes, you can't buy clothes, you can't buy anything," said Mrs. Ernestine Brown, one of the women on the bench.

For those receiving the minimum Social Security payment of \$84.50, which like other benefits will be increased by 5.9 per cent next June, the situation is far grimmer, particularly since only 75,000 of the nearly 1 million elderly in the city receive old-age assistance payments.

**WELFARE AVOIDED**

Those who are getting average or larger Social Security checks are not eligible for it, but of those who are, only a comparative handful will apply.

"Old people around here hate welfare like poison said Mrs. Mary Yankauer, the executive director of the Burden Center for the Aging, at York Avenue and 85th Street. "They won't even go to the welfare office to get food stamps or to renew their half-face subway cards."

It is this quality of thorny pride, of a refusal to accept charity after a lifetime of honest work, that fills many of the persons like Mrs. Yankauer who work with the elderly with admiration and with rage at what they regard as the shabby way they are treated by society.

What stops most old people from applying for welfare, even in desperation, is the requirement that they can have no more than \$500 in liquid assets. Lacking either the guile or the wish to conceal, say, the existence of a savings account of a couple of thousand dollars, they prefer to do without.

"It's inhuman that they have to be stripped that far down," said Mrs. Yankauer, "when you can see comparatively young people ripping off welfare and wearing fur coats and driving new cars. That money gives the elderly a sense of identity, of not being totally impoverished. It may be set aside for their funeral, to make sure they aren't buried in Potter's Field."

Among its activities, the center, which receives \$41,000 a year, the bulk of its income, from the family of City Councilman Carter Burden, helps the old people of the area in threading their way through the bureaucratic complexities that confront them.

Unlike some welfare recipients who have expressed their displeasure with certain policies in recent years by beating up case-workers and setting fire to their offices, old people can only try to struggle through the four-page application for food stamps or the 10-page application for Medicaid and accept silently what Mrs. Yankauer described as the incivility of city clerks.

"They tend to take out their frustrations on the old people," she said. "Many of them in Yorkville are foreign-born, and there may be a language problem. And I'm not saying that all old people are angels, either. Some of them can be very difficult."

What strikes Mrs. Yankauer as bitterly ironic is the fact that while most old people struggle to retain a shred of pride and independence on an income far below the poverty level, they could bankrupt the country if they simply decided to lie down on the side-

walk and wait to be carted off to a municipal hospital, nursing home or welfare hotel, at 10 times the cost.

**ELDERLY MOBILIZING**

"Very few people realize that only about 3 per cent of the elderly are living in places like that," she said. "They don't want it, and they are willing to make all kinds of sacrifices to keep out of them, and I think the least that the country can do is to help them more effectively than it's doing now."

Gradually, as their number in the total population increases, and as they watch the assets they accumulated in a lifetime of labor destroyed by inflation, older persons are mobilizing to improve their position.

The Congress of Senior Citizens has 250,000 members here and is affiliated with a national organization that numbers more than 4 million. It is generally regarded as highly effective in forcing society to consider the plight of the aged.

Surprisingly, old people show little resentment. Conversations with dozens of them revealed a seeming acceptance of their lot. "Old people don't have to eat so much," said one woman, explaining how she got by with one meal a day at a senior center.

**LITTLE HELP FROM CHILDREN**

Few seem to get any assistance from their children. "He's got a lot to contend with," said another woman, speaking of a married son in the suburbs. "Sometimes I lend him money."

If there are resentments, and there certainly must be, they are buried deep, and as anyone knows, grandparents can be artful dissemblers, indeed.

The economic situation of older persons who are receiving Social Security payments at or near the minimum and who have refused to accept welfare will improve markedly in January.

At that time, the Social Security Administration will state old-age assistance plans take over the distribution of throughout the country, guaranteeing a minimum income of \$130 per month for single persons and \$195 for couples.

"We expect 100,000 New Yorkers to apply," said Miss Alice Brophy, who heads the New York City Office for the Aging. "They will be getting Social Security checks instead of welfare checks, which will be much more acceptable, since older people feel they helped to build the Social Security system."

Others will qualify because the means test under the new law allows single persons \$1,500 and a married couple \$2,500 in assets, considerably more liberal than the present limitations.

**CITY LENDS HAND**

Although the services that are provided for older people in the United States, particularly in the area of medical care, are regarded as far from adequate, particularly in comparison with what is available in many countries in eastern and western Europe, there is general agreement that more has been done for them in New York City than anywhere else.

The city's Human Resources Administration, for example, operates 65 senior centers, where hot lunches are available at token cost, and which provide recreation and health facilities.

In addition, there are the cut-rate bus and subway fares, for which the city pays 17.5-million annually to the Transit Authority, and rent-increase subsidies and property-tax reductions that cost another \$22-million.

The Office for the Aging has also secured reduced prices for Yankee baseball games—the Mets limit their generosity to four games a year and the pro football clubs, which sell all their tickets, give none—to afternoon movies and other events that the aged could not otherwise attend.

One reason, observation suggests, why old



people have been so long neglected is their invisibility. There are many of them on the streets of Yorkville by day, for example, trudging slowly from their apartments to the market, or to the clinic at Metropolitan Hospital, to the Burden Center perhaps, or to the Lenox Hill Neighborhood House, which has a broad program of assistance, to buy food stamps, or sitting quietly on the benches in Carl Schurz Park.

#### THE WITHDRAWAL OF AGE

But by early evening, when the area's young secretaries and brisk executives are arriving home from work, the aged, tired and more fearful than most people of being mugged, have withdrawn themselves into their apartments.

Then again, one does not really see old people, in the way, for example, that a man sees a pretty girl or an Afghan hound or a man at the wheel of a large and shiny car.

Their clothes are drab, their eyes, by and large, reflect little light, their backs are bent, knees stiff. They seem to withdraw into themselves, as though ashamed of having survived so long, of providing, for a country that worships youth and beauty and cares little for the fruits of experience except at the odd moments when a 76-year-old senator catches its fancy, a disagreeable reminder of mankind's common end.

#### ASPIN AND PIKE FIGHT FLIGHT PAY FOR ARMCHAIR OFFICERS

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our colleagues Representative LES ASPIN of Wisconsin and Representative OTIS G. PIKE of New York for their leadership last June in our vote against flight pay for noncombatant Air Force and Navy officers—a vote which will save taxpayers \$14.6 million a year.

An editorial from the July 9, 1973, *Kenosha News*, and articles from the June 27, 1973, *Milwaukee Journal* and the June 29, 1973, *New York Times*, follow:

#### ASPIN VERSUS THE PENTAGON

For a comparatively new congressman, Les Aspin, Democrat, Wisconsin First District, is compiling quite a record of leadership.

Even in his freshman term, a bottom-of-the-heap position for congressmen, Aspin's knowledge of government and hard work commanded respect. Now six months into his second term, he and his energetic staff are showing no letup.

One of Aspin's latest endeavors was to take on the Pentagon. Together with Rep. Otis Pike, D-N.Y., they wanted to know why some earthbound Air Force colonels and generals and Navy captains and admirals should be receiving flight pay.

Congress had decided last year that those officers serving in noncombat assignments should not receive flight pay and it passed a law that went into effect this June 1 to cut off funds for such payments.

But then Aspin learned that the Air Force chief of staff, Gen. John D. Ryan, signed an order that for all practical purposes ignored the law for a list of 65 Air Force generals. (One of the 65, as fate would have it, was a Gen. John D. Ryan.)

Ryan said that those generals and 67 colonels were in jobs that might require them to fly, whether they actually flew or not, and that such officers as the command-

er of the Air Force Academy were in "combat assignments."

Aspin, charging that Ryan's action represented a "clear violation of law and utter defiance of civilian authority," joined with Pike to lead a fight against a House bill that would have prolonged the lame duck flight payments until at least the end of this year.

Somewhat surprisingly, they succeeded. A motion was passed telling the House members of a Senate-House conference committee to stand firm on the June 1 cutoff date.

They did it in the face of a lobbying blitz from officers. And if it is upheld in the conference committee, their action could make certain that the \$14.6 million a year savings foreseen in the original cutoff bill will stay in the taxpayers' pockets.

In a country increasingly concerned about inflation and increasingly concerned about the behavior of the people it pays with its tax money, the issue involved is not a trifling one.

Congress should uphold the June 1 cutoff. Aspin and Pike are to be commended for their role.

#### ASPIN BLOCKS FLIGHT PAY EXTENSION

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The House Armed Services Committee attempted to slip an extension of flight pay for some generals and colonels through Congress Tuesday without mentioning the subject.

The attempt to get quick approval was stopped by Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wis.). Aspin said 65 Air Force generals, including Air Force Chief of Staff John D. Ryan, still got the flight pay for which Congress cut off funds effective May 31.

#### TERMED DEFIANCE

The committee tried to get the flight pay extended to Dec. 31 by having the House accept a Senate amendment to a dependents' benefits bill. But the House never heard the words flight pay mentioned.

All it had was a motion by Rep. Samuel Stratton (D-N.Y.) to take up the dependents' bill, accept the Senate amendment and grant final approval.

Aspin objected, forcing the bill to be passed by some other procedure.

Aspin, who disclosed the continuing flight payments to the 65 generals called it "a clear violation of law and an utter defiance of civilian authority by the Pentagon brass."

#### ABUSES CHARGED

The Air Force confirmed, after Aspin's statement, that it had authorized flight pay status for 132 general officer positions under the new restrictions.

Congressional restrictions on flight pay were enacted because of widespread complaints that the system was being abused by "weekend warriors"—officers who drew full flight benefits by putting in token flying time.

Aspin said Ryan's order according himself and other high ranking officers flight pay status was "a new low in the whole grubby history of armchair officers and their fight to collect flight payments they don't deserve."

The Wisconsin Democrat said he had asked the General Accounting Office to investigate the Air Force's compliance with the new flight pay restrictions.

#### HOUSE BARS FLIGHT PAY FOR DESK-BOUND OFFICERS

WASHINGTON, June 28.—Two iconoclasts on the House Armed Services Committee—Representatives Otis C. Pike of Suffolk and Les Aspin of Wisconsin—took on the military establishment on the House floor today and won on the issue of flight pay for desk-bound admirals and generals.

With some lobbying, satire and appeal to the political instincts of Congressmen, the

two Democrats got the House to go on record against giving flight pay to colonels, navy captains, generals and admirals who do not fly.

As was gleefully pointed out after the vote by Mr. Pike, who has sat in critical isolation on the committee for 13 years, it was the first time in more than a decade that the House Armed Services Committee, working in tandem with the military, had lost an issue on the House floor.

The issue before the House was whether to continue a provision incorporated in the defense budget last year banning flight pay after May 31 to any officer of the rank of colonel or above who was serving in a "non-combat assignment."

#### SENATE MOVE OPPOSED

The Senate had approved an amendment to a military dependents bill postponing the May 31 cutoff to the end of the year. The counter-move of Mr. Pike and Mr. Aspin was a motion instructing House conferees not to accept the Senate amendment in a Senate-House conference on the legislation.

For the last two days, as the two Representatives mounted their campaign, generals and admirals faced with loss of flight pay had been buzzing the Capitol in a concerted lobbying campaign. From their home districts, many Congressmen received calls from officers warning that they could not pay for their homes if the flight pay, which is \$245 monthly for a colonel and \$165 for a general or admiral, was stopped.

Meanwhile, Mr. Pike and Mr. Aspin were engaging in some lobbying and publicizing on their own. On Tuesday Mr. Aspin issued a news release complaining that Gen. John D. Ryan had signed an order permitting himself and 64 other Air Force generals to continue to receive flight pay.

In the floor debate, Mr. Pike told stories of Air Force generals who swivel around so rapidly in their Pentagon chairs that they think they are doing outside loops and are thus entitled to flight pay.

By the time the members reached the floor for the vote, Mr. Pike and Mr. Aspin had succeeded in casting the issue in terms of whether flight pay should be given to generals and admirals who did not fly. Cast that way, the choice was easy for the majority. The Pike-Aspin motion was approved by a 238 to 175 vote.

#### CONGRESSMAN BURKE'S QUESTIONNAIRES

### HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, each year since I was first 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 following results 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 the respondents:

#### BURKE CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRES, 1973

1. President Nixon has indicated he intends to make substantial cuts in govern-

ment 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 ..... 76.2  
No ..... 23.8

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 provided separate columns for the answers of the husband and wife. The following is a tabulation by percentage of each of their views:

	Wife		Husband			Wife		Husband	
	Yes	No	Yes	No		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	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
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	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
3. National Health Insurance will be a topic of discussion in Congress soon. Which of the following would you favor? Select 1:					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
(A) A program should be financed by increased taxes and operated by the Federal Government.	50.8	49.2	52.9	47.1	9. (A) Do you believe the United States should withdraw from the United Nations?	35.8	64.2	34.5	65.5
(B) A Federally-operated program should be financed by employer and employee contributions.	73.7	26.3	68.2	31.8	(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
(C) Income tax credits should be allowed for those purchasing private health insurance.	87.2	12.8	84.5	15.5	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
(D) A federally funded insurance program for catastrophic illnesses only.	75.1	24.9	75.6	24.4	11. Do you favor diplomatic recognition and economic and cultural trade with:				
(E) No additional Federal programs.	67.7	32.3	60.7	39.3	(A) Red China	76.8	23.2	77.1	22.9
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	(B) U.S.S.R.	78.2	21.8	74.2	25.8
5. Congress must pass highway legislation in this 1st session of the 93d Congress. 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	(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 FARM LABOR RESEARCH COMMITTEE: A NEW LOOK AT FARM LABOR**

**HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, recent attempts by the United Farm Workers Union, led by Cesar Chavez, to organize

farmworkers have resulted in consumer boycotts of grapes and lettuce, counter-boycotts by the Teamsters Union, coercion, intimidation, and death.

The consequence, not surprisingly, is a number of proposals to "remedy" the situation by Federal law. There are presently six bills before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor of the House Education and Labor Committee which would either extend current labor law—the National Labor Relations Act—to cover farmworkers, or establish a new

regulatory system which would incorporate parts of the NLRA and the Railway Labor Act under a national farm labor relations board arrangement.

Let us consider, therefore, three significant facts about American agriculture: It is one of our most efficient and productive industries; its history is, remarkably, relatively free of labor strife and damaging strikes; farmworkers are not now covered by Federal labor law.

In light of these facts, not only should proposals to extend Federal labor law to

farmworkers be seriously questioned and studied, but a fundamental reexamination of Federal labor law as such is in order. The costs of goods have soared on the domestic market and U.S. industry is having great difficulty competing in the world market. Has U.S. labor law been a major cause of this? Have the monopolistic, compulsory privileges given to unions by our labor law greatly contributed to labor strife and undermined efficiency and production? Surely such questions deserve careful and thoughtful attention.

I am, therefore, greatly encouraged by the recent information of the Farm Labor Research Committee. The FLRC has a single purpose—to research and analyze farm labor-management relations with particular attention to proposed legislation in this field. The committee does not, however, merely rehash the same old issues from the same old perspective: they analyze current legislation, but in so doing question many of the supposedly unquestionable assumptions upon which current labor law is based.

This is admirably demonstrated by Dr. Sylvester Petro, a professor of law at Wake Forest University, in a speech presented to the FLRC on July 17, 1973. Dr. Petro carefully examines the main provisions of the six bills before the Agricultural Labor Subcommittee, contends that all of them would be harmful to the agriculture industry, the farmworker, and the consumer, and offers some provocative, basic principles to follow in handling the farm labor problem.

Although Dr. Petro's speech is too long to be printed in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the FLRC is preparing a series of abstracts dealing with the essential points discussed by Dr. Petro. Following is the first abstract:

**EXCLUSIVE REPRESENTATION—WHOSE INTERESTS SERVED?**

The National Labor Relations Act and legislative proposals to extend it or similar labor law to agriculture, all base their central provisions upon the stated principle of free employee choice. However, they all flatly contradict that principle by their "exclusive representation" provisions. Under these provisions, a particular union selected by a bare voting majority of employees becomes the exclusive bargaining agent for all employees in the unit. This perversion of the majority rule principle abrogates the free choice of the employees who do not want to be represented by a particular union, or indeed may wish to act as their own bargaining agents, without representation by any union. The effect is to serve the interest only of union officials.

Under our current system of labor law based on the NLRA as it has been amended and interpreted, the exclusive representation provision amounts to an overwhelming organizing advantage for union officials, and a denial of the freedom and common law rights of employers and employees. The only thing union officials are required to do in order to become the sole bargaining agents for all the employees in a particular unit is to sign up or win the election votes of fifty percent plus one of those employees. Then fifty percent less one are required to accept the terms and conditions of employment negotiated by those union officials, losing the right to

seek their own best deal with their employer in free competition. Furthermore, the non-consenting employees will probably have to pay dues or equivalent fees to the union officials they voted against, since one of the primary bargaining objectives of any union bargaining agent is a contract clause requiring union membership and dues payment as a condition of employment.

The organizing advantage accorded to union officials by the exclusive representation provision has been further extended at the cost of individual rights by the National Labor Relations Board. Under an NLRB rule, upheld by the Supreme Court, an employer can be required to bargain with union representatives who have actually been rejected by a majority of his employees in a secret ballot election. According to the NLRB, this is justified where union officials have obtained the signatures of a majority of the employees on "bargaining authorization" cards prior to the election, and where they have charged the employer with "serious" unfair practices that make a fair rerun election an "unlikely possibility." Of course, anything the employer might do or say to in any way discourage his employees from casting ballots for representation by a particular union might be construed as a "serious" unfair practice under the NLRB's interpretation. On the other hand, the NLRB and the Supreme Court have held, in the recent *Gissel* case, that a card majority authorizes exclusive representation even where the meaning of the card is misrepresented to the employees who sign them. In that case, employees signed cards believing that they were calling for a representation election, only to be told later that their signature on the card was considered as a vote for exclusive representation by a particular union.

Once past the organizing stage, union officials enjoy a monopolistic advantage in the collective bargaining process by virtue of the exclusive representation principle. The employer is forbidden to deal with anyone other than the exclusive bargaining agents in all matters pertaining to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment.

The exclusive representation provision thus binds both employers and employees, and ultimately consumers, in a strait jacket. The organizing advantage it gives to union officials, along with the other special privileges granted by the NLRA, has contributed to the unionization of virtually all the organizable "blue collar" employees in American industry, destroying the employees' freedom of choice in the process. The bargaining advantage under the exclusive representation principle has enabled union officials to make the demands that have created inflation and unemployment in industry and have priced many American goods out of world markets.

But while industry has been suffering under union monopolistic privileges for 38 years under the NLRA, its amendments and interpretations, American agriculture has used its freedom from governmental intervention in farm labor-management relations to establish an impressive record of productivity and efficiency, and has developed into one of the healthiest segments of our national economy. Ninety-five percent of American farms are small family farms, which would be at least as vulnerable to unionization as industry generally, if pending legislative proposals were passed. Armed with the special monopolistic privileges granted by our current system of labor law, union officials would be able to undermine the productivity, destroy the economic health, and abuse the rights of agricultural employees, employers, and consumers of agricultural products to the same extent as in industry generally. Can we afford to extend to the food-producing sector of our economy labor

laws that serve the interest only of power-hungry union officials?

**OUTSTANDING SERVICE**

**HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a list of those people from the State of Maryland employed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who have been cited for their outstanding service during 1972 and 1973.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of these employees I would like to have printed into the RECORD the names of the recipients of those awards:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1973.

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOGAN: In response to your letter of July 30, 1973, I am pleased to submit a list of employees of the Department from the State of Maryland who received awards during 1972 and 1973.

It is indeed commendable that you are able to find the time, in view of your busy schedule, to pay tribute to these outstanding employees, and I am sure they will be most appreciative of your efforts.

Sincerely,

CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,  
Secretary.

**RECOGNITION OF RECIPIENTS OF AWARDS**

**DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD—1972**

Sidney Edelman, Thomas McFee, Charles Miller, John R. Seal, M.D., and Thomas M. Tierney.

**DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL—1972**

Surg. Gen. Harold M. Graning, Surg. Gen. Emery A. Johnson, Surg. Gen. Seymour J. Kreshover, and Surg. Gen. Robert Van Hoek.

**SECRETARY'S SPECIAL CITATION—1972**

Stuart H. Clarke, William Russell, and Dr. Carl Kupfer.

**MERITORIOUS SERVICE MEDAL—1972**

Diet Dir. Merme Bonnell, Surg. Gen. Bertram Brown, Scient. Dir. Lewis J. Cralley, Surg. Gen. Edgar N. Duncan, Med. Dir. David M. Fried, Surg. Gen. John C. Greene, Surg. Gen. Gerald M. Hansler, Vet. Dir. Joe R. Held, Surg. Gen. Thomas J. Kennedy, Jr., and Nurse Dir. Florence M. Seidler.

**COMMISSIONER'S CITATIONS—1972**

John L. Gianoncelli, Doyle Hagan, Richard P. Harmon, John A. Hesper, Theodore G. Kalandros, Arthur E. O'Dell, David R. Smith, John N. Traino, Levi J. Ogden, Ursula K. Stickles, John E. Hahn, Gerald Sheinbach, Elmer C. Lupton, Robert C. Marks, and Revoc P. Matthews.

Joseph L. Alsczyk, Winifred Brogden, Camillo E. Colletta, Farrell K. Davis, Leonard S. Diamond, Albert L. Harrison, Jack H. Hill, Kent B. Keene, William J. McGraw, Hazel G. Mills, Valerie J. Murphy, Estelle C. Parker, Marlon E. Reals, Beulah E. Saunier, and Lawrence S. Schulman.

Lawrence E. Seng, Irene C. Shea, David B. Smith, Kathleen A. Stevenson, Veronica B. Adamski, Mildred J. Alexander, Charlotte S. Bennett, Thomas H. Boyer, Mary Carolyn Brazezicki, Jack H. Campbell, Mary Ann Cecconi, Carolyn D. Davis, Dorothy M. Dewsnap,

Mr. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, Mr. Speaker, requests that the names of the recipients of the Distinguished Service Award, Distinguished Service Medal, Secretary's Special Citation, and Meritorious Service Medal for 1972 and 1973 be printed in the RECORD.

Veronica L. Freeman, and Ollie E. Hanson.  
 Ronald W. Hillman, Joan A. Jennings, Paul F. Koehler, Alfonso R. Lewis, Donald L. Louey, Charles J. Schreiber, Jr., Donald E. Marks, Walter B. Murphy, Bruce A. Neumyer, Agnes A. Schmitt, George L. Smigovsky, William J. Thompson, Dorothy M. Belzer, Leon Bernstein, and Patience Lauriat.

Laura M. Chambers, Gilbert C. Fisher, Alvin L. Freedman, Robert C. Mullen, Karen S. Adams, Wendell H. Bearden, Ronald Blavatt, Elsie C. Fried, Frederick S. Heuschele, Lyle T. Hickey, Molly L. Leath, James A. Lesh, Karen H. Ross, William E. Wood, and Mary C. Kudyba.

## MEMBERS OF GROUP AWARDS—1972

Dieter Ammann, Loree Bengston, Merman Berger, Ronald Bowling, Susan Brownstein, Martin Corcoran, Edmund Di Giorgio, Ruth Eggelston, Irving Eisenmeyer, George Freed, John Gillard, R. Douglas Glynn, Frank Gould, Peter Hughes, Arthur Jeffries, Julius Johnson, Benjamin Kirman, Donald McSween, Sharon Miller, Charles Payne, Charles Pearson, Edwin Prigmore, Elizabeth Rieger, Nathaniel Roberson, Olivia Singh, Robert Spigner, Virginia Stastica, Susan Stoddard, Martin Wallach, Beverly Weber, Ralph Adcock, and John Colburn.

James Gerhardt, Alan Harris, Mike Her- rick, Lee Hosford, George Kretz, Harry Overs, Roger Paton, Don Rank, Donald Ryerson, Arthur Solomon, Satoru Terada, George Yamamura, Kevin Buckley, Gary E. Good, Douglas B. Hoffman, Harry A. Synder, John Brassard, Leonard Grebow, Alan Hunzeker, Earl Kraisser, David Macloch, Gary Miller, Richard Schaefer, Raymond Swartz, Joseph Ward, Elaine Whelan, Theodore Zamerski, Nelson J. Brenneman, Kenneth C. Hansely, Michael P. McCoy, Frank D. Rettaliata, and Stephen P. Lippenholz.

Malcolm W. Ewell, Lillian M. Dodson, Dorothy S. Projector, Judith S. Bretz, Kenneth Dymond, Ellen Murray, Tillie Mazor, Eugene Moyer, Gilbert C. Deshaies, William D. Bevensee, Charles F. Ferrara, Allan Gorochow, Warren L. Hobbs, Alvin S. Levy, Joseph R. Michel, Mary F. O'Connor, David Bernstein, Robert Beveridge, William Denk, Leonard Ensor, Catherine Glanville, John M. Hayes, Ralph Hersh, Robert Marder, Nancy Ranck, Winston D. Rohrbeck, and Raymond Worley.

## COMMENDATION MEDAL—1972

Med. Dir. Joe W. Atkinson, Nurse Dir. Margaret Benson, Nurse Dir. Rita Chow, Nurse Dir. Elizabeth Edwards, Sr. San E. Richard A. Coddington, Nurse Dr. Helen Foerst, Sa. Hso, William C. Jenkins, Sr. San. John E. LaPlante, Nurse Dir. Ruth J. Metka, Med. Dir. J. Kiffin Penry, Diet Dir. Jean M. Pope, Sr. Surg. Charles L. Vogel, and Sr. Hso. Joseph K. Wagoner.

## FDA AWARD OF MERIT—1972

Paul DiNenna, John Collins, Robert Rosenthal, Pearl McKeough, Herbert Blumenthal, Ogden Johnson, and Robert Sauer.

## Group award

Robert Britton, Mary Jo Robinson, Samuel Ingraham, Walter Gundaker, Robert Farley, Marguerite Ward, Rodger Leupold, John Eure, Jane Fahey, and Marie Shaffer.

Earl W. Robinson, Ethel Johnson, Darryl Adams, Angelina Calomeris, D. J. McConeghy, Thomas Moore, Walter Beagh, Robert Jacobs, James Mague, and N. M. LaTorre.

## SUPERIOR SERVICE AWARD—1972

Donald Hirsch, Ruth Bozeman, Betty Wal- ler, Doris Conley, David Dukes, Nathan Dick, Jerry Sutton, Stuart H. Clarke, and Robert B. Herman.

Ms. Edith Robins, Judith L. Carpenter, Ronald J. Wylie, Dr. Erminio Costa, Dr. Saul

Feldman, Dr. Marian Radke Yarrow, Isalah Russell, Ms. Virginia Knode, and Ella J. Jones.

## Group award

Lillian M. Buhl, Arlene A. Mosler, and Rose B. Holly.

Donald C. Parks, Joseph Leiter, Ph.D., Davis B. McCarn, Verda E. Rexroth, James W. Schriver, Earle L. Browning, Virginia John Evans, Sc.D., Frank J. Rauscher, Jr., Ph.D., J. Palmer Saunders, Ph.D., Saul A. Schepartz, Ph.D., Robert H. Purcell, M.D., David R. Davies, Ph.D., Elizabeth F. Neufeld, Ph.D., Herbert A. Sober, Ph.D., Robert E. Burke, M.D., Arnaldo Lansansky, M.D., Theodore Cooper, M.D., W. Glen Moss, Ph.D., Gordon J. Dlov Dahl L. Earl Laurance, Edward J. Driscoll, D.D.S., Otto A. Bessey, Ph.D., Donald T. Chalkley, Ph.D., and William Fine Raub, Ph.D.

## RECOGNITION OF RECIPIENTS OF AWARDS

## DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD—1973

Stuart H. Clarke, Elizabeth A. Chase, Char- lotte E. Crenson, Thomas C. Parrott, James D. Isbister, and Theodore D. Woolsey.

## MERTORIOUS SERVICE MEDAL—1973

Med. Dir. G. Gilbert Ashwell, Sr. Surg. Lewellyn T. Barker, Pharm. Dir. Mark H. Barnett, Med. Dir. Ruth E. Dunham, San. E. Dir. James H. Eagen, Pharm. Dir. Robert Frankel, Med. Dir. George G. Glenner, Med. Dir. Jerome Green, Nurse Dir. Marie F. Han- zel, Med. Dir. Clarence L. Hebert, San. Engr. Dir. Edwin M. Lamphere, Med. Dir. John M. Lynch, Hso Dir. Ruth F. Richards, Scient. Dir. John A. Scigliano, Med. Dir. Thomas L. Shinnick, Diet. Dir. Jeanne L. Tillotson, Scient. Dir. Elizabeth K. Weisburger, Med. Dir. Kamehameha K. Wong, Ther. Dir. Dean P. Currier, Pharm. Dir. Arthur Dodds, Harry W. Bruce, Jr., D.D.S., Daniel F. Whiteside, D.D.S., Richard R. Bates, M.D., and George E. Garrington, D.D.S.

## SECRETARY'S SPECIAL CITATION—1973

Audrey Vincer, Peter Wheeler, Peter Hutt, Peter Holmes, Richard Seggel, Scott Flem- ming, Foy L. Lunsford, Donald E. Johns, Dr. Emory Johnson, and Gerald Kurtz.

## COMMENDATION MEDAL—1973

Sr. San. E. Robert L. Bolin, Jr., Hs. Dir. Gloria S. Burich, Sr. San. E. John Keith Cars- well, Med. Dir. Jean R. L. Herdt, Sr. Surg. King Holmes, Pharm. Dir. Thomas H. Hodges, Nurse Dir. Marion Keagle, Nurse Dir. Beatrice Marino, Sr. No. Helen M. Mangan, Hs. Dir. Sheldon Miller, San. Dir. William C. Miller, Sr. No. Barbara Rolling, Hso. Douglas Lee Spron, Dent. Dir. Kenneth T. Strauch, and Nurse Dir. Virginia Worsley.

## COMMISSIONER'S CITATIONS—1973

Elliot Kirschbaum, Jane H. Pelesz, Ruth A. White, Irving L. Becker, Robert E. Bever- idge, Peter O. Guthrie, Eva R. Stunkel, James H. Troy, Barbara E. Glaser, Glen R. Dehn, Evelyn B. Faulk, Royce C. Elsen, Na- thaniel M. Pigman, Michael J. Borman, Ver- non W. Burnett, Minnie R. Christian, Car- roll T. Cogar, James A. Cornish, Joan R. Coughlin, Evelyn M. Fetterman, Geneva R. Fitzgerald, Maceo C. Holland, Patricia B. Kis- ner, Charles F. Lear, Robert A. Lilly, Mar- garet D. Murphy, Lucille B. Reid, Lyle M. Smith, Mary C. Stokes, J. Arthur Thomas, Helen M. Tippet, Lee P. Washington, Charles L. Weber, Arthur Garnet West, Mary S. Alder- man, Lucille D. Aler, Gordon A. Berg, Jr., Lena G. Bunch, and Marion F. Goldberg.

Huldah Lieberman, Frank E. Murphy, Mar- ion C. Myers, Evelyn J. NeSmith, John Ross, Kenneth J. Seaman, Beverly Smith, Beverly A. Taylor, Dorothy L. Allulis, Kathleen M. Klinger, Robert Marder, John J. Hladky, Sylvia Cooke Martin, Sol Sherman, Raymond M. Sillup, Bernard A. Dowgiello, Hinda E. Silver, Marvin Brody, Flora N. Brooks, Idella Hardy, Diane James, George Kotishion, Mary-

lou M. Lewis, Rosemarie E. Naugski, Salva- tore A. Pettl, Abraham J. Teitler, and A. Robert Trazzi.

## MEMBERS OF GROUP AWARDS—1973

Philip A. Merchant, Kenneth N. Russell, Jr., Benjamin Longnecker, John Burkhart, Patricia Briscoe, Karl Zeuch, Henry O'Brien, Carolyn Elbeck, Jannette Recek, Claire B. Bates, Nancy S. Benjamin, James W. Casey, Emily Cogswell, Louis Hillman, Bertha B. Jones, Mildred C. Longerbeam, Gwendolyn H. McCray, and Marv V. Means.

Lynda Jackson, M. Dolores Athas, Michael C. Coco, Clara E. Fields, Dorothy K. Thomas, Margaret E. Houchins, Carl E. Cookerly, Em- ma C. Anderson, Felipa A. Bond, Frances M. Brown, Anna C. Carter, Shirley L. Clark, Lewis P. Coale, Audra I. Doll, Annie L. Jones, Norma C. Lamar, Myrtle M. Snack, Julius E. Wilson, and Jacqueline E. Yellowdy.

Anna I. Miller, Esther Nicolaus, Bernard H. Reichlyn, Roy C. Thompson, Ruth E. Woods, Paul Arca, Charles A. Russell, Ralph G. Salvagno, Carl H. Walker, Russell J. Eld- ridge, James Bern Ilencck, Benjamin L. De- laney, Robert Thomas Williams, Joseph John Tighe, James Robert Kelley, and Louis J. Schott.

## DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL—1973

Med. Dir. G. Robert L. Bowinan.

## SUPERVISORY EXCELLENCE AWARD—1973

Stephanie F. Delvecchio, Gladys E. Palmer, and George L. Smigovsky.

## CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION—1973

William Brown Mary Z. Gray, Mozelle Mulloy, Mary Jumalon, and Oliver A. Hin- ton.

## FDA AWARD OF MERIT—1973

John T. Walden, William F. Randolph, Robert Moure, John Droke, Jacob Markowitz, Gerald F. Meyer, Julian Kramer, Henry E. Simmons, Marion Finkel, and Donald Helm. Ogden Johnson, Mae Walton, J. William Boehne, Allan Forbes, Joseph V. Rodricks, Jerry Gaskill, Samuel Sperling, Henry L. Verhulst, James O. Gesling, Peter Hutt, and Robert Wilmoth.

## SUPERIOR SERVICE AWARD—1973

Edward J. Dyer, Helen H. Hudson, Henry M. Kissman, Ph.D., Calvin B. Baldwin, Jr., Doris M. Chaney, Gregory T. O'Connor, M.D., Ira H. Pastan, M.D., Herbert J. Rapp, Sc.D. William D. Terry, M.D., Rosemary H. Williams, Sey- mour H. Wollman, Ph.D., Henry M. Fales, Ph.D., Robert P. Akers, Ph.D., George L. Payne, Dewitt Stetten, Jr., Ph.D., Norman P. Salzman, Ph.D., Robert L. Schreiber, Mar- tin Gellert, Ph.D., Ronald W. Lamont-Hav- ers, M.D., George T. Brooks, Ph.D., Reubin Andres, M.D., Fernando L. Leon, Carl D. Douglass, Ph.D., Francis A. McDonough, A. James Thomas, John M. Dolan, Estelle S. Elsendrath, Andrew J. Cardinal, Barbara Cummings, Mrs. Margaret Barbour, Tillie Pollock, and William L. Bort, Sr.

Marie Wharen, Helen Sutherland, Dr. Jane Lin-Fu, Donald Harrington, Ph.D., Ms. Gloria Wackernah, Thomas F. A. Plaut, B. J. Sades- ky, Alice L. Muth, Anne M. Gibson, Judith F. Funkhouser, Ralph Simon, Ph.D., Sam Silverstein, Ph.D., Bonnie Zevin, Kate Krup- pen, Beatrice Shriver, Ph.D., Esther Diamond, James Stockdale, Morris Cohen, Albert J. Richter, George F. Russell, Jr., Giovanni Di- Chiro, M.D., J. Gordon DuBay, Julius J. Kess- ler, Ervin F. Rothenbuhler, Kenneth C. Blythe, Henry V. Chadwick, Philip S. Law- rence, Ralph L. Sloat, Jr., Reta America (Mrs.), Fred Elmadjian, Ph.D., Leo G. Leit- ner, Jr., and Marie A. Freeman.

## EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACHIEVEMENT AWARD—1973

Herbert R. Compton, Jr. and James A. Thomas.

OUTSTANDING HANDICAPPED EMPLOYEE OF THE  
YEAR AWARD—1973

Howard M. Nickelson.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACHIEVEMENT AWARD—  
1973

Peter Barton Hutt, Alvin L. Gottlieb, Sharon Beall, Eric Blumberg, Linda Broadwater, Roscoe Bryant, Becky Butler, Grace Edwards, Linda Edwards, Virginia Farkas, Carol Furlow, Jay Geller, Louis Hankins, Phillis Henkel, Michele Isaacson, Maureen James, Shelly Kornspan, Arthur Levine, Francis McKay, Stephen McNamara, Lois Parrish, Mary Saperstein, and Richard Shupack.

Richard Silverman, Barbara Spivak, Robert Spiller, Jeffrey Springer, Jack Wohlreich, Rose Adler, Gerald G. Altman, Ella Barahan, Susan Blizzard, Ruth Bozeman, Evelyn Bradford, Mary Brennan, Mary Broening, James Bruce, Frak Dell'Acqua, Geraldine Dernoga, Lester Ebert, Henry Egles, James Fritze, Shirley Gaby, Randolph Gaines, Donald Garrett, Mary Gludt, and Henry Goldberg.

Diane Haynes, Marjorie Hoffman, Sandra Huber, Kinsey James, Doris Johnson, Robert Longo, Christie Lowman, Marjorie McGee, Dora McMichael, Joseph Moran, Lila Morgan, Stephanie Morris, Sharon Nell, James Pyles, Edward Schor, Steven Selzer, Edward Steinhouse, Gard Stephenson, Richard Strom, Thomas Stuber, Kathryn Wagner, Jerry Wall, and Stephen Weiss.

Frances White, Gloria White, Llewellyn Woolford, Verrell Dethloff, Bill Hicks, Walter McCabe, John Watson, Selma Floyd, Donald Hirsch, Galen Powers, Shirley Smith, Jacqueline Bennett, Burton Berkeley, Thomas Ferris, Beverly Gillette, Ronald Guttman, Manuel Hiller, Vivian Jones, Norman Latker, Edward Lowenberg, Leroy Randall, Karin Reynolds, David White, and Peggy Whittington.

Dorothy Wilfong, Pearlle Winzer, Sidney Edelman, Esther Rechenback, Joel Mangel, Howard Walderman, David E. Benor, Joan Beach, Donald Young, Jerry Tipton, Richard Riseberg, William G. Ketterer, Pam Wines, Katherine Cage, Christine Butler, Betty Harmon, Eula James, William Kaplin, Katherine Saunders, and Steven Winnick.

Dorothy Ashwood, Ann Baldea, Cheryl Caloway, Al Hamlin, Howard Holstein, Alan Jacobson, Jerry Luck, Marriann Shultz, St. John Barrett, Darleen DelValle, Marga Laboy, Mary Moulton, Donald Bass, Elizabeth Croog, Azalee Lattimore, Virginia Mitz, Marguerite Oswald, Alberta Payne, and Arthur Shapiro.

OUR NATION SALUTES HON. ROBERT STAKESING, MANAGING EDITOR OF THE NEWS, PATERSON, N.J.

**HON. ROBERT A. ROE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to call your attention to the lifetime of outstanding public service rendered by an esteemed member of my Eighth Congressional District, State of New Jersey, and good friend, the Honorable Robert Stakesing of Hawthorne, N.J. As a leading news correspondent and editorial writer for over a half century, Bob Stakesing during the past four decades has been city editor and later managing editor of the Paterson News, one of New Jersey's most pres-

tigious newspapers. The Paterson News has been a source of great strength in contributing to the vital and essential role of the news media in our society. On Saturday, September 15, I look forward to participating in a fellowship-testimonial-retirement dinner in tribute to his illustrious and distinguished career performed quietly, industriously, and unbiased, in fairness to all, with effectiveness, brilliance of character and the highest integrity.

The intensity of Bob Stakesing's seriousness of purpose, the depth of his sensitivity, his thoroughness and fairness in reporting the news in every respect were undoubtedly evident to his predecessor, the city editor who interviewed and hired him, just out of high school, as a cub newsman a little more than 50 years ago. To those of us who have had the good fortune to know him, his warm human characteristics have certainly manifested themselves in the quality of his writing and the wealth of his wisdom which have truly enriched the newspaperman's institution and instrumentality by which information and ideas on public matters are disseminated in our community, State, and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed that as sources of information and sources of influence, the news media is an integral and critical element in America's democracy and the expression of opinion by the newspaperman's translation of daily contacts, events, and experiences of our people is, in large measure, responsible for America's preeminence in having the best informed citizenry in the world today. The initiative and leadership of the newsmen help shape the destiny of our Nation and their writings are oftentimes the bellweather and a dominating force in the conduct of public affairs; the policies, personnel, and procedures of government.

In our American democratic system of government, the doctrine of governmental checks and balances has always been essential to the basic freedoms of mankind and the very cornerstone of the foundation of democracy itself with freedom of the press and the people's right to know as one of our most vital constitutional principles. The newsman's privilege is a sacred public trust in the very vanguard of the fiber of our Nation's conscience, and I am very honored and pleased to state in this historic journal of the Congress that Bob Stakesing has demonstrated the highest standards of excellence of leadership and trust for which the citizens of his hometown of Hawthorne and all of us of the Eighth Congressional District and State of New Jersey can indeed be most proud.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to seek national recognition of Bob Stakesing's achievements as one of our most distinguished newsmen, leading citizen, and great American and respectfully request you and our colleagues here in the Congress to join with me today in saluting Bob Stakesing and extending to him and his wife, Lillian, our best wishes for continued success and happi-

ness in their retirement years. Our Nation salutes one of New Jersey's most distinguished newsmen and outstanding journalist of our time—Best wishes and good luck, Bob and Lillian Stakesing.

CONSTITUENT MAIL REFLECTS NATIONWIDE SUPPORT FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the volume of mail reaching Members' offices in support of self-government for the District of Columbia can be understood best by glancing down the list of national organizations actively supporting this legislation:

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS COOPERATING WITH THE COALITION FOR SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

American Association of University Women (AAUW).  
American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).  
American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE).  
American Fed. of Labor—Congress of Indus. Organizations (AFL—CIO).  
American Fed. of State, County & Municipal Employees (AFSCME).  
American Federation of Teachers (AFT).  
Americans for Democratic Action (ADA).  
American GI Forum.  
American Jewish Committee.  
American Jewish Congress.  
American Veterans Committee.  
Association of Student Governments.  
B'nai B'rith Women.  
Central Conference of American Rabbis.  
Common Cause.  
Communications Workers of America.  
Delta Sigma Theta Sororities, Inc.  
Democratic National Committee.  
General Board of Christian Social Concerns, United Methodist Church.  
Improved Benevolent Protective Order of Elks.  
International Union of Operating Engineers.  
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.  
League of Women Voters.  
League of United Latin American Citizens.  
Legislative Affairs Project, United Methodist Council on Youth Ministries.  
National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees (NAPFE).  
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.  
National Association of Human Rights Workers.  
National Assoc. of Negro Business & Professional Women.  
National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs.  
National Council of Churches.  
National Council of Negro Women.  
National Education Association (NEA).  
National Farmers Union.  
National League of Cities.  
National Sharecroppers Fund.  
National Urban Coalition.  
National Urban League.  
New Democratic Coalition.  
Newspaper Guild.  
Ripon Society.  
Southren Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC).

Union of American Hebrew Congregations.  
 United Auto Workers (UAW).  
 United Church of Christ, Council for Christian Social Action.  
 United Presbyterian Church in the USA.  
 U. S. Conference of Mayors.  
 Urban Action Emergency Committee, Christian Church.  
 Washington Research Project Action Council.  
 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.  
 World Federalist Youth, USA.  
 Young Democratic Clubs of America.  
 Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA).

## AMERICANS' DISSOLUTIONMENT WITH THE UNITED NATIONS INCREASES

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the growing dissolutionment of the American people with the inability of the United Nations to cope with the great power politics of the 1970's is being expressed on a number of fronts.

As a recent editorial in the prestigious news publication, U.S. News & World Report, so aptly pointed out:

The high hopes Americans once held for the U.N. as a vehicle for peace and understanding among peoples have withered almost to nothing.

The ability of the third world, underdeveloped countries to ramrod resolutions through the General Assembly despite the objections of the major powers, who carry the financial burden of the organization, has been largely responsible for major nations bypassing the "global village debating society" on consequential issues.

In spite of the President's glowing proclamation of United Nations Day 1973 and the fact that U.S. taxpayers continue to pay a disproportionate share of the funds to support the organization, there is an increasing realization among the voters of the country that the United Nations has outlived any usefulness it may have had to our Nation in the past.

As editor Howard Flieger concludes—

What the U.N. says or does just doesn't make much of an impact on reality these days.

This is a conclusion that many Americans realized some years ago and more are awakening to this fact daily.

I include the copyrighted editorial from the U.S. News & World Report, along with the President's Proclamation No. 4240 in the RECORD at this point:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 13, 1973]

UNITED STATES, UNITED NATIONS—AND REALITY

(By Howard Flieger)

When the United States cast its fifth veto in the United Nations Security Council the other day, scarcely anybody in this country

gave it a second thought—or a first thought, for that matter.

If you think about it, the very fact of that indifference is significant.

For one thing, it demonstrates how the high hopes Americans once held for the U.N. as a vehicle for peace and understanding among peoples have withered almost to nothing.

It also shows something else—the U.S. no longer is the all-powerful leader of the world organization. It now is where Russia was for years—in the minority and a favorite target of diplomatic badgering by others.

The vetoed resolution would have censured Israel for not giving up Arab territory it presently occupies. The U.S. argued that this would have put another roadblock in the path of lasting peace in the Middle East. That sounds reasonable to most Americans. But the United States delegate was a very lonely man. Without his veto, the resolution would have been approved overwhelmingly.

Thus, it may be an opportune time to examine the United Nations as it is today.

When the organization was founded near the end of World War II, it consisted of 51 countries, most of them eager to rely on the U.S. for leadership and guidance.

Now there are 132 members, and things are not the same.

Small nations often dominate. The Organization of African Unity, composed of black and Mediterranean African countries, has 41 members—nearly a third of the total U.N. membership. The Arab states generally vote with the Africans, as do almost all of the so-called "underdeveloped" countries.

This gives them a clear majority in the U.N. General Assembly. Often, the votes there have come to be tallied on the basis of "the have-nots" vs. "the haves"—which frequently puts the U.S. on the losing side.

With little or no success, Washington has been trying for years to convince the Africans and others that, by their "anti" tactics in the United Nations, they really are wrecking the only organization that can be of much help to them in dealing with the world.

John Scali, Washington's Ambassador to the U.N., has said that President Nixon intends to make more use of the organization because "he knows that the generation of peace he believes in has to have an international law to hang on to in moments of stress."

That may be. But you will find many diplomats—foreign and American—who disagree.

Most foreign diplomats feel that Mr. Nixon ignores the U.N. on important issues, bypasses it when possible and much prefers to deal directly with other governments, rather than going the U.N. route.

Many U.S. career people agree, but they say Mr. Nixon can hardly be blamed because the U.N. itself has changed so much in character in recent years. In practice, it just isn't regarded as a good place to get things done.

Not only the U.S. but Russia and other major nations choose to operate outside the U.N. when they want to accomplish something they deem important.

This way, they can consider how the smaller nations feel about a given situation but not be controlled by it. They can move ahead, unhampered, in their own self-interest. Arrangements are not complicated by U.N. politics and emotionalism.

Ironically, as the use of the U.N. by the major powers is diminished, so is the political heft of the smaller and poorer nations. The United Nations is their only global forum—and what the U.N. says or does just doesn't make much of an imprint on reality these days.

PROCLAMATION 4240—UNITED NATIONS DAY 1973

(By the President of the United States of America)

A PROCLAMATION

Each year the peoples of the world celebrate October 24 as United Nations Day, recalling the date in 1945 when the United Nations Charter came into force. This is an appropriate occasion for people everywhere to renew their adherence to the Charter ideals of peace and human rights, and their determination to promote economic and social progress and a greater measure of justice and freedom for all.

This year the anniversary occurs at a time of dramatic change in world affairs. We sense the promise of a more peaceful world and the opportunity for new strides in international cooperation.

As the world climate improves, the prospects will grow for using the United Nations to alleviate political disputes and for broadening its constructive activity in the social, economic and technological fields.

In some areas, international cooperation is already a longstanding tradition—moving the international mails, regulating international communications and transportation, preventing the worldwide spread of disease, developing international standards of practice in labor, and many others.

More recently, the United Nations and other international agencies have begun to work in other areas—devising safeguards, for example, for the production of nuclear energy and rules concerning man's use of outer space; extending the rule of law over the exploitation of the oceans; protecting the environment; protecting the rights of refugees and prisoners of war; and inhibiting the international traffic in narcotic drugs. Efforts are also underway to cope with the problems of population growth and with the hijacking of aircraft and other forms of international terrorism.

In the years ahead the growing interdependence of nations will inevitably require international institutions to be even more effective in dealing with this new agenda. We need to create new arrangements to control new technologies for the common good. We must bridge the interests of rich and poor countries on matters of trade and aid. We must facilitate the exchange of technical and scientific knowledge and encourage modes of cooperative behavior which will permit nations to live together in concord.

Within this framework I hope all Americans will continue to appreciate and analyze, soberly and realistically, the benefits they and all peoples gain from international cooperation—within the United Nations and other institutions—to meet the challenges of the modern world.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Wednesday, October 24, 1973, as United Nations Day. I urge the citizens of this Nation to observe that day with community programs which will promote understanding and support for the United Nations and its affiliated agencies.

I have appointed Donald S. MacNaughton to be United States National Chairman for United Nations Day and, through him, I call upon State and local officials to encourage citizens' groups and agencies of communication—press, radio, television, and motion pictures—to engage in appropriate observances of United Nations Day in cooperation with the United Nations Association of the United States of America and other interested organizations.

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

RICHARD NIXON.

### CONGRESSMEN MAY FIND PUBLIC HAS OTHER CONCERNS

#### HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of California. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months much of the attention of the Nation has been focused upon one particular committee meeting of the U.S. Senate. At the same time, partly because of the divisions in our country, our problems have been mounting.

The following editorial which was carried by the Burbank Daily Review and the Glendale News-Press in my 20th District on August 4, 1973, expresses the point of view of a large segment of our population.

The editorial follows:

#### CONGRESSMEN MAY FIND PUBLIC HAS OTHER CONCERNS

Members of Congress can profit by their summer recess that began Friday. It affords them a chance to talk with their constituents, which is always a good idea but an especially good one right now. Many of those constituents may have the impression that the Watergate hearings represent the primary concern of the 93rd Congress. A wise senator or representative would do well to dispel that impression if he can.

For all the prime time and column inches given to Watergate, for all the time, effort and dollars spent in getting the full story of that affair into the open, we suggest that the average American has been able to keep the matter in better perspective than official Washington. As Senator Sam Ervin and members of his committee rush back and forth from their hearings to vote on legislation in the Senate chamber, we shudder to think how many other lawmakers are scurrying back and forth from a seat in front of a television set for the same purpose.

Who's minding the shop?

Preoccupation with Watergate has clearly slowed the performance of Congress, which is a ponderous institution to begin with. Its accomplishments in seven months, aside from hawkshaving by investigating committees of both houses, will be hard for some members to enumerate if they are put on the spot back home. Congressional quarterly's list of the 22 major items of legislation to come before Congress this year showed this week that only one had passed both houses and been signed by the President.

Harking back to the first of the year we recall that one of the overriding questions about the 93rd Congress was how responsibly it would treat the federal budget.

On the plus side, the sustaining of President Nixon's veto of some "budget-busting" appropriation bills is a heartening sign that Congress may finally be awakening to the fact that even pork barrels have a bottom.

The inability of previous Congresses to

keep a firm grasp on the size of the federal budget has accounted more than anything for the flow of budget-making power to the executive branch of our government and the necessity for presidents to impound appropriated funds. Although congressional Democrats are determined to make a political issue of the current impounding of funds, the attitude of the new Congress toward a budget ceiling indicates Mr. Nixon is getting his message across—that we cannot win our fight against inflation if federal spending is not kept in check.

Thus, a subject as dry as the budget may be the best talking point for a vacationing congressman trying to explain what he has done for his constituents since January.

He does not have much else to brag about—particularly if the talk gets around to the environment, the energy crisis, urban problems, defense needs, foreign aid, pension reform and all the other issues that concern Americans who can see beyond Watergate to the real problems that confront Congress.

He may find out, in fact, that John Q. Public is not as interested in the contents of White House tapes and memos as in the contents of the meat compartment in his own refrigerator.

### FIRMS TOLD TO ELIMINATE JOB HAZARDS WHEREVER POSSIBLE

#### HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, there are over 80,000,000 workers in America's labor force today and an increasingly large number are facing work-related health problems. Workers in coal mines, cotton mills, chemical pesticide, and fungicide plants and a long list of other industries have a high incidence of disease. These diseases have been persuasively documented by scientific research to be work-related.

The Public Health Service estimates that there are about 396,000 new cases of occupational disease each year. Much information about the relationship between the work environment and occupational diseases and casualties has been known for decades and continuing research uncovers more and more of this relationship.

Because of the growing problem, Congress enacted the Occupational Safety and Health Act in 1970. However, the strength of this legislation does not lie in its existence, but rather in its enforcement. By avoiding "stop-gap" measures and by requiring employers to eliminate job hazards OSHA can provide the protection the American worker is entitled to.

That is why I was so pleased to hear of the latest decision by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission and would like to bring the following related article from the Wall Street Journal, August 22, 1973, to my colleagues' attention.

The article follows:

### FIRMS TOLD TO GO BEYOND PROTECTIVE GEAR ON SOME JOB HAZARDS IN SAFETY-UNIT RULING

WASHINGTON.—Employers must protect workers by eliminating job hazards wherever possible, and can't do so just by providing protective equipment, a federal safety court ruled.

The decision by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission has potentially broad implications for corporate safety and health programs. It seems to suggest, attorneys indicated, that under such conditions as excessive noise levels or exposure to dangerous chemicals employers might be required, wherever technologically possible, to eliminate those exposures rather than simply require workers to wear protective devices and clothing. The decision could be appealed to a federal circuit court.

The case involves the Labor Department's charge that American Smelting & Refining Co. violated the Federal Job Safety Act by exposing employees at its Omaha, Neb., plant to airborne inorganic lead in excess of 0.2 milligram per cubic meter of air, based on a weighted eight-hour average. The 0.2 milligram level is a widely used industrial standard.

In New York, a spokesman for American Smelting said officials haven't had time to review the opinion in detail. But he added, "We are disappointed in the decision of the commission. We are especially concerned that the commission majority failed to give any weight to the extensive hygiene program that was in effect at the Omaha plant and that is designed specifically to protect workmen from hazardous exposure to lead."

#### "GENERAL DUTY" CLAUSE

When the Labor Department inspected the company, the government hadn't any specific safety standards covering lead exposures. So inspectors charged American Smelting with violating the "general duty" provision, which requires an employer to provide a workplace free of recognized hazards likely to cause serious physical harm or death.

The company appealed to the review commission, and in March 1972 Administrative Law Judge William E. Brennan ruled the company had violated the job safety act. He specifically rejected the company's claim that its protective safety measures reduced employee exposure to acceptable levels.

At the Omaha plant, he found the company required employees exposed to high air lead levels to use approved respirators, took periodic blood and urine samples to monitor exposure, and reassigned workers to other jobs when lead content of blood or urine exceeded certain levels.

Mr. Brennan ruled those procedures hadn't effectively eliminated hazards because tests disclosed excessive lead levels in blood. He also ruled the company had "waited until some of its employees had absorbed excessive and dangerous amounts of lead to take corrective measures. Such a program in effect uses the employees as a test device to determine hazardous conditions."

He called the practice of transferring exposed workers to other jobs "a stop-gap measure at best," and one that doesn't remove the hazard. And, he asserted, the permanent use of respirators places the burden of safety compliance on workers instead of the employer.

Mr. Brennan assessed a \$600 penalty against American Smelting and ordered the company to adopt "feasible engineering controls" to reduce lead levels to generally recognized safe levels within six months.

The full review commission began studying Mr. Brennan's decision more than a year ago, examining whether the lead levels were a

"recognized hazard." The company argued that Congress intended hazards covered by the general duty clause to be detectable by the human senses. But the commission examined congressional debate on the job safety law and found, by a two-to-one vote, that nonobvious hazards, including those that require instruments to measure, are covered by the act.

1973 TOASTMASTERS SPEECH  
CONTEST

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have been proud to be associated with Capitol Hill Club, Toastmasters International, Capital Hill Club, and its sister organization, Magellan Toastmasters Club of Guam, are part of a worldwide federation of men and women dedicated to improving their speaking and leadership skills. One of my Capitol Hill Club colleagues, Mr. Williamson Day, entered the 1973 Toastmasters Speech Contest and represented our club in area, division, district, regional, and international levels. On August 18, at the 42d Annual Convention of Toastmasters International in Houston, Tex., he competed in the 1973 International Speech Contest, placing third in a field representing 60,000 toastmasters worldwide. I congratulate Mr. Day and am pleased to share his speech with my colleagues:

THE WINNER

(By Williamson Day)

All your life you have put off thinking about this moment. Now it's here. No one will say so, but you're dying—dying because you're burned over 70 percent of your body, so badly burned that there's nothing they can do. You lie in a hospital bed, throbbing, looking at a bottle of plasma over you, dripping, drop by drop, dripping life in as life drips out.

Seconds before, minutes before, you were racing at Indianapolis, racing the 500, throttling your Offenhauser past the stands, past the chutes, past Gasoline Alley, Indy. The Granddaddy. The Kingpin. Crowds, flags, heat, beer, girls, cars, colors—a kaleidoscopic blur like none in the world. And you remember the big thing: You won. You won at Indy—before you crashed into the wall at 200 miles an hour.

You're a winner. Or are you?

Now you have five minutes to live, maybe fifteen. In the last few moments of your life you ask yourself: what is winning in life? Is winning a title, money, a moment in the spotlight? Or is winning in life something much more important? You think about winning as you remember your race, every minute, every mile.

"Gentlemen, start your engines."

You're off, lap one, gearing for the turn, instinctively, reflexively, gearing for the millionth time, leaning with the car, moving with it, part of it, beautiful. You tailgate

now, tailgate too close, but you don't care, you want that title more than anything in the world.

Lap 10. The cars snarl at Indy, round and round and round, as a mixmaster whirrs in a kitchen, round and round. Your wife is cooking and baking while you race. No longer can she bear to watch at the track. She remembers the old days, when you were home for breakfasts, dinners, for Kathy's bedtime. She remembers when you were there, a father, a husband, not away, not at racer's meetings, not on the road. As she cooks, she has no idea that, before her cake is done, she will hear the phone ring. It'll be your mechanic, his voice tortured and sickened, with the news. She'll start for the hospital, catching a glimpse of your picture. She'll look for a long moment before bursting into tears; deep inside, she'll know that picture is all she has left.

Lap 100. Rain pelts the asphalt. It's wet and dark on the track. There's death in the dark, but you don't care, you pour on the power. You want your picture on every sports page in the country.

Lap 150. The cars growl at Indy, round and round and round, as a phonograph turns in a bedroom, round and round. A six-year-old girl, your Kathy, listens to a record, waits for you to come home, waits for a shoulder ride, for another reading of *Cinderella*. She knows she loves you more than anything in the world. What she doesn't know is that you won't be coming home, won't ever be coming home. In two terrible hours her mother will press a moist face to hers, tell her that something's happened to Daddy, that she must be very grown up and very brave.

Lap 200. The last lap. The Offy punishes the pavement. You lash it, beat it, hurtling, vibrating, undulating. You see oil on the track, but you don't care; you want to stand in that winner's circle, you want to hear the howl of 400,000 people—all for you.

Then you see it: the flag, the checkered flag. You win at Indy! You shout in the wind.

You're still shouting when the Offy hits the oil. You spin nauseatingly, bobbling and turning, then splinter into the wall, an orange fireball of methanol burning and crackling around you. By the time they cut you free, there is very little they can do.

Your plasma runs out and there's no need for more; your life runs out with it. No more will you go round and round.

You're a winner. Or are you?

And so, my friends, what of us? Are we winners? Are we racing for a title, for money, for a moment in the spotlight? Are we racing so hard for a silver cup that we're losing a woman with her love, a child waiting to be tucked in for the night?

A MAN FOR THE PEOPLE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, September 10, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call Mr. D. Parke Gibson to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Gibson, a Harlem resident, is a self-made man in the field of public relations. He achieved his status by ap-

proaching advertising for black people from a black perspective. More importantly, he has sought to serve rather than to exploit the Harlem community. Mr. Gibson is truly a great asset to Harlem and to the entire city of New York. I submit the following article on this remarkable man which was written by Willie L. Hamilton of the Amsterdam News:

D. PARKE GIBSON—A SELF-MADE MAN

(By Willie L. Hamilton)

Just what is a self-made man?

There are examples and there are examples but D. Parke Gibson perhaps typifies the idea of pulling oneself up by the bootstraps.

Who is Daniel Parke Gibson? Well, he's only the owner of a public relations firm with the same name with International Inc., added.

Now Gibson didn't just walk into his own firm. No indeed. Back in 1948 Gibson graduated from Garfield High in Seattle, Wash. He never went to college but instead went into the Air Force for the next four years. There he served in the public information office and decided he wanted to do something in that field.

Upon leaving the Air Force, Gibson moved to Philadelphia, Pa., where he became an associate in public relations for two years. Later he sold advertising space for Interstate United Newspapers which at the time, also serviced the Amsterdam News.

In May, 1954 Gibson moved to New York and in 1963 began his own firm in a one room office in Harlem at 2631 Seventh Ave. Later the firm moved to 2580 Seventh Ave, and on to its present location at 475 Fifth Ave.

Gibson feels that present advertising on television and radio "was not conceived for us but was created to convince whites that Blacks were part of society and that they did the same things as themselves."

BLACK MARKET—\$39 BILLION

He said, "Companies who hope to reach the Black market—worth some \$39-billion—must gear their products and campaigns to a life-style that is different from that of whites."

Of course, "Blacks still don't join country clubs but they spend more per capita for furniture than whites because their life-style is centered around the home."

Attired in a light blue shirt, a dark blue and white tie, blue pants and black shoes, the 42-year-old Gibson, still a Harlem resident, said the trend is presently toward more "polarization" although his firm is committed to integration as a goal.

POSITIVE ELEMENTS OF INTEGRATION

... "Blacks want the positive elements of integration—good jobs, education and housing," said Gibson.

Although most firms are "aware that Blacks exist," said Gibson, "they often don't follow through." He feels that whites in the top levels of management would like to do their part in righting past wrongs but "middle management, where the idea has to be executed," often are the cause of "a lot of problems."

Principals of the firm, besides Gibson, are Ellen Hall, VP and treasurer and Mary P. Murray, VP and secretary. Both have been with the firm since its conception.

NEED BLACK ORIENTATION

He said that corporate PR people and executives need to read Black media, to attend Black meetings, and participate in what is happening in the Black community. "I see



very few white PR people at Black publications," he said.

Currently there is a thrust to hold first-run premieres and movies in Black neighborhoods. Gibson is all for the idea but feels that the idea isn't always feasible because in certain Black areas, theatres aren't large enough to accommodate the crowds. The

Apollo Theatre there is an exception, said Gibson.

Services offered by the firm include "The Gibson Report," a monthly letter on marketing to nonwhite consumers; "Race Relations and Industry," a monthly letter on equal opportunity problems, programs and practices; Gibson's book, "The \$30 Billion Ne-

gro," and an upcoming book, yet untitled, on the Caribbean.

As for young Blacks who might want to enter the field, Gibson tells them not to place any "restrictions" on themselves. "Many of the things we perceive as racial would be something different if we had red hair."

...the first... the second... the third... the fourth... the fifth... the sixth... the seventh... the eighth... the ninth... the tenth... the eleventh... the twelfth... the thirteenth... the fourteenth... the fifteenth... the sixteenth... the seventeenth... the eighteenth... the nineteenth... the twentieth... the twenty-first... the twenty-second... the twenty-third... the twenty-fourth... the twenty-fifth... the twenty-sixth... the twenty-seventh... the twenty-eighth... the twenty-ninth... the thirtieth... the thirty-first... the thirty-second... the thirty-third... the thirty-fourth... the thirty-fifth... the thirty-sixth... the thirty-seventh... the thirty-eighth... the thirty-ninth... the fortieth... the forty-first... the forty-second... the forty-third... the forty-fourth... the forty-fifth... the forty-sixth... the forty-seventh... the forty-eighth... the forty-ninth... the fiftieth... the fifty-first... the fifty-second... the fifty-third... the fifty-fourth... the fifty-fifth... the fifty-sixth... the fifty-seventh... the fifty-eighth... the fifty-ninth... the sixtieth... the sixty-first... the sixty-second... the sixty-third... the sixty-fourth... the sixty-fifth... the sixty-sixth... the sixty-seventh... the sixty-eighth... the sixty-ninth... the seventieth... the seventy-first... the seventy-second... the seventy-third... the seventy-fourth... the seventy-fifth... the seventy-sixth... the seventy-seventh... the seventy-eighth... the seventy-ninth... the eightieth... the eighty-first... the eighty-second... the eighty-third... the eighty-fourth... the eighty-fifth... the eighty-sixth... the eighty-seventh... the eighty-eighth... the eighty-ninth... the ninetieth... the ninety-first... the ninety-second... the ninety-third... the ninety-fourth... the ninety-fifth... the ninety-sixth... the ninety-seventh... the ninety-eighth... the ninety-ninth... the one hundredth...

...the first... the second... the third... the fourth... the fifth... the sixth... the seventh... the eighth... the ninth... the tenth... the eleventh... the twelfth... the thirteenth... the fourteenth... the fifteenth... the sixteenth... the seventeenth... the eighteenth... the nineteenth... the twentieth... the twenty-first... the twenty-second... the twenty-third... the twenty-fourth... the twenty-fifth... the twenty-sixth... the twenty-seventh... the twenty-eighth... the twenty-ninth... the thirtieth... the thirty-first... the thirty-second... the thirty-third... the thirty-fourth... the thirty-fifth... the thirty-sixth... the thirty-seventh... the thirty-eighth... the thirty-ninth... the fortieth... the forty-first... the forty-second... the forty-third... the forty-fourth... the forty-fifth... the forty-sixth... the forty-seventh... the forty-eighth... the forty-ninth... the fiftieth... the fifty-first... the fifty-second... the fifty-third... the fifty-fourth... the fifty-fifth... the fifty-sixth... the fifty-seventh... the fifty-eighth... the fifty-ninth... the sixtieth... the sixty-first... the sixty-second... the sixty-third... the sixty-fourth... the sixty-fifth... the sixty-sixth... the sixty-seventh... the sixty-eighth... the sixty-ninth... the seventieth... the seventy-first... the seventy-second... the seventy-third... the seventy-fourth... the seventy-fifth... the seventy-sixth... the seventy-seventh... the seventy-eighth... the seventy-ninth... the eightieth... the eighty-first... the eighty-second... the eighty-third... the eighty-fourth... the eighty-fifth... the eighty-sixth... the eighty-seventh... the eighty-eighth... the eighty-ninth... the ninetieth... the ninety-first... the ninety-second... the ninety-third... the ninety-fourth... the ninety-fifth... the ninety-sixth... the ninety-seventh... the ninety-eighth... the ninety-ninth... the one hundredth...

...the first... the second... the third... the fourth... the fifth... the sixth... the seventh... the eighth... the ninth... the tenth... the eleventh... the twelfth... the thirteenth... the fourteenth... the fifteenth... the sixteenth... the seventeenth... the eighteenth... the nineteenth... the twentieth... the twenty-first... the twenty-second... the twenty-third... the twenty-fourth... the twenty-fifth... the twenty-sixth... the twenty-seventh... the twenty-eighth... the twenty-ninth... the thirtieth... the thirty-first... the thirty-second... the thirty-third... the thirty-fourth... the thirty-fifth... the thirty-sixth... the thirty-seventh... the thirty-eighth... the thirty-ninth... the fortieth... the forty-first... the forty-second... the forty-third... the forty-fourth... the forty-fifth... the forty-sixth... the forty-seventh... the forty-eighth... the forty-ninth... the fiftieth... the fifty-first... the fifty-second... the fifty-third... the fifty-fourth... the fifty-fifth... the fifty-sixth... the fifty-seventh... the fifty-eighth... the fifty-ninth... the sixtieth... the sixty-first... the sixty-second... the sixty-third... the sixty-fourth... the sixty-fifth... the sixty-sixth... the sixty-seventh... the sixty-eighth... the sixty-ninth... the seventieth... the seventy-first... the seventy-second... the seventy-third... the seventy-fourth... the seventy-fifth... the seventy-sixth... the seventy-seventh... the seventy-eighth... the seventy-ninth... the eightieth... the eighty-first... the eighty-second... the eighty-third... the eighty-fourth... the eighty-fifth... the eighty-sixth... the eighty-seventh... the eighty-eighth... the eighty-ninth... the ninetieth... the ninety-first... the ninety-second... the ninety-third... the ninety-fourth... the ninety-fifth... the ninety-sixth... the ninety-seventh... the ninety-eighth... the ninety-ninth... the one hundredth...