

Tally, Billy Fair
 Tappan, Jeremy Richard
 Taylor, Reeves Ramsey
 Teague, Foster Schuler
 Terry, Daniel Gilley Warren
 Thomas, Donald Patrick
 Throop, James Ray
 Tortora, Anthony Michael
 Traweek, Billy Banks
 Trueblood, William Eugene
 Tuttle, Jerry Owen
 Tuttle, John Robert
 Vanwestendorp, Steven
 Varner, Duane Lyle
 Velazquezsuaruz, Francisco A.
 Vojtek, Thomas Michael
 Wallace, Thomas McCarthy
 Walsh, William Albert
 Warner, Laurance Bliss
 Weedon, Robert Ernest
 Wehrman, Philip William

Weissman, Marvin Malcolm
 Wellings, John Franklin
 Wells, Don Vinton
 Wheeler, James Bernard
 Wheeler, John Raymond
 White, James Richard
 Will, Otto William, III
 Willenbrink, James Frederick
 Williams, Randall Lee
 Williams, Richard Ellis
 Wilson, Robert William, Jr.
 Wilson, Vaughn Edgar, Jr.
 Winans, Gilbert Loren
 Wise, James Edward, Jr.
 Wise, Peyton Randolph, II
 Withrow, John Eastin, Jr.
 Wood, Charles Sherman
 Woodbury, Kyle Harry
 Woods, Robert Clair
 Yeager, Donald Robert
 Young, Alfred Avery, III

Young, David Bryan, Jr.
 Zick, Richard Allen

The following named Reserve officers of the U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Balogh, Albert Theodore
 Harris, Frank Brayton
 Oakley, Nicholas Wickham, Jr.

The following named women officers of the U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Koestline, Sarah Evelyn
 Labonte, Nadene Barbara
 Marshall, Alice Claudine
 Mogge, Marjorie Helen
 Neely, Jean Chapman
 Quigley, Robin Lindsay C.
 Young, Sue Ella

RHODESIAN CHROME

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, 1971 and 1972, the Senate three times voted to permit the importation into the United States of chrome, a strategic material, from Rhodesia.

Prior to the approval by the Congress of my legislation to allow this importation, shipments of chrome—and all other commodities—from Rhodesia to this country were banned by an Executive order issued by former President Johnson. The Executive order, never submitted to the Congress, was issued pursuant to a resolution of the United Nations Security Council.

Today legislation is pending to bring this question of Rhodesian chrome imports once again before the Senate. Of course, I shall oppose the latest effort to repeal the legislation admitting Rhodesian chrome, but in a sense I welcome the approach of another debate in this area, because it affords a vehicle for extended discussion of many issues in the relationship between the United States and the United Nations.

Two recent articles have discussed some of the considerations involved in the Rhodesian chrome issue. One is a column of September 10, 1973, by Anthony Harrigan, published in the Huntington, Ind., Herald-Press and other newspapers; the other is an editorial in the September 17 edition of the Petersburg, Va., Progress-Index. Both are excellent discussions of the issues involved. The editor of the Progress-Index is Edward A. Wyatt IV, and its publisher is Rufus Josey.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these articles be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

[From the Huntington (Ind.) Herald-Press, Sept. 10, 1973]

AN UNJUST TRADE BAN

(By Anthony Harrigan)

With the publication of the final report of the National Commission on Materials Policy, the Congress should show a greater awareness of America's need for strategic and critical minerals in the years ahead.

The report rightly warns that the United States "is not self-sufficient in all basic materials, and other growing industrial areas of the world are increasing demands for essential raw materials." If the American standard of living is to be maintained and advanced, the U.S. will have to take steps to obtain secure access to overseas energy sources and minerals. Certainly, Japan, the Soviet Union and the European Common Market countries are very mindful of the importance of gaining access to sources of essential materials for the final years of the 20th century.

In view of this situation, it is fantastic and shocking that Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn.) and a group of co-sponsors in the Senate should endeavor to deny the United States access to the world's greatest supply of chrome ore—an absolutely essential mineral. Yet this is what Sen. Humphrey has done in introducing Senate Bill 1868 to "halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome." Among the co-sponsors of this profoundly hurtful legislation are Sens. Bayh, Eagleton, Inouye, Jackson, Kennedy, McGovern, Muskie, Stevenson and Tunney. It is hard to figure just who these senators think this bill would punish. Rhodesia's chrome, after all, is sought after in many parts of the world. The effort by the African bloc in the United Nations to prevent sale of this chrome in international market was a failure. Many industrial nations know that they must have access to Rhodesian chrome.

The report of the National Commission on Materials Policy indicates that the U.S. has to import 100 per cent of its chrome ore requirements. If American companies are denied an opportunity to buy it from Rhodesia, a free world country, they will be compelled to buy it from the Soviet Union at twice the cost.

Sen. Humphrey & Co. are trying to reimpose the Johnson administration ban on chrome imports from Rhodesia. An amendment introduced by Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. has happily freed the United States from that absurd ban. Now the liberal coalition in the Senate is seeking to knock out the Byrd amendment. This effort by Sen. Humphrey and his liberal colleagues flies in the face of

all wisdom concerning America's mineral needs. Without chrome, the manufacture of essential alloys is impossible.

It is outrageous that U.S. trade policy should be shaped by the demands of the African bloc in the United Nations which is engaged in a vendetta against Rhodesia. Moreover, the Humphrey bill (S. 1868) represents a double standard. Rhodesia has not injured the United States. On the contrary, it offered to send troops to fight in Vietnam. Rhodesia has enjoyed almost 10 years of responsible, fiscally sound government benefiting all population groups. Its critics in Africa include bloody dictatorships, savage regimes such as exist in Uganda where the head of state praises Hitlerite notions, and client states of communist superpowers. To compound the irony, the sponsors of the ban on trade with Rhodesia are ardent advocates of increased trade with Communist China—the most completely totalitarian society in the world today.

The lengths to which the liberal coalition carries this vendetta is both absurd and extraordinary. For example, the Carnegie Endowment For International Peace recently made it appear that two U.S. airlines and two American auto rental services were violating the law because they allegedly participated in inter-line billing for Air Rhodesia and making hotel and car rental reservations in Rhodesia. No one has heard the Carnegie Endowment complain because U.S. airlines fly passengers into communist countries or because American companies do business in such nations. The Carnegie Endowment, by the way, is the organization that a few years ago published a blueprint for military invasion of Southern Africa—a remarkable document for an organization purportedly devoted to "peace."

Sen. Humphrey and his associates can't point to any threat Rhodesia has made against the U.S. interests. The liberal coalition in the Senate isn't advocating a trade ban with Libya, which has confiscated American oil properties, harassed American citizens, and harbored terrorists. Only Rhodesia is singled out for economic pressure.

The Humphrey bill should be rejected by the Senate, for reasons of both practicality and justice. Instead of banning Rhodesian chrome ore, the United States should encourage the rapid development of Rhodesia's mineral industry. Indeed the final report of the National Commission on Minerals Policy states that U.S. government agencies "should intensify their efforts to encourage worldwide development of resources by all means." Rhodesia's chrome ore is both strategic and

critical insofar as the United States is concerned.

[From the Petersburg (Va.) Progress-Index, Sept. 17, 1973]

TIME TO STOP GETTING "BURNED"
(By Edward A. Wyatt, IV)

A dated topic comes back into the news with the Nixon administration's move to cut off all trade with Rhodesia and to repeal the 1971 amendment which allowed the United States to import chrome from that country in spite of the embargo on trade with Rhodesia advocated by the United Nations.

The case for the amendment, which was sponsored by Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., was based on claims that Rhodesian chrome is a strategic material, that it is of higher quality than chrome from other countries, and that compliance with United Nations would put the United States in a position of dangerous reliance upon the Soviet Union.

The embargo was an effort to apply economic pressure to the government of Prime Minister Ian Smith with a view to forcing reforms in the field of racial policy. The amendment setting forth a contrary attitude was promoted as safe and sensible in terms of the interests of the United States, and it won enough support to become law.

The Nixon administration argument, expressed chiefly by Ambassador Scall, head of the United States delegation to the United Nations, and by Assistant Secretary of State Newsom, in charge of African affairs, is that United States foreign policy is suffering because of the effect of the amendment and that its repeal would encourage other nations to live up to their international obligations. However, expectation that a subservient or compliant attitude on the part of the United States to recommendations by the United Nations would serve the interests of either the United Nations or the United States has been badly battered by 25 years of history.

There seems to be no proof or very convincing argument that setbacks and disappointments in foreign affairs, which are global and nothing if not abundant, are attributable to the amendment allowing this country to buy chrome from Rhodesia. Neither is there evidence that the application of economic pressure has improved the political morals of Rhodesia, although there are reports that on its own that government has been moderating its racial policies.

We must wonder whether chrome has the great intangible importance which is assigned to it by a move which puts the White House in somewhat unlikely company with Senator Kennedy and Senator Humphrey. Searching for an explanation why the President after two years has become disturbed by the amendment, one is reminded of the thesis that one of the Nixon responses to deep trouble is to make sudden gestures to the liberal left. The concern over chrome and the amendment which permits the United States to buy it from a nation in the United Nations doghouse seems to qualify for the description. How many governments in Latin America, Africa, Asia or anywhere else would actually care or behave differently if the amendment were repealed?

If the issue can be viewed in terms of the interests of this country, the amendment seems as sensible as it did in 1971. If reliance upon the Soviet Union for chrome was dangerous then, it is dangerous now. Present fear that Arab governments may use oil in attempts to influence decisions by the United States is a reminder how these things can work.

Chrome, wheat, and oil are very different commodities. We have just been told by Treasury Secretary Schultz that the United

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

States was "burned" in last year's wheat deal. This is a discovery which housewives, consumers, and the general populace made some time ago. If the chrome issue involves any "burning," and granted that being burned in worthy causes is all in a day's experience for our rulers, some members of the commonality have had enough of being burned unnecessarily and would like to be excused from more of the same.

THE ALEXANDRIA WATERFRONT

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary goals of my tenure in Congress is to be of some assistance to the city of Alexandria in its efforts to achieve orderly planning and development of the Alexandria waterfront.

Recently a very positive step was taken in that direction when a compromise of a lengthy dispute over land use was reached. At this time, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Star-News which comments on that compromise.

ALEXANDRIA'S LAND SWAP

Every once in a great while, local government and private enterprise, locked in one of those interminable disputes over land use, manage to reach an accommodation that serves everyone's interest. Precisely that appears to have occurred in the admirable land swap disclosed the other day that will shift the proposed Watergate II apartment complex away from the Alexandria waterfront.

The dispute, which had been growing more complex with the passing of time, had all the familiar markings of an insuperable impasse. Apart from the issue of high-rise development on the waterfront, the feud had depressed the chances of congressional legislation to remove the decades-old cloud over federal-city ownership of the Alexandria shoreline. And without such legislation, the city has been handcuffed in its desire to achieve orderly, long-needed planning and development of the waterfront.

Under the proposed agreement, the city would acquire ownership of a six-acre waterfront site at the foot of Princess Street, on which the Watergate high-rise condominium apartments had been planned, in exchange for the site of the abandoned Ficklin School, several blocks away.

While the original apartment development proposal—surrounded by adequate safeguards to protect the waterfront itself—had not seemed to us a disaster, the transplant clearly is more in the public interest. At its new location the high-rise complex will be compatible with similar existing development. The city's hands will be much freer in renovating the waterfront. And in easing a myriad of tensions and pressures, the swap promises political dividends that could hardly have been achieved any other way.

More importantly, the proposal gained status the other day when the private developers agreed to the concept of the swap. That word was no sooner in than the city council voted unanimously to throw its support behind the venture. We join City Manager Wayne Anderson in hoping that the agreement holds, and commend those on both sides who responsibly put together the compromise.

A CONTINUING ROLE FOR NATO

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, there is much discussion today on the viability in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—NATO—in light of detente and in light of the conferences now being held between the Soviet Union and her allies and the United States and other free world nations.

An article, written by Arthur Veysey and appearing in the Chicago Tribune, of Sunday, September 30, 1973, brings to our attention some strategic factors which must not be forgotten in weighing the future of NATO. I call it to the attention of my colleagues, particularly those on the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Armed Forces, and Appropriations:

THE IMPORTANCE OF AND NEED FOR NATO

(By Arthur Veysey)

CASTEAU, BELGIUM.—Is the North Atlantic Alliance still important? Is there still any need for its military command set up by General Eisenhower 23 years ago when the Soviet Union was blockading Berlin?

Yes, declares the present commander in chief. He is Gen. Andrew Goodpaster, an American. NATO and its military arm, SHAPE, will be vital, he says, until Western Europe unites or until the Soviet Union and its allies cease to be a threat. Neither, he says, is in sight.

Why keep NATO? Why keep American forces in Europe?

For three hours, I sat in on a private briefing at which Goodpaster, his chief of staff, and his directors of intelligence, planning, and supplies made their pitch. Here is the gist of what they said.

The Soviet leaders preach detente but continue to improve their military forces.

The Soviet military budget has gone up each year for five years. The research budget is up 60 percent. The Soviet Union today spends as much on its forces or perhaps a little more than the United States even tho its total income, its gross national product, is only half that of the United States.

The army keeps its 24-month draft. In Central Europe, the Soviet Union and its allies have more tanks, planes, and guns than NATO and enough short-range nuclear missiles to smash Western Europe.

The Soviet Union has developed multiple warheads for its big, long-range missiles, adding to the number of American cities it can wipe out in an instant. It is putting missiles into stronger underground silos. Its newest submarines carry missiles capable of reaching 4,000 miles, letting the subs attack every part of America without leaving the Arctic Ocean. Eight such subs were built last year. Yards now turn out one a month.

The Soviet air force has a new faster-than-sound bomber and a new fighter.

The Soviet navy has grown fastest of all. Its nuclear submarines can attack shipping in any ocean. Its newest destroyers and cruisers carry missiles to attack other ships, sonar to seek submarines, and a double defense against planes. The first Soviet aircraft carrier is afloat. Old cruisers have been converted to communication and command ships. Supply ships let a fleet operate indefinitely in any ocean. Research ships probe the seas.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Why does the Soviet Union devote so many men, so much money, supplies, and effort to its military forces?

The Soviet Union, unlike the United States or, more so, Western Europe, has within its borders almost everything it needs in wartime. Thus it has little need for a defensive navy.

But the Kremlin leaders apparently learned from the Cuban missile crisis the power of a navy in peacetime. Today the Soviet navy, backed by land, air, and space forces, can support Soviet economic, political, or military strategy throughout the world.

The improved land, sea, air, and space forces have turned the world military balance to favor the Soviet Union. An even bigger shift may come from the Soviet's policy of detente.

By preaching peace, the Soviet Union stimulates Western euphoria and wishful thinking that the Cold War is over.

Negotiations for mutual balanced force reductions in central Europe will be a false road to peace if they further disturb the military balance. How can withdrawal of American troops across the Atlantic be matched against the movement of any number of Soviet forces a few hundred miles to the east, where they could be placed against the NATO flank or, in emergency, quickly sent back into central Europe?

NATO and SHAPE have served the West well. Europe has gone more than a quarter of a century without war. The Soviet Union has been unable to pick off more European nations one by one. NATO has encouraged the West to work together and make the best use of men, money, and supplies.

All NATO governments are under strong public pressure to cut military spending. Heavy cuts will come, unless people who still believe in NATO speak up loud and clear.

TOM VAIL

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when death strikes down a young member of our own congressional family as it did Tom Vail recently, we are all doubly saddened by the closeness of tragedy.

Tom's passing is especially grievous to me. His lovely wife Nancy served for 4 years as my personnel secretary. Knowing her as I do, I am confident that her faith in God, her courage, and her abiding love for Tom and their four youngsters will sustain her and the children in the years ahead.

Tom Vail was a proud and competent member of our congressional family. He served with distinction as a staff member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation before joining the Senate Finance Committee and becoming its chief counsel.

Tom served us well, Mr. Speaker. He served his profession and his community with pride and excellence. He offered us each day the fullness of his wisdom, and now, in death, we all share a sharpened memory of his devotion to the Congress and his loved ones whose grief we now share.

Let us all share it, Mr. Speaker, with a pledge of continued concern for Nancy and Tom's children, just as we shall share in the days ahead the memory of a good man and a good servant of this Nation. Tom Vail was one of us in life; in the stillness of death he will remain one of us.

COST OVERRUNS AT
NEWPORT NEWS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Navy's plans to build two new huge aircraft carriers are running into both lengthy schedule delays and cost overrun problems.

It is my understanding that the new aircraft carrier *Nimitz* will be delivered at least 6 months behind schedule.

Spokesmen for the Navy have admitted that the *Nimitz* will be delayed anywhere from 5 to 11 months behind original schedule. The ship was scheduled for delivery in September.

The reason that the *Nimitz* has been delayed is the result of the late delivery of parts for the ship's nuclear propulsion plant. In addition, labor troubles and delays on the *Nimitz* will also affect both the cost and the schedule on the *Eisenhower*, the second aircraft carrier under construction at Newport News Shipbuilding Yard. Originally, the *Eisenhower* was scheduled to be delivered 21 months after the *Nimitz*. But, the *Eisenhower*'s construction schedule has been delayed due to shipbuilder manpower problems.

Also, cost overruns on the two new aircraft carriers now total \$274.6 million.

The total cost of the *Eisenhower*, *Nimitz*, and CVAN-70 will be at least \$2.3 billion.

Delays combined with cost overruns call into question the competence of the Navy's management and the adequacy of Newport News operations.

The cost overruns are being caused by engineering changes, inflation, and the specific overrun of \$56 million on the Newport News contract.

At least \$28 million of the contractor overrun was the result of increased overhead.

I have requested today that the General Accounting Office thoroughly investigate these cost overruns.

It is entirely possible that the Government is being taken as a sucker by another big contractor through excessive overhead charges.

I have also had serious doubts about the wisdom of building any new carrier within the next few years.

A new aircraft carrier such as the one contemplated for approval this year is nothing less than a billion dollar target that would be lost at the outset of any major war.

The United States should retain a smaller carrier fleet of no more than nine ships.

October 1, 1973

OBJECTIONS TO SONNENFELDT
CONFIRMATION MUST BE ANSWERED—PART VIII

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 23 of this year I made the first of seven insertions in the RECORD concerning the pending confirmation of Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt as Under Secretary of Treasury. At the first hearing before the Senate Finance Committee on May 15, Mr. John Hemenway raised numerous objections to Mr. Sonnenfeldt's confirmation and named other individuals who could testify on alleged leaks of classified information by Mr. Sonnenfeldt while he served at the State Department. Subsequently, Mr. Stephen A. Kocak testified before the committee and charged that he had overheard Mr. Sonnenfeldt orally transmitting highly sensitive information to members of the Israeli Embassy in 1958.

The second prepared statement by Mr. Hemenway concerning the Sonnenfeldt nomination, follows:

FURTHER TESTIMONY ON THE CONFIRMATION
OF MR. HELMUT SONNENFELDT

(Second statement by John D. Hemenway, 4816 Rodman St., NW, Washington, D.C., before the Senate Committee on Finance, to supplement and augment the statement made of record on May 15, 1973.)

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Finance Committee, I wish to introduce into the record my publicly expressed further objections to the confirmation of Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt designated to be Under Secretary of the Treasury. You will agree that it is fitting for this written testimony to be given you at the second public session of the confirmation hearing begun on May 15 of this year.

On May 15, Mr. Chairman, you asked that I make myself available for questions pertaining to my testimony of that date. Naturally, when the time for such questions arrives, I shall be ready to respond to questions on this testimony as well.

FORCES PRESSING FOR SONNENFELDT'S CONFIRMATION ARE THE SAME FORCES ATTEMPTING TO SEIZE EFFECTIVE OPERATIONAL CONTROL OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

Mr. Nelson Rockefeller has been widely cited in the press concerning his ambitions to be named Vice President, in the event the current cabal against Mr. Agnew is successful.

Mr. Rockefeller has the active cooperation of the Attorney General as well as Dr. Henry A. Kissinger (Rockefeller's protege) and a few senators and representatives.

Concerning the matter before you, the Sonnenfeldt nomination, a similar drama is cast with the identical players. Consider the following items:

THE ROCKEFELLER/KISSINGER/SONNENFELDT/
RICHARDSON ALLIANCE

Last Saturday, 22 September, 1973, at 11:00 am, following the swearing of Dr. Kissinger as Secretary of State, Mr. Rockefeller (Nelson Rockefeller, Gov. of N.Y.) was present to congratulate his protege. Also present was Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt. Mr. Sonnenfeldt put his arm around Mr. Rockefeller and was heard to say:

Can't you do something to help me [get

confirmed]? The Senate Finance Committee is holding it up. Can you get the matter transferred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

When asked, Sonnenfeldt told Gov. Rockefeller that his confirmation was held up because of "cheap smears" against him for which the Ichord Committee of the House of Representatives was responsible.

In another conversation, Gov. Rockefeller told a newsman that he had not come to Washington to see the President; he had come only to see Dr. Kissinger.

The facts in the above item can be verified by the Finance Committee under oath, should Mr. Sonnenfeldt fail to remember the details. I can supply the Committee with the name of the witness.

In fact, it is not "cheap smears" (serious security charges) alone that argue against Mr. Sonnenfeldt's confirmation. On May 15 I was the only witness to oppose the confirmation of Mr. Sonnenfeldt. To my knowledge there have been no subsequent witnesses called, the *New York Times* to the contrary notwithstanding. However, a great deal of evidence has been developed to support fully every charge I made on May 15. There were four, in order:

(1) Mr. Sonnenfeldt's professional judgment is faulty; (See the Soviet grain deal, below).

(2) Mr. Sonnenfeldt's personal standards of integrity are unacceptably low;

(3) Mr. Sonnenfeldt repeatedly has performed acts that violated his oath of office; and,

(4) Mr. Sonnenfeldt's confirmation will place the Finance Committee of the Senate in the position of seeming to condone illegal acts and violations of standards of conduct for Federal Service set by the Congress itself.

Sonnenfeldt's basic competence to serve was questioned in my testimony and it was the main point. I stated that Helmut Sonnenfeldt simply is not qualified for the position for which he seeks confirmation. He has neither the academic nor the technical qualifications for such a post.

Sonnenfeldt is responsible, with his boss Dr. Kissinger, for the basic staff decisions that misled the President into the disastrous wheat deal with the Soviet Union that is behind so much of the financial chaos we are witnessing today internally in America and externally, too, as the dollar declines to the point where foreigners are reluctant to accept it in payment for obligations without discount.

Other bad Sonnenfeldt judgments are on record in my testimony of May 15 and in an example of undercutting the US offset position on October 5, 1970 (see below).

The Hon. Elliot L. Richardson, now Attorney General, knew of all of the events Mr. Sonnenfeldt now refers to as "cheap smears" soon after January 20, 1969 when he became Under Secretary of State (the official who runs the place from a management/administrative point of view). Not only did Mr. Richardson do nothing in the Sonnenfeldt matter, it was under his administration that the fraudulent lateral entrance of Sonnenfeldt was facilitated at the highest level, FSO-1 (equivalent to major general).

However negligent of the Sonnenfeldt case, Elliot Richardson as Attorney General has vigorously pushed for the prosecution of Vice-President Agnew; indeed he seems determined to break all Constitutional precedents in this vigorous pursuit of "justice".

SONNENFELDT IS AN OFFICIAL WHO LIES; IT IS AS SIMPLE AS THAT

Human Events on August 25, 1973 (page 3—full page) laid out in detail expected testimony of Mr. Stephen A. Koczak concerning events that could only be described thus: Sonnenfeldt willingly was a party to an espionage collection activity of a foreign power. The author of the article was Alan Ryskind,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a very careful journalist who interviewed Mr. Koczak.

That Sonnenfeldt lied about these intelligence matters is evident from the telegram sent to the Finance Committee by Mr. Otto F. Otepka, former Chief of Security Evaluation at the Department of State. According to Otepka, "Any denial by Sonnenfeldt that he provided data to unauthorized persons is a gross falsehood." Full text of the Otepka telegram is at TAB A.

Moreover, Otepka and two other witnesses (Hemenway and Koczak) have indicated that they are willing to be placed under oath in public session. They are prepared to describe three or more widely-separated matters concerning which Mr. Sonnenfeldt has not told the truth and concerning which Mr. Sonnenfeldt has made misrepresentations to this, the Finance Committee that is considering his suitability for high office.

On October 5, 1970, Sonnenfeldt undercut the official financial policies of the United States in Europe. On that date, he briefed German Chancellor Brandt and his aides in Bonn concerning offset arrangements (ways to counter the outflow of gold because of the stationing of large numbers of US troops in Europe—largely Germany—under NATO). The Chancellor's aides included Mr. Egon Bahr and Berndt von Staden, now German ambassador in the United States.

Sonnenfeldt's briefing misrepresented US policy, but US policy was changed promptly thereafter to correspond to what Sonnenfeldt, top aide to Kissinger at the NSC had told the Germans.

This occurred only a few months after Presidential Counselor Clark Mollenhoff had requested Dr. Kissinger (on two occasions) and Gen. Haig to look into serious matters concerning Mr. Sonnenfeldt. Partly because Dr. Kissinger blocked impartial investigations, Mr. Mollenhoff resigned effective 1 July, 1970. (See "The Mollenhoff/Kissinger Standoff" from the Senate Official Hearing Report on Henry A. Kissinger, Part 1, pages 206-208 or: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 19, 1973, pages H8147-H8151).

Heimut Sonnenfeldt thereby undercut a specific policy agreement decided between President Nixon and Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. It provided for ways in which our close European allies (especially the Germans) would help us financially to ease the US balance of payments problem.

High officials at the Department of State and the Department of Defense knew of the blunder but they covered up for Sonnenfeldt. In one instance a senior official was ordered to falsify a memorandum of conversation which set out the facts, so that the unfortunate undercutting of US policy by Sonnenfeldt would not be revealed in that record of the conversation. Once again, if the Committee wishes to go into this detail, I can provide the names of all of the witnesses who could testify under oath as to the facts.

Having meddled in constructive ways to assist the US balance of payments, Sonnenfeldt also has engineered unwise financial arrangements to further upset our BOP, such as the grain deal with low credits and other subsidies to the communists who can now make both political capital and financial profit from US purchased grain practically given them for \$1.50—now worth over \$5.00 per bushel. Little wonder that grain now is appearing in India and other areas in which the USSR has political interests. (See Kissinger Confirmation Hearing Record part 1, page 202, "The grain deal with the Soviet Union".)

THE ROCKEFELLER CONNECTIONS

Mr. Nelson Rockefeller gave a toast to Dr. Kissinger on the occasion of Kissinger's 50th birthday. It was at a party held at the Colony Club.

In his toast to Dr. Kissinger, the Governor noted that he had been associated with Kissinger in three Presidential campaigns.

"We succeeded in the third," said Rockefeller, "Henry went to the White House."

The above remark was made concerning the first Nixon administration. Yet at that time, Kissinger said that the man who made him Secretary of State was not fit to be President. In 1968, just after Mr. Nixon had defeated Mr. Rockefeller for the nomination, Rockefeller-supporter Kissinger is reported by Bernard Collier in the Boston Globe to have said, "That man Nixon is not fit to be President."

Also in 1968, candidate Nixon promised a "clean out" at the Department of State. Mr. William Rogers and Mr. Elliot Richardson were in charge of that "clean out" which consisted largely of building up Henry Kissinger's NSC apparatus. There was no effort to stop the violation of regulations and the law in the personnel field of which Helmut Sonnenfeldt's commissioning as an FSO-1 in the career diplomatic service is but one of hundreds of dreadful examples.

It is widely known that the State Department has become "Rockefeller's domain" within the administration. Dr. Kissinger was Rockefeller's foreign affairs advisor during the period of Rockefeller's candidacy for the Republican nomination.

One fact capable of substantiation concerning Sonnenfeldt's improper conduct is that he leaked official secrets to his good friend Kissinger (read: Rockefeller).

On August 20, 1973, there was leaked the following statement:

"There is every indication that the President himself might telephone Long [that is, Chairman Long of the Finance Committee] urging him to go ahead with the nomination but White House officials hope such action will not be necessary." (Source: Aldo Beckman in the Chicago Tribune, 20 August, 1973, TAB B)

Sonnenfeldt and Kissinger, both refugees from Hitler's Germany, are old friends, having first met in an army unit as enlisted men after the war, serving under a German emigre, Fritz Kraemer, who serves in a high staff position with the military establishment. Kraemer was also present at Kissinger's swearing in on September 22.

Dr. Kissinger himself is reported to be the source of the leaks he is said to have investigated as Chief of the NSC. (The investigation is said to have "cleared" Sonnenfeldt.) It is an old trick to have someone's phone tapped by an "independent" agency, and then to warn those whose phones are so tapped so that their conversations are "clean" and so reported by the "independent" agency. It is a fact that Sonnenfeldt and Mr. Marvin Kalb (both of whose phones were tapped by order of Dr. Kissinger) are close friends. They see one another often enough on social and semi-social occasions to accomplish any transfer of information without having to use the telephone.

The President's first choice to handle the Watergate situation was Secretary of State Rogers; when Mr. Rogers declined, the President's second choice was Mr. Richardson. It was Messrs. Rogers and Richardson who sabotaged Mr. Nixon's commitment to "clean out" the Department of State.

Mr. Chairman, with the position of the Vice President under fire; with Mr. Rockefeller being considered openly as his replacement; with Mr. Richardson pressing the attack against him, but not against Mr. Sonnenfeldt; it is not straining credulity to discern a certain pattern in these events.

Whether there is such a pattern or not, it should by now be painfully clear that Mr. Sonnenfeldt is not fit for the high office to which he has been nominated nor worthy of the trust.

When called again as a witness, as you indicated on May 15, I shall be pleased to note a number of inaccuracies in Mr. Sonnenfeldt's direct testimony of May 15 (in which he comments on my charges against him.)

OTEPKA TELEGRAM TO FINANCE COMMITTEE CLAIMS THAT SONNENFELDT GUILTY OF "GROSS FALSEHOODS"

In a telegram sent to Senate Finance Committee Chairman Long, timed for delivery prior to the hearing session this morning, Mr. Otto F. Otepka accused Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt of "leaks of information by Sonnenfeldt to unauthorized persons."

Further hearings on Helmut Sonnenfeldt's confirmation to be Under Secretary of the Treasury were scheduled for Monday, 10:30 am, October 1. Mr. Sonnenfeldt was the only scheduled witness.

Otepka also said in his telegram to the Finance Committee that "other evidence known to me proves transmittal of classified intelligence (by Sonnenfeldt) to an agent of a foreign nation." Otepka, former chief of Security Evaluation at the Department of State, said that such offenses violated government security regulations.

"Any denial by Sonnenfeldt that he provided data to unauthorized persons is a gross falsehood," according to Otepka's telegram to Senator Long, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

On May 15, in his testimony before Senator Long, Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt had denied the specific allegations referred to in Mr. Otepka's telegram to the Finance Committee. Prior to his testimony on May 15, Mr. Sonnenfeldt had not been sworn in and was not under oath. However, as a high official in the National Security Council under Dr. Henry Kissinger, he is expected to be truthful when questioned by a Senate committee. The Senate Finance Committee is currently examining Sonnenfeldt's suitability and qualifications for this high Treasury Department post.

The text of the Otepka telegram to the Finance Committee follows:

"As requested, have provided vital details regarding Helmut Sonnenfeldt to FBI agent Charles McDougal, Elizabeth City, N.C.

"My statements describing wire tap evidence obtained by State Department security officers established leaks of information by Sonnenfeldt to unauthorized persons. Other evidence known to me proves transmittal of classified intelligence to an agent of a foreign nation. Such offenses violated Government security regulations.

"Any denial by Sonnenfeldt that he provided data to unauthorized persons is a gross falsehood and raises a serious question for his suitability for confirmation to a cabinet post.

"Strongly urge my recent testimony before Ichord committee be carefully reviewed and that Stephen Koczak, former foreign service officer, appear before your committee as witness prior to any committee action on nomination.

"/s/ Otto F. OTEPKA.

"Wheaton, Md."

ADDITIONAL \$10 MILLION FOR THE F-15 ENGINE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed to learn that Deputy Defense Secretary William Clements has decided to release an additional \$10 million to Pratt & Whitney for the F-15 engine

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

even though the engine has not completed required tests.

The Pentagon is obviously coddling another contractor whose performance has been totally inadequate.

Originally, the F-15 engine was to complete a full 150-hour endurance test by September 30. In the last month, the Air Force did pass a totally trumped-up test planned and executed in agreement with the defense contractor. It is patently ridiculous to release another dime of funds to Pratt & Whitney until all necessary tests on the F-15 engine have been completed. It is simply wrong to release millions of dollars to contractors who are not able to pass the tests required for the new plane.

In addition to \$10 million to Pratt & Whitney, the Pentagon has released a total of \$19 million to McDonnell-Douglas and \$2 million to the Air Force to buy support and electronic gear for the new plane.

It is quite apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the concept of fly before you buy is being thrown out the window. Until the F-15 engine has passed all of the required tests, no additional funds should be released on the program.

THE DEDICATION OF THE BAR HARBOR TOWN PIER

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the town pier in Bar Harbor, Maine, was recently dedicated in memory of Dr. John Ells, a devoted citizen of that scenic town. I include a summary of the dedication, which was published in the Bar Harbor Times in the RECORD:

BAR HARBOR TOWN PIER

The municipal pier at Bar Harbor, Maine was officially dedicated Wednesday afternoon, August 15, 1973 in memory of Dr. John Ells. The resolution to name the pier after Dr. Ells was approved by the residents of Bar Harbor at the town meeting of March 20, 1973.

At the dedication ceremony, State Representative James MacLeod told of how Dr. Ells started out in life with nothing. In his youth Dr. Ells sold newspapers on the pier and aboard the ships visiting in the harbor. In those days the American and British navies visited Bar Harbor along with many palatial yachts. Years later Dr. Ells attended dental school and became a practicing dentist in the town. He was a school board member, selectman, and had a brief term as State Senator.

But Dr. Ells will be remembered most as the greeter of Naval ships visiting Bar Harbor. Albert Cunningham, Chairman of the dedication, spoke of Dr. Ells' lifelong love for the U.S. Navy. Dr. Ells was presented with the Navy Award for Meritorious Service in 1952.

Town Council Chairman Roland Salsbury expressed the sentiment of the townspeople at the dedication ceremony when he said, "We all had a great love for Dr. Ells."

The plaque now installed at the end of the Dr. John B. Ells Pier stands as a monument to this remarkable man. This recognition will also bring back many pleasant memories to those who had the good fortune to be in Bar Harbor during Dr. Ells' lifetime.

October 1, 1973

THE 360TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLONIA IN AMERICA

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Monday, October 1, marks the 360th anniversary of the arrival at Jamestown in colonial Virginia of the original Polish settlers on this continent. This event is being commemorated throughout the Nation by Americans of Polish descent. It is fitting that we here in the Congress render appropriate acknowledgement of an event of such significance to so great a portion of our people.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD correspondence recently received by our distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, from the president of the Polish American Congress, Mr. Aloysius A. Mazewski, commemorating the arrival of Poles in Virginia in 1608:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
September 27, 1973.

Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DERWINSKI: The Polish American Community in the United States is preparing to participate in the national observance of our country's Bicentennial.

The Americans of Polish descent are most anxious to emphasize the concept of "Unity in Diversity"—to use the pluralistic approach as a base for further growth and the highlighting of the multi-colored American Mosaic.

We view the Bicentennial celebration as a vehicle through which all ethnic, professional and community groups can rededicate themselves and through which they can strengthen their positions as true Americans.

In these days of fast moving events, periods of uncertainty and doubt, it is necessary to pause and reflect on one's proud heritage and to draw strength and inspiration from past accomplishments.

The year 1973 will always be remembered as that of Mikolaj Kopernik's, universally known as Nicholas Copernicus, born in Poland, devoted to the studies of the universe—a man for all ages.

Now, however, we wish to turn our attention to future commemorative events, especially the celebration of our Nation's birth and the significant contributions of its many ethnic groups to America's growth and development. We wish to plan for its future.

In order to properly set the stage, we wish to reflect on the arrival of the first Poles on this continent on October 1, 1608 at Jamestown, now part of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

We, of the Polonia, would be most honored if you, dear Congressman, and your distinguished colleagues would set aside a moment on that day and help us reflect upon the significance of that event.

Further, and not detracting from Jamestown, we wish to bring to your attention the fact that millions of Americans of Polish extraction will be commemorating on October 11, the 194th Anniversary of the heroic death of General Casimir Pulaski at Savannah in the defense of our young Republic.

With the above in mind, I submit for your consideration, as an attachment to my letter, some thoughts as expressed by a number of distinguished scholars and statesmen during past anniversaries of Jamestown.

With deep appreciation, I remain sincerely yours,

ALOYSIUS A. MAZEWSKI,
President.

VARIOUS REMARKS DEALING WITH THE CONTRIBUTION OF POLES TO JAMESTOWN

President Dwight D. Eisenhower: Since the earliest days, American of Polish origin have contributed much of their rich cultural, historical, and spiritual heritage to this land. In the development and continuing promise of our country, Polish-American citizens play a vital role.

Mieczyslaus Haiman, historian; in his book, *Poles in America*: The beginnings of Virginia also mark the beginnings of the history of Polish immigration in this country. To some degree, Poland influenced the founding of that oldest English colony in America.

Early in the 17th century England suffered a heavy economic crisis. The destruction of her forests for commercial purposes threatened the very existence of her industry, especially three of its most important branches: ship building, wool manufacture and foundries. All three required great quantities of lumber, wood and wood products. To supply these needs England was forced to import large quantities of those materials from foreign countries, particularly from Poland. The main purpose of the Plymouth Company and of the Virginia Company of London, chartered by James I, for the colonization of North America, was to make England independent of Polish and other imports.

Pioneers of American History—Jamestown was founded in 1607, by the first immigrants sent by the Virginia Company. A year later, in October 1608, the Poles appeared with the Second Supply engaged by the Company as experts and instructors in the manufacture of glass and pitch, tar and other products which Poland exported to England. The exact number of this group is not known, but they were not more than a handful.

Immediately after their arrival the Poles started their work. They built a glass furnace about a mile from Jamestown and cut down the first trees for wood manufactures; in a short time they were able to send to England the first products of American industry. However, their labors soon met with great obstacles, Indians, pestilence and famine attacked the colony.

The winter of 1609-1610 was especially severe and became known in the history of Virginia as "starving time"; of four hundred colonists only sixty survived. Worst of all, however, was the disorder which reigned in the colony. Most of the first settlers were the famous "vagabond gentlemen" who were accustomed to easy life and came to Virginia in quest of fabulous gold mines. In contrast to them, the Poles conducted themselves very creditably. Captain John Smith who did not mince words when speaking of his lazy countrymen, spoke of the Poles in terms of the highest praise. "They," said he, meaning the colonists generally, "never did know what a day's work was except the Dutchmen and Poles." Later documents speak of the Poles with praises, too, and the Virginia Company tried, not without success, to induce more of them to come over from Europe.

Honorable Clement J. Zablocki of Wisconsin; in the House of Representatives: It is proper and fruitful for us to engage in such commemorations. They give us a better understanding of our heritage, and they help us to appreciate the principles which should guide us in our endeavors through the years to come.

The entire history of our Nation, and the record of the early colonization of the New World, contain ample evidence that men and women of Polish blood contributed their toll

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

and talents to the settlement of North America, and to the birth and development of our great Republic.

We should remember this fact and, to this end, our thoughts turn today to the small British sailing vessel, named Mary and Margaret, which crossed the Atlantic Ocean and docked in Jamestown, Va.

Aboard this ship, which was bringing provisions and settlers to Jamestown, were five Poles, specialists in industry, who came to the New World to lend their talents, and their energies, to the task of developing the American Continent.

From old records we have learned that these five Polish experts built the first glass furnace on the American continent, organized the production of soap, pitch, clapboards, and other building materials, and contributed greatly to the success of the early English colony at Jamestown.

These facts should be remembered by all of us, and we should take pride in them. We should be equally proud of the countless other men and women who came to this land from Poland in the decades and centuries that followed the settlement at Jamestown, helped to conquer the wilderness, and to build the American Nation upon this continent.

A. D. Chandler, President of the College of William and Mary: If I were to fail to say at the outset that I am honored to have the privilege to participate in this ceremony, I would be less than truthful. I want to thank you and your president for inviting me.

I want to greet you—the descendants of our early settlers in the New World.

We in Virginia feel that Jamestown is hallowed ground because this area is the monument to the spreading of the European influence in America.

Not far from where we meet today, there was established the first industry in what is now the United States of America.

We are all here to commemorate that event, and to honor the memories of the five men from Poland who planted the first seeds from which has grown the greatest industrial nation under God.

Only thirty-two of the original band of one hundred and five settlers survived the first two winters in Virginia. When the second group arrived with seventy recruits for the new colony, Captain John Smith warmly welcomed the five Polish artisans among them, not only because they were what Jamestown most needed—skilled workmen—but because he knew them as representatives of a sturdy, industrious, liberty loving nation.

John Smith had reason to respect and admire the Poles. Only a few years before, in Christian Europe's wars with the infidels, he had been captured by the Turks and led into slavery. All of Southeastern Europe was then held by the Mohammedans and the first Christian sanctuary the fugitive found was in Poland. In the book he later wrote, called *The True Travels*, John Smith describes how he crossed Poland, aided every foot of the way by the people unmatched in his experience for, as he said it, "Respect, Mirth, Content and Entertainment," who insisted on loading him with gifts before sending him on to the next town.

At any rate, as history reveals, the Jamestown colony was then divided into boroughs in which every man who had worked up his indebtedness to the London company was given the right to vote. Every man, that is, except the half-a-hundred Poles, who incidentally, monopolized the industries of Jamestown. The British colonists, dependent as they were on their Polish fellowsettlers, arbitrarily decided that citizenship should be a privilege reserved for their own special group.

The same undemocratic spirit, unfortunately still survives in much of the world

today. Too many persons, who falsely think themselves the best kind of American, sometimes look down on their fellow citizens, forgetting that all the people in America, who are not Indians, are descendants of immigrants, whether they came here 300 or 30 years ago.

Well, the Polish colonists in Virginia protested. They said they were as good Americans as any of the rest who came to America with them or even later. When their protests were ignored they said, "Okay" (for however you say it in Polish) no citizenship, no work.

So they closed down the glass factory, the tar distillery, the soap works and spent their days fishing and dancing the polka.

Perhaps you could call it the first strike in America, except that the Polonians were not quitting work on an employer. They shut down their own industries. Except for the few pounds of tobacco the colonists were beginning to export, practically all of the profits realized by the London Company came from the re-sale of the products of the Polish industries. The Jamestown government quickly realized that if it sent empty ships back to England, the consequences could be very unpleasant.

And so, members of the Jamestown General Assembly quickly declared their Polish fellow-colonists to have full citizenship with every right of the vote and equal representation.

Albert O. Maisel in *The Reader's Digest* article, "The Poles Among Us": Barely a year after it was founded, England's first settlement in America stood on the verge of collapse. Jamestown had a magnificent leader in the tall young soldier, Capt. John Smith; but most of the colonists sent out with him were "gentlemen adventurers"—no match for the tough job they faced in the wilderness. Soon Smith was beseeching his London backers to "send but 30 carpenters, blacksmiths and masons rather than a thousand such as we have here."

On September 25, 1608, a small ship sailed up the James River bearing six broad-backed artisans. Axes in hand, they followed Smith into the woods and set about making a clearing. Within three weeks they had a roaring fire going under a glass furnace, the first factory in the English Colonies in America. They tapped the pine trees and distilled tar and pitch. They set up a soap works and erected a saw mill. Presently, goaded by their example, the entire settlement was hard at work.

Surprisingly, this handful to whom Smith later gave credit for saving the colony—thus insuring that America would develop as an English-speaking nation—were not Englishmen at all. Their names were—Michal Lwicki, Zbigniew Stefanski, Jur Mata, Jan Bogdan, Karol Zrenica, and Stanislaw Sadowski—and they landed in America 12 years before the *Mayflower*.

THE TORRANCE-KASHIWA SISTER CITY PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this month Mayor Ken Miller of Torrance, Calif. will journey to Kashiwa, Japan, the sister city of Torrance under the people-to-people program initiated in 1956. The object of this commendable program is to stimulate friendship and understand-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing between the United States and other nations by direct personal contact.

After extensive study by a special sister city committee—using the criteria of similarities in size, population, and industry—the Torrance City Council extended a formal invitation to Kashiwa to become its sister city in 1971. Certainly, Torrance and Kashiwa share many similarities. Both cities are major industrial centers with a wide variety of business and industry. Their populations, 140,000 for Torrance and 160,000 for Kashiwa are comparable, and they both are governed by a mayor and councilmen.

It was a long-awaited event when, in February of this year, Kashiwa and Torrance formalized their ties as sister cities and pledged themselves to further the cause of friendship and good will. The mayor and several councilmen of Kashiwa marked this occasion by a personal visit to Torrance.

Now Mayor Miller will return the courtesy by visiting Kashiwa. I know I speak for the U.S. Congress in extending our congratulations and best wishes to these two fine cities for their efforts to develop international understanding and peace through friendship.

DISHING IT OUT IS EASIER THAN
TAKING IT

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by Clayton Fritchey has brought out an interesting point: Although President Nixon evidently feels that he is the subject of "leers and sneers" by news commentators, in fact the media have been overwhelmingly favorable to him.

During the last Presidential campaign, the newspapers favored Nixon over McGOVERN by more than 12 to 1, both in terms of numbers of papers and in terms of readership. The New York Times was the only major organ of the "Eastern Establishment Press" to come out for McGOVERN. Twelve States had no pro-McGOVERN newspaper at all.

Throughout the campaign, both the print and electronic media placed Senator McGOVERN and his campaign under a microscope—this was their job. But President Nixon was subject to no such examination. He ran a noncampaign, totally removed from the people and from all the major issues, and except for a few scattered grumblings the news media let him get away with it. There were no editorial demands for a "Meet the Press" appearance, for a debate, or for direct answers to the sharp questions that should have been asked about Watergate, about the war, about the economy, and about how he planned to deal with the unemployment that would result from the closing of domestic military installations.

Throughout the campaign, the media

treated him as the President, rather than as one of two candidates for political office.

Since the election, news has continued to be slanted so as to be overwhelmingly favorable to the President, except when the facts of the scandalous conduct of his administration made it absolutely impossible to do so. Mr. Fritchey refers to interviews CBS conducted with four freshmen Congressmen just back from recess, who reported that the folks at home were bored with Watergate—but the four happened to be conservative Republicans: fine gentlemen but hardly a typical sample of Congress. And as Mr. Fritchey did not report, at about the same time the Washington Post did the same thing, only it used two instead of four conservative Republicans as its sample of Congress.

None of this is peculiar to the Nixon administration. Presidents Johnson and Kennedy received the same kind of kid-gloves treatment.

But what is unusual is that, despite this overwhelming favoritism, Mr. Nixon appears to feel himself the subject of persecution by the media. It seems the only "responsible" press coverage in his eyes is one of unadulterated adulation. We can only wonder how he would react if the media were to show similar favoritism toward those who disagree with him.

Mr. Fritchey concludes:

Apparently having more than 93 percent of the nation's newspapers in his corner was not enough for Mr. Nixon. It is, of course, possible to get 100 percent but only under certain kinds of governments.

I insert Clayton Fritchey's column entitled "They Can't Seem To Please Him," from the Washington Post of September 15, 1973, in the RECORD at this point:

THEY CAN'T SEEM TO PLEASE HIM

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Pity the poor television networks. They can't seem to please Mr. Nixon no matter how hard they try—and, heaven knows, they've been trying. In fact, they've been leaning over backward to give the President a fair shake, especially on the main, big-audience, half-hour evening news shows.

Yet, for all their pains, the President, at his latest press conference, blamed the networks newsmen for his loss of public confidence. For the last four months, he complained, he has been attacked in "every way" by "innuendo, by leak, by, frankly, the leers and sneers of commentators..."

The ordinary television viewers must wonder who, specifically, Mr. Nixon was referring to, for if anybody has reason to complain over recent political imbalance on the air it should be the Democratic National Committee, not the White House.

Recently, when Congress returned to Washington from a month's recess, CBS, on the Walter Cronkite's "Evening News," interviewed four freshmen representatives to get a cross section of opinion on what the voters back home are thinking, particularly about Watergate and the President. The congressmen were William Hudnut of Indiana, Ronald Sarasin of Connecticut, David Towl of Nevada and David Treen of Louisiana. Rep. Treen reported that only one voter out of 500 cares about Watergate. As for the Senate investigation, they want "that nonsense" stopped. The other three congressmen also said Watergate was more or less a bore to their constituents. Apparently, nobody was mad at Mr. Nixon.

October 1, 1973

These four legislators have one thing in common; they are all conservative Republicans. No members of the opposition were on the program at all. One shudders to think what the White House would have said if all those interviewed on CBS had been liberal Democrats, especially if they had reported that the electorate was deeply disillusioned with the President over Watergate. There surely would have been outraged protest by presidential spokesmen.

The CBS performance, however, was matched by NBC the night after Mr. Nixon's August 15 prime-time television speech on Watergate. In testing public reaction to the President's effort to explain away the scandal, NBC filmed interviews with a hard-hat construction worker and his family, a Midwest farmer and his family and the wealthy guests at a party in an exclusive Los Angeles suburb. Again, those interviewed had one thing in common: all had voted for Mr. Nixon last fall. It turned out that several of the group were not much impressed by the President's television defense, but even so how would the White House have reacted if NBC had instead sought out, say, an antiwar demonstrator, a liberal college professor and a party put on by a crowd of Democrats?

By this time, the White House would no doubt have filed a formal complaint with the Federal Communications Commission, charging NBC with tilting its program by filming only pro-McGovern, anti-Nixon voters. Doubtless it would have demanded equal time in thunderous words.

The NBC program in question was the John Chancellor evening news broadcast, with Gerick Utley pinch-hitting on this occasion. After talking with Mr. Utley, who, like Chancellor, is widely respected for his objectivity, I am satisfied that the show was arranged in good faith, with no conscious intention of loading it against the Democrats.

The producers apparently felt there wouldn't be much news in a pro-McGovern Democrat reacting critically to the President's speech. No doubt they were right in thinking that a Republican-bites-Nixon interview would arouse more interest. Be that as it may, it is unlikely that the White House would accept such an explanation if the situation had been the opposite.

The White House doesn't like newspapers any more than television, although it is hard to see why. Shortly before the President's landslide reelection last fall, Editor and Publisher reported 548 daily newspapers for Nixon and 38 for McGovern. By circulation, it was 17,532,436 for Nixon as against 1,468,223 for McGovern.

George Sedles, the author, observes that "no one pointed to or 'viewed with alarm' the more alarming fact that there were 12 states without one Democratic newspaper." Apparently having more than 93 per cent of the nation's newspapers in his corner was not enough for Mr. Nixon. It is, of course, possible to get 100 per cent but only under certain kinds of governments.

**SHUNZO SAKAMAKI: OUTSTANDING
HAWAIIAN EDUCATOR**

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened recently by the passing of Dr. Shunzo Sakamaki, former dean of the summer session at the University of Hawaii. In his 16 years of service before he retired in 1971, he built a summer program recognized as one of the finest

and best known in the Nation, with an increased enrollment of almost 13,000 students in an expanded program of course offerings.

Born in Olaa, on the island of Hawaii, Dr. Sakamaki received bachelors and masters degrees in history at the University of Hawaii, and then joined the faculty at Doshisha University in Kyoto, Japan. He taught at Mid-Pacific Institute in Hawaii from 1931 to 1933. He joined the university faculty in 1936 as an instructor in history and later became a full professor and department chairman, receiving his doctorate in history from Columbia University in 1939.

He was extremely active in community affairs, and his scholarly writing accomplishments were numerous and outstanding.

Shunzo Sakamaki was many things during his long career—teacher, administrator, community leader—and he performed well in all of these roles. Hawaii is diminished by his loss.

In tribute to a great American who realized his American dream in academic pursuits, I include an article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin about the life and accomplishments of Shunzo Sakamaki be at this point:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 19, 1973]

SAKAMAKI, 67, RETIRED UH SCHOLAR, DIES

Shunzo Sakamaki, 67, retired dean of the Summer Session at the University of Hawaii, died today in Kuakini Hospital.

Under his guidance, the University built one of the largest and best known summer programs in the nation.

In 1955, when he became dean, the summer program had 4,214 students and 161 classes. In 1970, the year before he retired, 16,986 students were enrolled in 1,000 classes.

Sakamaki was born in Olaa, a Big Island sugar community. He came to the Manoa campus as a student and received his bachelor's degree with honors in 1927 and his master's degree in history the following year.

From 1928 to 1931 he was a member of the faculty at Doshisha University in Kyoto, Japan.

From 1931 to 1933 he taught at Mid-Pacific Institute.

He joined the University faculty in 1936 as an instructor in history and later became a full professor and department chairman. He received his doctorate in history from Columbia University in 1939.

For many years he was the only professor who taught Asian and Japanese history. It was while he was dean of the summer program in 1959 that the annual Summer Institute on Asian Studies was begun.

Wytze Gorter, chancellor of the University, said "Dr. Sakamaki, as a student, alumnus, faculty member and dean was a distinguished member of the University's family for almost half a century. All of us mourn his passing.

"He was first of all a friend to so many of us. He was also a man with a deep sense of public responsibility, an infectious sense of humor and an inventive way of getting the right things done."

Active in community affairs, he was a past president of the Kalihi-Palama Community Council and many other organizations, including Phi Beta Kappa and the Hawaii Government Employees Association.

An accomplished writer, he was the author of "Japan and the U.S., 1790-1853," "Ryukyu: A Bibliographical Guide to Okinawan Studies," "Ryukyuan Research Resources at the University of Hawaii," co-author of "Asia," and author of many monographs in scholarly journals and books.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Funeral services will be private.

He is survived by his widow, Yoshiko I., and a son, Sidney R.

The family asks that instead of flowers contributions be made to the Shunzo Sakamaki Lectureship Fund in the University of Hawaii Foundation.

THE MILITARY MAN—PART VI

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in testimony before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover points out decisionmaking and management problems within the Defense Department. Because of an overload of bureaucrats and because the military services are topheavy with admirals and generals who hear only what their staffs think they want to hear, he charges that dissent is stifled and viable alternatives are lost in redtape. In challenging the decisionmaking process in the Defense Department, the admiral also challenges the role of Congress in effective leadership and oversight in defense matters.

Following is an article which appeared on September 24, 1973, in the Rocky Mountain News that summarizes Admiral Rickover's straightforward and insightful testimony.

RICKOVER CHARGES DEFENSE DECISIONS ARE STRANGLED

(By Ralph Kennan)

WASHINGTON.—National defense decision makers are strangled in red tape because Congress permits the Defense Department to be top-heavy with "professional problem solvers" busy perpetuating their own jobs, according to Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

The nation's most vulnerable point, he told a House appropriations subcommittee, is its growing inability to find "talent and determination to guide our fortunes" and congressional refusal to cut the bureaucracy down to efficient size.

The tart-tongued Rickover, father of the nuclear submarine, is director of the Atomic Energy Commission's division of naval reactors as well as deputy commander of the Navy's nuclear power directorate. He complained during testimony recently made public that:

"The dilemma facing me and others who are responsible for programs is that we must force ourselves through hordes of these problem solvers before we can reach those at the top who make ultimate decisions governing our technical programs."

These layers of "problem solvers" have created "a sea of ink," not effective management of the nation's defense resources. One result is cost overruns and program delays that "waste our sinews of war."

Calling on Congress to cut Defense Department bureaucracy by half, Rickover complained the military services are top-heavy with admirals and generals who tend to become isolated from reality by staffs anxious to tell the boss only what they believe he wants to hear.

Dissent is stifled, he said, in this process so the decision maker is not given a series of factually presented alternatives.

"Possibly the time will come when our leaders will assume the role they were intended to: men who really lead and who talk

with us, rather than at us," he continued. "Until that time comes, and for the reasons I have given you, it is essential for the good of our country and for our military strength that Congress continue to probe deeply into all aspects of military life."

But Rickover complained that with regard to the constitutionally created three separate but equal branches of government, "Congress today has become separate and unequal."

"In essence," he said, "not only is Congress not the government, it often appears unwilling to be even one-third of the government. It is rare for Congress to initiate any new piece of legislation on its own, even rarer for it to formulate any new policy. That is not a criticism, merely a recognition of the existing situation."

Rickover, 73, whose career embraces half a century, complained that many members of Congress "allow the executive branch to ignore with impunity the intent of Congress; the impoundment of funds is one example. Another is shown in the answers that some executive branch officials have given in response to congressional inquiries."

"These statements are often models of careful evasiveness, full of the phrases loved by public relations people, but singularly devoid of substantive information."

LEAA BLAMES CRIME IN THE STREETS ON HOMEOWNERS LACK OF SECURITY MEASURES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the latest pronouncement from LEAA, which is expending massive amounts of taxpayers dollars for "safe streets and crime control," would blame homeowners for not maintaining their homes more securely against criminals.

This Federal agency, operating with homeowners tax dollars, has filed a recent report through one of its grant consultants in Washington suggesting "compulsory security measures in homes." Apparently this is a new trend like mandatory seatbelts. If this program were adopted, the homeowner would become the lawbreaker if he chooses not to provide for a security device or if he decides not to use them. Nothing is said about deterrent to crime or the criminals, but as usual we are told society must realize that it is responsible for creating the criminal environment.

I feel that our homeowners in America are entitled to know how their tax dollars are being spent "to improve criminal justice and make the streets safe."

A related newsclipping follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1973]

MORE INFORMATION SEEN NEEDED TO AID SECURITY IN U.S. HOMES

(By Claudia Levy)

Consultants to the Law Enforcement Assistance Association have concluded that the federal government's most important role for helping homeowners and apartment renters to make their homes more secure against burglars is to provide "accurate and useful information" about security measures.

The consultants, Security Planning Corp. of Washington, also recommended that local law enforcement agencies initiate res-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

idential security inspection programs and that security considerations be included in site-planning and subdivision regulations.

The firm's 18-month study was undertaken to help provide government officials "with a feasible framework for identifying the policy implications of various security approaches and measures," SPC president Arnold Sagalyn said.

Among the consultants other recommendations to the federal government:

Establish an LEAA clearinghouse to collect, summarize and disseminate information about residential security.

Assume leadership role in efforts to train housing and planning professionals about design and security.

Set up a central information source, "in light of the special federal obligation to residents of public housing," so that local housing authorities can more easily obtain information about security hardware, design modifications, tenant patrols and public housing guard forces.

If and when the government decides to subsidize a "low-cost, reliable intrusion detection device," estimate what such a system would actually cost consumers over a prolonged period, including installation, monitoring and response costs.

Police in some cities have begun to conduct home security inspections because they are aware that burglars seek out visible defects in residences and that residents have sparse information about how to protect their homes, the consultants said. The report focused on California, where five jurisdictions, using LEAA funds, conducted such inspections.

"Common elements of their programs were an extensive publicity campaign, mail or phone or door-to-door solicitations, followed by the inspections. Each inspector went into the field with a checklist of vulnerable points and a set of recommended hardware and procedural standards to discuss.

"Some hard lessons were learned from the experience. The inspections proved quite costly on an individual basis, response on other than door-to-door solicitations was disappointing and the compliance rate was minimal."

The researchers concluded that it would "seem far preferable to limit security inspections to homes that have just been victimized and those whose owners voluntarily request an inspection from the police not as a consequence of door-to-door canvassing."

The most often suggested incentive for homeowners is the reduction of crime insurance rates for homes where protective devices are installed, the consultants said, adding that they didn't consider it a realistic proposal. The incentive effects would be minimal, they said, and the insurance industry "itself has little reason to promote the incentive."

The firm said that in the area of compulsory security measures, it favors the inclusion of security among the design standards in subdivision or site plan reviews.

"Our major conclusion is that serious issues about the effectiveness and impact of codes have not been addressed."

In addition, the report states, "there is a need for sophisticated market research, especially into the low- and moderate-income market, to determine the marketability of residential intrusion detection systems."

"A variety of government initiatives—ranging from drug abuse programs to improvements in the criminal justice system—may reduce crime pressure," the firm said. "They are beyond the scope of this report, but they necessarily and appropriately command most of government's attention and resources in this field."

"Residential security measures affect vulnerability far more than crime pressure . . . Reductions in vulnerability benefit only some

people and impose a greater crime burden on others. This displacement effect has ramifications in terms of equity and fairness that an individual homeowner may ignore but that government cannot."

High intensity street lighting and related public light programs, for instance, can serve to displace crime, thus "increasing the security of one neighborhood at the expense of contiguous areas," the consultants said. "Further research is needed on these displacement effects and other aspects of the relationship of street lighting to crime."

Simply putting better locks on the doors of one home will have a negligible effect on the over-all incidence of crime in the neighborhood, the report said, because "their primary protective function consists in reallocating crime away from the residence to which they are applied to other homes in the neighborhood . . . It means that the impact of applying a security measure to every home will be extremely difficult to assess."

Discussing locking devices, the consultants said that while cylindrical (key-in-knob) locks are the most widely used in residential construction, they are the least desirable from a security standpoint. Properly installed, they said, "a vertical deadbolt rim lock is an excellent security addition at a cheaper price than a replacement primary lock . . . Cylindrical lock sets combining a deadlatch function with a deadbolt combine the best features of a good security lock."

Although sensors and alarms are being used increasingly, the consultants found, "only a negligible number of homes are now equipped with intrusion detection systems . . . (which) place certain strictures on family living patterns that are difficult to observe constantly . . . Inappropriate family behavior, together with equipment and installation deficiencies, have resulted in excessively high false alarm rates (estimated as high as 95 per cent.)"

To insure effectiveness, they said, "detection and monitoring devices must be more reliable and communicate directly or indirectly to the police. Direct police communication is increasingly rare, as soaring false alarm rates have made police leery of direct communication. While the private central station alarm system offers its client a positive attitude and response, the principal disadvantage to the consumer is cost."

Such systems start at roughly \$15 a month, the consultants said.

They stressed the possibilities of using architecture to create "zones of territorial influence" where residents can act as their own policing agents, noting that design often increases tendencies toward "crime violence and social isolation."

SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS HELP FROM CONGRESS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in both my capacities as a Member of Congress from a district having thousands of small businesses and as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Small Business, I have had an opportunity to analyze carefully the myriad of problems confronting the small businessman and woman. According to the latest available census statistics, there were over 18,000 small businesses, employing 50 or fewer employees in Erie and Niag-

ara Counties, N.Y., and over 8 million nationally.

The plight of small businesses in our Nation is deplorable. Small business is being hit from every side. It is being caught in a credit crunch, by overwhelming paperwork requirements, by growing regulation, by devaluation and inflation, by supply shortages, by transportation difficulties.

On Thursday, September 20, I addressed the Small Business Council of the Chamber of Commerce in Buffalo. Because the issues which I brought to the attention of these outstanding businessmen and women are of direct importance to the deliberations of this body and its committees, I insert into the RECORD at this point the formal text of my address:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JACK KEMP

My fellow businessmen and women, people will not stay in business just to break even or to suffer a loss.

Yet, the plight of the small business today is one of continual struggle to keep your black pen on the desk and your red pen in the drawer. Small business is being hit from every side, and no small amount of the shots are coming from misdirected government policies and regulations. You are being caught in a credit crunch, the likes of which our Nation has never seen. Government paperwork requirements, arising from greater and greater regulation, have become excessive to even well-staffed accounting offices. Government procurement policies restrict your capacity to compete for contracts. Your dollar has been devalued. Your purchasing officers cannot buy goods which are in short supply; and if you can buy them, there may not be sufficient fuel to have them shipped promptly to you. And you can look forward to a cold winter in your offices and warehouses—again as a result of the misallocation of scarce resources arising from misdirected government regulation.

No matter how well intentioned, or how well conceived, government policies and regulations may be, there is one simple truth which emerges from your plight and the plight of businessmen since the days of the Roman Empire. Diocletian, who thought he too could successfully regulate wages and prices. That truth is this: No economic system yet devised has produced the degree of prosperity, the buttressing of political and economic freedom, and the sense of unity, as has the market economy, allowing the forces of supply and demand to seek their natural, respective levels, unfettered by excessive government regulation. Government leaders have learned little from history.

Why then do I talk to you this evening in less than cheery tones? Because I am bound, as a Christian man, to tell the truth, no matter what its consequences at the voting booth. In my readings last evening, I ran across a quotation which I wish to share with you. It reads, in part:

The truth must be repeated again and again, because error is constantly being preached round about us. And not only by isolated individuals, but by the majority. In the newspapers and encyclopedias, in the schools and universities, everywhere error is dominant, securely and comfortably ensconced in public opinion which is on its side.

The Vice President's Des Moines speech? No, it's Johann Goethe, the German poet and dramatist, writing in 1832, the last year of his life, a reflective period in his works.

There is, then, a truth which you must realize in your own economic self-interests, which collectively form the strength of the private enterprise economy of our nation. No matter what the merits of your arguments,

October 1, 1973

no matter what your real economic plight might be, no matter with what logic and reason you postulate your contentions for the survival of your own business or of American business in general, no matter how much truth is on your side, the struggle between business and government—and I must sadly conclude that the once great American cooperative spirit between business and government is turning into a miserable assortment of growing animosities—will be resolved in the real world of the political arena. It is a sad commentary on the way in which government action looms over the entirety of our lives and businesses today that your very survival depends on political action. But it does.

What am I doing to help?

First, I have undertaken legislative initiatives. And I have not just introduced these for local consumption and then sat back to allow other forces to control the issue. Through my committee assignments, through my reporté with colleagues sharing similar concerns, through my party work, and through efforts to increase public recognition of the problem areas and possible solutions to them, I think we are going to get some action from this Congress. We must.

Secondly, I have today asked the powerful Chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, Congressman Wilbur Mills of Arkansas, to start paying more attention to the problems of small businesses. I can appreciate the Chairman's problems—big business, not small business, is the focal point for public opinion; the administration's initiatives are typically in the area of problems affecting big business; the concerns of the regulatory agencies and the Internal Revenue Service are directed towards tax policies affecting the big bucks—and that means the big corporations. But, this is truly a matter of overriding importance to the well-being of the economy.

My letter to Chairman Mills is as follows:

—
SEPTEMBER 20, 1973.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS, M.C.,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, U.S.
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The strengthening of the small business community of our Nation is not primarily for the benefit of the small entrepreneur. The greater beneficiaries are the public and the economy, for small businesses have always been a cornerstone of that economy and its well-being.

In this age of large corporations and conglomerates, it is easy to forget, even within the halls of Congress, the need to enhance the role of small businesses and to remove inequitable or outdated tax burdens.

The statistics bear out the need for your distinguished Committee to consider this Session tax reforms which affect small businesses. Ninety-five percent of all the business units in the United States are small businesses. They produce over thirty-five percent of the Gross National Product, and they employ forty-four percent of the work-force. During the 35 years since the enactment in 1938 of the law which exempts corporations from the twenty-six percent surtax on earnings, the loss in purchasing power of the dollar would require raising the present \$25,000 exemption limit to \$75,000. Nearly all of the 5+ million full-time commercial small businesses in the country would be detrimentally affected by the proposed changes in estate taxation which would result in the taxation of capital gains at death—in addition to taxation of the decedent's estate.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask, not only on behalf of the thousands of small businesses of Western New York but also on behalf of all our Nation's small businessmen and businesswomen, the favorable considera-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tion by your Committee of at least these important measures:

The proposal to increase the present surtax exemption for corporations from \$25,000 to \$100,000. This measure, first introduced by Senator John Tower, would retain the present twenty-two percent normal rate on the pre-tax income up to \$100,000, thus helping to solve the internal financing needs of many small businesses.

The rejection of proposed changes in estate taxation which would result in the taxation of capital gains at death. Such proposals would strike in an inequitable fashion at the small businessman, most of whose net worth is usually represented by a business built up over a lifetime, often as an integral part of a family endeavor.

The bill, which I introduced on March 6 of this year—the Small Business Tax Simplification Act of 1973, which would provide for an adjustment of corporate normal tax. This is a modest, progressive reform which provides reductions in normal corporate tax rates for corporations earning less than \$500,000 per year. From earnings of \$500,000 to \$1 million, the base rate of twenty-two percent would remain the same, but the effective rate of taxation would drop due to the reduced percentage in the lower brackets. As corporate earnings rose above \$1 million per year, the normal tax would incline slightly upward to a maximum of twenty-four percent for corporations earning over \$1 million annually.

This bill would also provide for special provisions to encourage establishment of new small business enterprises, through an exemption of \$25,000 operating income for a three-year period; for an increase from \$25,000 to \$50,000 in the amount of allowable losses resulting from the purchase of small business stock; for an additional first-year depreciation allowance from \$10,000 to \$20,000; and for other purposes.

The Bible-Evins legislation, among the provisions of which are the creation of permanent government and small business advisory machinery for simplifying tax laws and tax forms; the making of Subchapter S corporations more flexible and less dangerous to use; the creation of additional incentives for new small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I am not requesting a special system of taxation that would benefit small businesses but be unfair to others. I am, rather, asking that the tax treatment of small business take into account the particular problems of small business in accumulating capital, when the normal avenues of access to capital and to credit that are available to large businesses are partially restricted or even closed to small business. Tax reform is needed on behalf of small business. I sincerely hope that the Committee can address itself fully to this matter during this Session.

Sincerely,

JACK KEMP.

I am asking my colleagues to join with me in this effort.

What can you do? There is much. Without it, my job is an impossible one.

You can urge your trade associations to pursue tax reforms for small businesses more vigorously.

Those of you who are articulate should take the initiative to take the story of small business—and the problems it faces from government over-regulation—to civic associations, to radio and television programs, to the print media, to the schools. What has happened to the spirit which prevailed when I was a young lad, the spirit of telling the absolute wonders of capitalism?

Write to Members of Congress from New York, asking them to support vigorously our joint and mutual efforts.

You can write to Chairman Mills, asking

for action on tax reforms for the little businessman.

You can write the President, asking that this be made a major initiative of the Administration's State of the Union proposals to be given in January.

Ladies and gentlemen, my pledge to the small business community is that I will do all I can to see that these measures are not ignored in the quest for tax reform in this Congress, that they are not ignored when it comes to the necessary change of laws and regulations in those areas outside of tax policy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, particularly those on the relevant committees, to consider favorably the merits of various statutory reforms which will assist small business.

REALISM IN DÉTENTE

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article that was recently written by Mr. Anthony Lewis of the New York Times relating to the problems of the Soviet Union and its handling of Jewish citizens and dissidents who wish to emigrate from that country.

Recently, we have been told by the administration that any effort on the part of this Congress to use its leverage through the trade reform bill to liberalize Russia's restrictions placed on its minority groups will jeopardize "détente" with that country. Mr. Lewis perceptively outlines the weaknesses of this argument and argues persuasively for Congress to continue its efforts to support civil liberties and human dignity.

I am certain my colleagues will find this article illuminating and that it will reinforce the strong sentiment in both Houses for the Jackson-Mills-Vanik amendment to the Trade Reform Act.

The article follows:

REALISM IN DÉTENTE

(By Anthony Lewis)

BOSTON, September 23.—In granting trade advantages to the Soviet Union, should the United States require concessions to human rights? As Congress grapples with that profound question, it is important to remember the human realities involved. Hence a story.

Valery Panov is one of the great ballet dancers of the world. He and his exquisite young wife Galina were with the Kirov company in Leningrad when they applied for exit visas for Israel. Panov was immediately dismissed from the Kirov, harassed, forbidden to dance anywhere—a sentence of psychological destruction for that proud physique.

Before Leonid Brezhnev came to the United States last June, the Panovs were told that they would get their visas if they stilled all publicity about their case during the summer, as they did. On Aug. 9 that commitment was officially confirmed to an American visitor in Moscow, Robert Abrams, borough president of the Bronx, N.Y. A Soviet deputy interior minister named Viktorov, with other high officials present, told Abrams that Panov "will positively be able to leave."

Last month the authorities again rejected

the Panov's visa applications. Two weeks ago Panov was told that he might still be allowed to go—alone, if he abandoned Galina. He said no.

Henry Kissinger is fighting in Congress against any conditions on American trade concessions to the Soviet Union. In answer to questions at his confirmation hearings he suggested that the United States, rather than trying to "transform the domestic structure of societies with which we deal," should aim to affect "the foreign policy of those societies."

The Panov story indicates one major fallacy in that Kissinger proposition: It is not possible to divide a system like the Soviet Union's into neat "domestic" and "foreign" aspects. A powerful Government that breaks its word at home, that practices vindictive cruelty toward its own citizens without any moral or political constraints, can hardly be trusted abroad.

It is of course not only the arbitrary barriers to Jewish emigration that arouse concern about the U.S.S.R. The violent suppression of dissent, the fearful inhibitions on contacts with foreigners—these things are disturbing in foreign policy terms precisely because a society so isolated is not likely to be a rational and reliable partner in international life.

For those very reasons, opening the Soviet system to a freer flow of ideas and persons has been a major aim of Western policy for years. It is, for example, at the current European Security Conference. Those who feel strongly about pursuing that goal are not against détente; they only fear what Andrei Sakharov, the Soviet scientist, has rightly called "the danger of seeming détente, not accompanied by increased trust or democratization."

But would it be effective to put conditions on American trade concessions?

One idea that should be got out of the way is the notion that strong public action may hurt the victims of oppression, that appeals for them should be left to "quiet diplomacy." We know by now that Soviet officials are moved not by deferential politeness but by firmness—and fear of embarrassment.

And the victims themselves want to take the risk. Twelve distinguished Soviet Jews have just rejected "quiet diplomacy" as useless and called for "open public struggle." One man who signed the statement was Benjamin Levich, a high-ranking scientist who has suffered the cruelist of retractions for wanting to emigrate. His 24-year-old son Evgeny, who was awaiting an operation for a severe intestinal disorder, was seized on the street, conscripted into the Army and taken to a camp in the Arctic. He is still there, doing hard labor, though he now has a tumor suspected of malignancy.

There are limits, severe ones, on what the United States can do. We cannot "transform the domestic structure" of the U.S.S.R., but we can try to obtain respect for certain minimum dependencies. Whether we succeed will depend not on abstractions but on bargaining realities.

In terms of those realities we are in a strong position. The Soviet Union is obviously eager for American trade and investment. Despite a good deal of bluster, for instance it suspended the exit tax on emigrants. As Sakharov said, "the Soviet Union is the interested party, and it is bluffing hard. It is very important that the Western countries should make full use of their trump cards."

Nor need we feel any compunctions about hard bargaining. In a negotiation about arms control, there is mutual advantage to be gained. But when the Soviets come to us for an economic transfusion, we are quite entitled to see a quid pro quo.

Finally, this has to be said. It would be one thing if issues of human rights had never been raised in connection with the trade bill,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

but it is another one they have. For Congress to turn a blind eye now would be taken by Soviet leaders as legitimizing their view of law and humanity.

CONGRESSMAN WOLFF'S NEWSLETTER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I distribute a newsletter and questionnaire to my constituents in a continuing effort to keep them up to date on my activities in Washington as their representative and to get the benefit of their thinking on major issues. At this point in the RECORD, I would like to share my most recent newsletter with my colleagues for their information:

CONGRESSMAN WOLFF'S NEWSLETTER

Dear Friend and Constituent, if we are ever going to stop "crime in the streets" we must first contain the wave of drug addiction that is responsible for more than 70 percent of the lawlessness and violence running rampant in our communities today. If we are to stop the person who steals to support his habit we must first wipe out the supply of hard drugs at the source, and that is why, as Chairman of the House Subcommittee on International Narcotics Control, I went to the Far East to press for a real crackdown on the illegal trafficking of opium.

From the poppy fields of Asia's Golden Triangle (Burma, Thailand, Laos) to New York's streets and suburbs winds a long and ruinous road of corruption, profiteering and political and official acquiescence that must be blocked now. We cannot permit the aspirations and goals of our society and its future generations to become further corroded by a lethal drug culture that already has gained too deep a foothold. The opium being cultivated in Southeast Asia today, and none is grown in the United States, is being steered on a direct course to your backyards, either via addiction or crime.

Unfortunately, our State Department people overseas seem to close their eyes to the dangers drugs pose at home, placing political considerations and motivations above the most treacherous enemy this nation has ever faced heroin addiction.

Do you know that in the international port of Hong Kong, the "clearing house" for trawlers laden with opium from Bangkok and the northern provinces of the Golden Triangle, only two U.S. narcotics agents are permitted by local authorities to work on cracking down on this multi-million dollar illegal traffic?

Do you know that the United States is the world's major producer of acetic anhydride, the sole catalyst used to refine opium into heroin? Yet there are no controls over its sale or distribution here or overseas.

Do you know about the dirty practice of slipping heroin into marijuana in an attempt to hook our kids on hard drugs—a practice that is crossing the Pacific as smuggled cargo aboard U.S. military planes? Yet, our agents in the Far East are not provided with a sufficient number of dogs trained to ferret out this cargo.

I believe we must let foreign nations, which do not cooperate in efforts to stop the illegal opium traffic, know that we mean business. If they will not, or do not, control the traffic aimed for our shores, then we must suspend all U.S. aid, a commodity they cannot risk losing.

October 1, 1973

I am particularly gratified to report that your Congress is moving definitively along these lines. My amendment to grant the President the power to impose trade sanctions against countries that do not implement strict narcotics traffic controls has been passed by the Ways and Means Committee and is included in the new U.S. trade bill.

I intend to pursue this vigorous course. We can no longer afford to pay the awesome price of allowing America's citizens and institutions to be contaminated by drugs. I am striving to eliminate a major cause of crime for if we are to assure our freedoms, we must cure our nation's ills.

Sincerely,

LESTER WOLFF.

WOLFF LEGISLATION ENACTED INTO LAW

The Library of Congress has issued the following compilation of legislation introduced by Rep. Lester Wolff which has been enacted into law during the first eight months of the 93rd Congress.

H.R. 1484—Broadens and improves the Older Americans Services Act of 1965 to upgrade programs of assistance and opportunity for the elderly.

H.R. 2250—Steps up vocational rehabilitation grants and assistance to severely handicapped and disabled persons under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

H.R. 2828—Transfers the jurisdiction for the National Cemetery System from the Army to the Veterans Administration in order to increase number of available burial plots for veterans and certain members of their families.

H.R. 9048—Provides improved medical care and disability benefits for veterans; provides hospital and medical care for certain dependents and survivors of veterans; and improves recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, under the Veterans Health Care Expansion Act of 1973.

H.R. 344—Improves federal assistance programs for urban mass transit under the Federal Highway Act of 1973.

H.R. 6056—Repeals Section 411 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972 and restores to the aged, blind and disabled who receive Social Security assistance, the right to participate in food stamp and surplus food programs.

H. Joint Res. 258—Designates August 26 of each year as Women's Equality Day.

H. Joint Res. 303—Authorizes the President to proclaim April 29, 1973, as day of observance to mark 30th anniversary of Warsaw Ghetto Uprising.

HIGH MARKS

Congressman Wolff's attendance and voting record for the first session, to date, of the 93rd Congress, as officially tabulated by the Clerk of the House, is one of the highest in the N.Y. delegation—90.2 percent.

TIME CHANGE

"Ask Congress", the non-partisan, public service television show moderated each week by Congressman Wolff, may now be seen every Thursday morning at 9:30 a.m. on WPXI, Channel 11. The half-hour program features various Congressional leaders in action discussing issues of current national concern.

WHAT'S YOUR OPINION?

In this issue, I ask your opinions on matters of genuine concern to all of us. I would appreciate your taking a moment to complete the questionnaire below and mail it to my District Office. (Two or more members in a household may answer by placing their responses side by side on the lines provided). You will receive the results of the tabulations in a subsequent Newsletter.

What do you consider to be the 3 most serious problems affecting your community to-

day? (Insert numbers 1, 2, and 3 in order of your concern.)

Drugs.
Crime.
Unemployment.
Food Costs.
Education.
Transportation.
Property Taxes.
Jet Noise.
Medical Costs.
Inflation.

Do you favor strict federal controls over the sale of weapons? (Yes, no, or no opinion.)

Handguns.
Shotguns and Rifles.
Dangerous Knives.

What new federal legislation would you like Congress to enact? (List 1, 2, and 3 in order of importance to you.)

FAREWELL TO THE FIRKIN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, recognizing that conversion to the metric system is fact coming upon us, many industries have already begun to educate and prepare their employees for the change.

The Exxon Co. is no exception—but their lively article on the subject included in their fall copy of the Lamp is exceptional.

I commend it to my colleagues as an informative and imaginative review of the situation before us today.

The article reads as follows:

FAREWELL TO THE FIRKIN

(By Ben Harte)

The United States has been "inching" toward the metric system of weights and measures for a long time. John Quincy Adams recommended it for its logic and simplicity in 1821. The U.S. Congress legalized it in 1866 for scientists and others who wanted to use it. An official meter and kilogram are on deposit at the National Bureau of Standards in Washington, D.C., and these measurements are used as a basis to define our feet and inches and ounces and pounds.

The use of metric measurements in science and industry has increased over the years, but the system never caught on in everyday life. We still buy groceries, weigh a baby or survey a home site in the quaint fashion we inherited from our forefathers—with the familiar pounds, tons, miles and acres and the less familiar firkins, pecks and drams. The U.S. stuck to the old English system because our early trade was mostly with England, and because the attitude of American lawmakers toward the metric system was permissive rather than mandatory. Given the choice, the public kept the mile instead of adopting the kilometer, thus thwarting Congressional hopes that the switch would be accomplished in a voluntary and painless manner.

Now, after nearly 200 years, change seems to be on the horizon. It is being brought about by—among other things—a U.S. trade deficit with the metric world. The nations we do business with—except for Sierra Leone, Gambia, Nauru and a few others—deal today in metric terms or are in the process of converting to them. Even Britain, from whom we inherited the system, and those other Anglo-Saxons in Canada and Australia, are gradually giving up their yards and furlongs for the sweet reason of decimalized weights and measures.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

This means that the U.S. is still trying to export goods defined in feet and inches and pounds and ounces to a world that thinks in terms of meters and kilos. And it not only thinks in those terms but builds, produces and buys and sells in them as well. Trying to fit a four-inch peg into a 10-centimeter hole is becoming increasingly arduous.

In fact, more and more U.S. industries that have to compete in the international marketplace are producing materials to metric dimensions. The pharmaceutical industry gave up its grains and drams years ago. IBM now produces its new machines according to the metric scale, and General Motors announced last April that all its new developments, including those in progress, would conform to metric standards—though it may take 10 years before we are talking about five-liter engines instead of 305 cubic inches here in the United States.

No one knows how soon America will be totally metric. Most of us would rather think in terms that are familiar—the 100-yard dash, a fifth of rye and 90 degrees in the shade. But according to Esso Research and Engineering's Bill Bray, who has lived in several metric countries, the same instinct for metric quantities is quickly developed. As he puts it, "You soon learn that when you buy two kilos of meat instead of two pounds you'll have a lot of leftovers." And most of us will gradually comprehend that a meter is a little longer than a yard, and that instead of building snowmen at 25 degrees Fahrenheit, we build sandcastles at 25 degrees Celsius. By going metric we will, alas, lose a colorful panoply of idioms, proverbs and legends. In two or three generations, the celebrated pound of flesh, the miss that is as good as a mile and loving you a bushel and a peck will be references known only to students and scholars. We will probably forget their meaning just as we have forgotten that Jack and Jill is really a sideswipe at Queen Anne for imposing taxes on jackpots, gills and pails of merchandise. No one will care that a pound was the weight of 7,000 grains of wheat, a mile was a thousand double steps of Caesar's legions, or that the yard was the circumference of King Henry I's waist.

But along with the color we will lose the bewildering arithmetic needed to convert small units into large units and vice-versa. There will be no more 16 ounces to a pound or 12 inches to a foot. The metric system (known as the Système International in Europe) is simpler because it deals in tens and hundreds like dollars and cents. It is easy to understand. Hence another advantage of going metric, and one which every grade school student will applaud: it may reduce the time spent teaching arithmetic by 30 percent, according to educators.

The metric system grew up as part of the 18th century "enlightenment." It was born just over 300 years ago in Lyons, France, when a priest called Gabriel Mouton conceived of a comprehensive decimal system based on the length of one minute of arc of a great circle of the earth. Perhaps it was more complicated for the average citizen to grasp than the proportions of King Henry's girth, but it had an advantage: it was a unit that was valid worldwide.

Although the Abbé Mouton's calculation of the unit was rejected, his idea was approved. In 1790, in the throes of the Revolution, the French National Assembly requested the French Academy to "deduce an invariable standard for all the measures and all the weights." It produced a system at once simple and scientific. The unit of length was to be a portion of the earth's circumference called the meter, from the Greek *metron* for measure. From this all other units used in determining volume and weight are derived. They all relate to one another and to the impartial and immutable dictates of nature itself.

As our instruments have become more sophisticated, it has become possible to find a standard that is even more stringent and universally available than an arc of the earth's circumference. In 1960 the meter was redefined, by international agreement, in terms of the wave length of a specific color of light.

The metric system was spread through continental Europe by Napoleon. After his downfall, many of the countries he had conquered decided to retain the weights and measures system he left behind. The British, however, retained Queen Anne's pail and King Henry's waist line as their standards of measurement until the Common Market effected what the little corporal couldn't and brought Britain into Europe. Britain will be metric by 1975, leaving the United States as the only industrialized country in the world not on the metric standard or well on its way to it.

How long will the U.S. hold out? Once again there is a bill before Congress, not to make the system mandatory, but to set up a council to guide the U.S. along the metric way and report on the advantages and problems.

And problems of course there are. Not just the man-in-the-street's psychological problems of getting used to hearing that Hank Aaron smashed the ball an amazing 125 meters, but problems that involve education and cost.

Already 90 percent of America's school children have some exposure to the metric system in the early grades and it is with the young generation, according to the National Bureau of Standards' Louis Barbow, that the process of educating America metrically must start.

Barbow is one of a team of Department of Commerce officials at the National Bureau of Standards that has been thinking and working in metrics for decades. More recently, he was a member of a team that spent three years preparing a report for Congress on metrification. The findings of this report, overwhelmingly favorable to the metric idea, gave momentum to Senator Claiborne Pell's bill and dozens of others that are now before Congress.

"We have to concentrate our efforts in the schools," says Barbow. "That's where the most flexible minds are and that's where the generation that's going to spend most of its life in a metric world is located. We at NBS are already stressing the urgency for metric teaching at the Office of Education."

Enthusiastic as he is about adopting the system, Barbow is convinced that the best possible federal legislation would allow an entirely voluntary effort. He sees an important role for industry in educating the public at large by way of advertising and booklets and points out that state governments also have a part to play in the control of weights and measures. The change will come, he firmly believes, simply when and because people realize that in the long run it will make for a stronger dollar. He certainly has no illusions about turning America metric overnight. It could take 10 or 20 years. "But for industry and commerce it's the only practical way," he asserts, "especially as desertion by Britain and the Commonwealth have left us alone against the rest of the world."

He also sees the major difficulty not as educating the consumer, but in the replacement of billions of dollars' worth of tools, precision instruments and pieces of machinery we use as a leading industrial power. The costs of this "hard conversion" may be large, but the consensus of industry is that they will be worthwhile. In other words, whoever has to convert or replace his equipment must personally pay the cost of doing so. The private sector of the economy has already established the American National Metric Council to assist industry in coordinating its plans for conversion.

Barbow's own conversion is total.

"For me," he explains, "It's like believing in motherhood."

For Exxon, a changeover would be more like brotherhood. Already, nine out of Exxon's 10 major European affiliates use the metric system and by 1975 all of them will. As Bill Bray, who has been studying the problems of a changeover with his colleagues at Esso Research and Engineering in New Jersey, points out, "The amount of time, energy and money we spend translating figures and quantities from the English system to the metric system for our affiliates outside the U.S. has never been fully evaluated but it is large. It is also inefficient because you can't convert inches into centimeters with the precision needed in engineering, and the difference between a calculation made here and a calculation made in Europe can result in a lot of wasted effort. Now that our British affiliate is going metric, our situation here is becoming anomalous. But we're not standing still. Esso Research and Engineering is now starting a four-year program to metricate all its design manuals and methods."

Bray, like Barbow, appreciates that there are substantial problems. Conversion, he points out, means that for 10 or more years it would be necessary to make dual parts to service existing equipment and new, mean that for a long time to come packaging and storage would also have to conform to two systems. Yet even amid these complications he discerns a fringe benefit. "Replacing machinery, tools and text books by their metric counterparts," he explains, "would give us a chance to examine how well our existing systems and manuals work and how they might be refined, improved and updated. For engineers especially it would provide a golden opportunity to review how things are working—not just mechanically but mathematically too. It could, in short, help us to keep this country's industry technologically efficient—kilometers ahead of our competitors."

BRANDT'S OSTPOLITIK

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Brandt government in West Germany concluded a treaty in regard to its relations with East Germany. The interpretation by Bavaria of this treaty by the West German Supreme Court has great meaning for relations between West Germany and the Communist countries. Little attention has been paid to these questions in the United States. I include two translations in the Record which illuminates this important question:

TELEvised INTERVIEW WITH FRANZ-JOSEF STRAUSS BY GERHARD LÖWENTHAL ON AUGUST 1, 1973

LÖWENTHAL. Mr. Strauss, the Federal Constitutional Court has rejected the Bavarian claim against the fundamental treaty. Do you feel a loser?

STRAUSS. We are not the losers. But the Federal Government may consider itself a Pyrrhic victor. There is no other way but to take the treaty to court, in order to receive a verdict from the constitutional court on the constitutionality and thus also on the grounds for the limitation of the constitutionality of the treaty. We had no choice but to proceed as we did. And in advocating the claim I was fully aware—as I explained publicly in the bodies and also to the press—that the objective of our claim was not to

have the treaty declared unconstitutional, but to obtain an interpretation of the treaty which will impose on this government and all those following it very close restrictions. I already said this at the press conference. This is not a newly gained wisdom put forward today, but this has been my viewpoint from the very beginning.

LÖWENTHAL. Am I correct to say that for you it is essential that this verdict will bind all federal governments as to the interpretation of the treaty?

STRAUSS. The constitutional court based its decision on the interpretation of the Federal Government. It was not able to ignore the fact that the other party to the treaty, i.e. the GDR and thus Moscow, interpret the treaty quite differently. But the court has now bound the government to its interpretation from which it will not be able to depart from now on. Now Mr. Bahr will not be able to propound new truths. Now he cannot come forward anymore with phrases such as: Our interpretation of yesterday has changed due to new circumstances, we now have a new interpretation. This verdict has a fundamental meaning, in constitutional as well as political respect. The literature on the court's ruling represents a true treasure. This is a break in German post-war history, in the German reunification policy, the extent of which we had not even expected.

LÖWENTHAL. Mr. Strauss, would you cite a few quotations from the verdict which you consider especially important?

STRAUSS. If I take a quick glance at the literature, I find of special importance some of the court's statements, such as: "The German Reich continues to exist".

LÖWENTHAL. That is in agreement with the twenty year old practice . . .

STRAUSS. But in sharp contrast to the interpretations of the Federal Government. Our basic law also defines our conception of the terms "all-German state people", "all-German state authority", and "all-German state territory". That means that the constitutional court binds this and all subsequent governments to the conception of the "all-German state people" and of the "all-German state authority". That is a striking contradiction to that which the GDR presented to the world public as a consequence of the fundamental treaty and the preceding eastern treaties. The court ruled that the establishment of the Federal Republic did not mean the foundation of a new west German state, but "just the reorganization of a part of Germany". The Federal Republic does thus not comprise all Germany as far as its people and its state territory is concerned. This is irrespective of the fact that it recognizes a unified state people of Germany as a subject of international law, of which its own population is an inseparable part, as well as a unified state territory which is also an inseparable part of the German Reich".

These are statements which are in clear contrast to the Chancellor's statements made as early as 1969 in his first state of the nation message. But then the text says: "The German Democratic Republic is part of Germany and cannot be considered a foreign state by the Federal Republic of Germany". That precludes an extension of the interpretation to the effect that some day either this Federal Government or another one will recognize the GDR as a sovereign of international law. That would be an open violation of the constitution. Another excerpt: "The constitutional situation demands that the claim for reunification be kept alive persistently within and without". That is considered by this government only to a very minor degree, to put it mildly. The text goes on: "The constitution prohibits the Federal Government to renounce a legal claim or a legal position derived from the basic law". The text also pronounces that it does not suffice to speak of the German

nation, but that the "German nation" is to be identified with "German state people". The term "German nation", it says, cannot simply be defined as a vague circumscription of an ethnic and cultural unity, as the Federal Government has already done. But the weightiest statement made by the court is the one about the border. On the question whether recognition of the border between the two states of Germany as a state border is compatible with the basic law, the court rules that "this is determined by the qualification of a border as a state border between two states whose special characteristic is their existence on the basis of the still existing unity of Germany as a whole." Thus this is a border comparable to those that exist between the Länder of the Federal Republic, for example between Bavaria and Baden Württemberg.

LÖWENTHAL. Is that not a decisive statement also with regard to the other treaties of the Federal Government?

STRAUSS. And then the text goes on: "It is only on this basis, that is on the basis of this qualification as a border between different Länder of the federal territory, and that the treaty is compatible with the basic law". That takes the Soviet western policy off its hinges, for their western policy was based on achieving recognition of the existing borders via this treaty, i.e. recognition also of the inner-German border, as a recognition of international law, as a recognition of the division, of the sealing of the division of Germany, as the final establishment of two unities separated by international law, i.e., the FRG and the GDR, in the course of a long fight. The Federal Government helped the Soviet Union to achieve this goal. The constitutional court has now destroyed that with one blow. Therein lies for us to value of this fundamental, I may even say, epoch-making and secular verdict.

LÖWENTHAL. Mr. Strauss, now the Federal Government will say that it had always intended for this to happen. The government always said that it would respect the provision of the basic law binding it to the reunification of Germany. Has not the government been legally confirmed in this claim?

STRAUSS. The Federal Government can no longer interpret the fundamental treaty as it pleases. It is bound to a definite interpretation which the court accords to this treaty, and the consequences drawn by the court from this interpretation go far beyond the concessions ever made by the government and are even in contradiction to the government's concessions.

LÖWENTHAL. Mr. Strauss, one last question: Why did the opposition as a whole or at least those states governed by the CDU not join in this claim? Don't you think that if they had done so the claim would have carried more weight with the court?

STRAUSS. As you know, I pleaded for our party which had the legal qualification to do so to take the treaty to court by itself. I was voted down by a slight majority. I believe that the opposition as a whole and those states governed by the CDU have missed a historic moment, if I may say that with all due loyalty for my political friends. And thus it became our task to proceed from Bavaria in order to obtain this verdict. This ruling will be a verdict of principle when many other verdicts have been forgotten on how to conclude treaties on Germany and with the other part of Germany.

[Article from the "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, August 1, 1973]

EARS FOR THE GOVERNMENT

(By Johann Georg Reibmüller)

It is customary following a constitutional proceeding for the victor to present a smiling face to the people while the loser licks his wounds in a dark corner. But after the verdict of the Federal Constitutional Court on

the fundamental treaty the victor, i.e. the Federal Government, has little cause for triumph, and the loser, i.e. the government of Bavaria, need not be desperate.

From the beginning the outcome of the proceeding was foreseeable. The constitutional court during the more than twenty years since its inception has developed the maxim on the relationship between basic law and foreign policy that political authority is naturally bound to the constitution also in matters of foreign affairs, but that in cases where constitutional goals are difficult to achieve and which depend on the will of other powers are to be realized, there is a margin which allows this political authority to decide on the appropriate approach by itself. If one takes this into consideration, one could not expect the court to declare the basic treaty unconstitutional. The Bavarian government could not hope for a ruling that would have ceded to its formal claim. That was obviously also not its objective. It wanted to obtain a verdict which declared the treaty constitutional, but only on the basis of a certain interpretation. Thus the claim and the real goal of the proceeding fell apart. If one views the verdict on that background, the Bavarian government could be satisfied.

But satisfaction or dissatisfaction on the part of the Bavarian government are not the criteria on which to base the decision of the constitutional court. The question is whether the verdict is helpful for a German policy that is based on the basic law—for there cannot be an otherwise orientated policy. This question must be answered positively, if one considers the language of—as well as the reasons for—the verdict.

Firstly: the Federal Constitutional Court did not reject the fundamental treaty. This saves the Federal Republic from having the treaty which is to settle its relationship with communist Germany considered valid abroad but invalid within the framework of the law governing relations between states. Such a legal dispute could have resulted, because the Federal Government rendered the fundamental treaty effective in June—in a haste that has now been clearly disapproved by the court—although it knew that the court was to announce its verdict only six weeks later.

It is no less useful that the constitutional court has built some bars into the treaty in declaring it constitutional which give some support to the government—but which bid it halt at the same time. These reminders do not touch upon the text of the treaty. But they give certain directions to its meaning while blocking others. The constitutional court stated that the German state continues as *one* German state with *one* people and *one* territory. It confirmed the claim for reunification as provided by the constitution and has committed the organs of the Federal Republic to that claim. In this sense the court categorically denied the basic treaty any qualification as a treaty on division as which it is often considered at home and abroad. The court confirms that the GDR is not a foreign state in regard to the Federal Republic and that the border between both is not a border between two foreign states.

From these principles the court deducts consequences which lay down in detail the Federal Republic's duties toward East Germany and its population. It prohibits our state organs to reduce the rights of the inhabitants of the GDR to the freedom of speech and to the postal secret in any treaties with the GDR. It confirms the claim of the Germans of the GDR to consular protection abroad. It rules that trade between Western and Eastern Germany is something else but foreign trade.

These concrete precepts and inhibitions imposed by the court are the real and practicable result of the verdict because they provide the Federal Government and the Bundestag with clear directions in negotiating "suc-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cessor treaties" with the GDR. The fundamental treaty with its compromises of language may appear flexible in regard to its interpretation by the constitutional court in the atmosphere of dissent that marks it. In any case, it is already in effect, and it is therefore difficult to provide it with little interpretative bars with an effect on the other party to the treaty. In the treaties to be still concluded between Bonn and East Berlin on individual issues, however, work will relentlessly go into detail, and here the government is not yet tied down. It can now refer to the constitutional court if the other side exceeds its Germany-political demands. Herein lies the merit of the constitutional proceeding on the treaty. Thus Bavaria's claim in Karlsruhe was not all that foolish after all from a state-political point of view.

NO TEARS FOR NO SHOWS

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of my colleagues have heard in recent weeks, since the House's enactment of legislation prohibiting the television blackout of sold-out home football games, the loud and laborious complaints of the National Football League over the problems the league is now having with "no-shows."

According to the NFL's public statements professional football is now on the brink of financial disaster because Congress passed the antiblackout legislation. The NFL claims that the number of people who hold tickets and yet stay at home is reaching incredible record proportions and cites the fact that there were 65,387 "no-shows" the week after the legislation was enacted.

What the NFL has failed to mention in its press releases is that in 1972, when no antiblackout legislation was in effect, more than 624,000 people were classified as no-shows and that includes some 16,995 who stayed away from one game in Kansas City.

To put it simply, Mr. Speaker, I am not yet convinced that Congress has destroyed the National Football League's financial base. Someone who shares my opinion in this matter is Mike Roberts, a columnist for the Washington Star-News. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would at this time like to place in the RECORD an article which Mr. Roberts has written on this subject entitled "Shed No Tears for NFL Over No-Shows."

The article follows:

SHED NO TEARS FOR NFL OVER NO-SHOWS

(By Mike Roberts)

Pro football's Year of the Closely Watched Turnstile has gotten off to an inconclusive start. Everyone is free to put his own interpretation on the fact that some seats that were paid for were not sat in this past weekend.

If you happen to be owner of a National Football League franchise or commissioner of all of them, it is a grand opportunity to exercise the option by crowing, "I told you so."

It is simple enough to draw the conclusion that every board foot that went unoccupied would have been warmed by a feverish rooter

if the television blackout of home games had been in force for the season openers.

From there, the next step is to catalog the various kinds of harm wrought upon the members of the league by those who stayed away. To appreciate some of these damages you need a subtle frame of mind, especially in light of the fact that the no-shows had already kicked in their \$8, \$10 or \$15.

First of all, by their absence they degrade football into a "studio sport." As nearly as anyone can tell from the sayings of Pete Rozelle, a studio sport is one which is not attended by a capacity crowd. Most major league baseball games are examples of studio sport. Some basketball and hockey games, too.

One direct result of becoming a studio sport is the diminution of emotion. Football is a game of emotion.

One no-show leads to another. Since football fans are presumably sheep, the do-shows will be tempted to follow the bad example of the no-shows.

Someone who does not come to the stadium cannot spend money to park his car, drink a beer or fondle a plastic memento adorned in the colors of his favorite team.

Rence the obsessive worries over no-shows in the councils of the NFL, and the league is always eager to feed the media no-show facts. Last year at the Super Bowl, NFL people made a special point of counting and publicizing the number of empty seats. The same service was provided in several press boxes Sunday.

But, for all the doomsaying, there still are some doubts that the blackout ban has begun to destroy football as we know it.

For one thing, nobody seems to know how many sold seats are ordinarily unused even when the game is not televised in the home city. Officials of several clubs contacted yesterday said they couldn't compare last year's no-shows to this year's because figures were never kept before.

Considering the structure of season-ticket sales, it shouldn't be surprising to find a number of no-shows under any circumstances.

Typically, a small knot of businesses and individuals control a team's season tickets. Roughly 14,000 people hold the rights to the Redskins' approximately 54,000 seats, for instance. Many clubs have a similar ratio of ticket-holders to seats.

Among these anointed few are plenty of wealthy folks, who have other options for entertaining themselves, as well as commercial outfits that distribute their tickets for goodwill purposes. George Arneson, ticket manager for the Vikings, estimates that 50 percent of their tickets are used "for business purposes."

It is also fair to say that not every seat in every stadium is a perfect vantage point. The NFL ought to consider the fact that the guy who buys a seat at nosebleed altitude isn't getting any bargain. Of course this line of reasoning is rejected by Philadelphia Eagles' owner Leonard Tose, who thinks people ought to buy tickets to sit behind a pillar.

Two games on Sunday had dramatic no-show figures, in Miami, where 11,755 persons stayed home and Kansas City, where 16,031 failed to show up. There were explanations in both cases: It rained until just before game time in Kansas City and it was so hot and humid in Miami that one player suffered heat prostration.

According to Frank Rose, vice president of the Harry M. Stevens concessionaire company, bad weather frequently cuts an anticipated crowd by 30 percent or more, so Miami and Kansas City didn't suffer quite as much as they might have.

Certainly no-shows at some stadiums will increase as the season progresses and certain teams drop out of the running. That happens every year anyway, and this season it will happen to teams which are not even

affected by the blackout law. Tickets to see the teams in contention will be in greater demand with each game.

As for the argument that last week's turnouts were substantially altered, the concessions figures at RFK Stadium don't support it. Parking fees brought in \$18,551, compared to \$17,742 for the 1972 opener. Food sales were a little higher (price on some items were raised) too, \$47,621 to \$46,581.

For a while, at least, the NFL ought to hold back its tears.

THE RIGHT OF CITIZENS TO OWN GOLD

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, last April the Senate and House both approved legislation giving Americans the right to own gold, although the House version, which later prevailed in conference, permits the President to decide when this right is to be implemented.

The time to implement this right is now. In fact, the right of citizens to own gold should never have been taken from them. Our own country is one of the few nations, outside of the Communist world, which denies its citizens this right.

Discussing the question of the citizens' right to own gold, Prof. Milton Friedman has declared that—

There never was and there is not now any valid reason to prohibit individuals from owning, buying, or selling gold. Individuals should have the same right to trade in gold as they have to trade in silver, copper, aluminum, or other commodities.

In an article in the September 15, 1973, issue of *Human Events*, columnist Allan C. Brownfeld discusses the reasons for permitting private gold ownership.

Mr. Brownfeld notes that, when the Bretton Woods International Monetary Fund was established, foreign central banks were allowed to convert their paper dollars into gold at \$35 an ounce, but the prohibition against American citizens' doing so was continued. He quotes economist Henry Hazlitt who states that—

The excuse continued to be that if American citizens were allowed this right, they might drain the Treasury of so much gold that it could not fulfill its solemn obligation to convert into gold for foreign central banks. But now the U.S. government has repudiated and defaulted on this pledge, the last excuse for depriving private citizens of the right to own gold.

Mr. Brownfeld concludes that—

In a free society the presumption of law should always be on the side of freedom, not of limitation. Those who want to prevent Americans from owning gold have failed to meet the necessary burden of proof.

I wish to share this article with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

THE RIGHT OF CITIZENS TO OWN GOLD— AND WHY

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

The Senate, in April, approved an amendment allowing Americans the right to own gold. The amendment, sponsored by Sen. James A. McClure (R.-Idaho), would simply

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

have removed the nearly 40-year-old restriction and allow American citizens to purchase and hold gold after Dec. 31, 1973. In May, the House rejected by a rare tie vote (162 to 162) a similar proposal by Rep. Philip Crane (R.-Ill.). It adopted, instead, a bill which endorses private ownership of gold but lets the President decide when it can be brought about. The two bills went to conference and the weaker House version prevailed.

The question of whether the individual should have the right to own gold has brought forth many arguments by those who seek to limit his rights in this area—particularly Treasury Department officials. It seems, however, that those who wish to limit this freedom are now clearly on the defensive.

Prof. Milton Friedman has declared that, "There never was and there is not now any valid reason to prohibit individuals from owning, buying or selling gold. Individuals should have the same right to trade in gold as they have to trade in silver, copper, aluminum or other commodities."

The initial nationalization of gold by President Franklin Roosevelt has been characterized by Dr. Friedman as "An act of expropriation of private property in no way different in principle from Castro's nationalization of U.S.-owned factories and other properties without compensation. . . . As a nation we do not have a leg to stand on when we object to these acts of expropriation. We did precisely the same thing to residents of the U.S."

At the same time that our own government prohibits Americans from owning gold, it is interesting indeed that the other countries in the world which have adopted a similar policy of prohibition are primarily totalitarian dictatorships, such as Albania, Bulgaria, Cuba, East Germany, Hungary, Rumania, Communist China and the USSR. The only non-Communist states with such a prohibition are Ceylon, India, Libya, Mali and Rhodesia. Even Great Britain, which followed our own policy for years, restored the right to ownership of gold coins two years ago.

When the Bretton Woods International Monetary Fund was established, foreign central banks were allowed to convert their paper dollars into gold at \$35 an ounce, but the prohibition against American citizens' doing so, or even holding gold, was continued.

Economist Henry Hazlitt notes that "The excuse continued to be that if American citizens were allowed this right, they might drain the Treasury of so much gold that it could not fulfill its solemn obligation to convert into gold for foreign central banks. But now the U.S. government has repudiated and defaulted on this pledge, the last excuse for depriving private citizens of the right to own or hold gold has been wiped out."

Yet, while the last excuse for such a policy has been eliminated, the policy continues, and continues to be supported. In addition, faced with a government policy of inflation, deficit spending, and currency devaluation, citizens have no safeguard. With the right to own gold, states Mr. Hazlitt, "American citizens would have a major way, prohibited to them now, of protecting their savings against the further erosion in value of an irredeemable dollar."

Among those who object to the citizens' right to own gold is the Department of the Treasury. They state, for example, that gold will be hoarded. Yet, they do not tell us what difference this would make. The Treasury Department is repeatedly saying that gold does not affect the nation's economy at all. If this is the case, then the economy would change more if people began to hoard potatoes or cabbage, which constitutes a real percentage of the GNP. The only effect that gold ownership would have would be a psychological one, giving the owner confidence that he owned something of value.

October 1, 1973

The Treasury Department recently declared that ". . . the premature lifting of restraints on the individual ownership of gold would inject a further speculative element into the present international monetary situation." It is difficult to imagine gold in any livelier speculation than at the present time—when the price has skyrocketed to more than \$100 an ounce—from \$40 in August 1971.

Out of the current debate has come an admission by Treasury Under Secretary Paul Volcker that he does recognize "the logic of allowing U.S. citizens to own and hold gold." He states, however, that the time is not yet right. Rep. Crane, however, declares that, "It seems to me that now is precisely the time, and that whatever arguments there might once have been for prohibiting the private ownership of gold, there are none today."

In a free society the presumption of the law should always be on the side of freedom, not of limitation. Those who want to prevent Americans from owning gold have failed to meet the necessary burden of proof. Sentiment in Congress is clearly in support of this right. It cannot be long before that sentiment prevails.

LOW-COST AIR TRAVEL NEEDS HOUSE HEARING

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, H.R. 8570, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act to grant authority for air carriers to perform one-stop inclusive tour charters within the United States, was sponsored by Mr. Moss with 10 cosponsors, including myself. This bill was referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, where up to this time, no hearings have been scheduled.

A companion bill, S. 1793, has been introduced in the other body, and the Senate Commerce Committee has reported out an amended version and recommended favorable action. I believe that a brief review of the findings of this committee would be beneficial at this time, helping to clarify some of the central issues and, hopefully, hasten the scheduling of House hearings on this important legislation.

As reported by Senator CANNON on September 11, the Senate committee received expert testimony and detailed economic studies which demonstrated that the introduction of one-stop inclusive tour charter service in the United States would have great advantages for consumers and for all classes of air carriers.

The opposition to S. 1793 came almost solely from scheduled air carriers, specifically the Air Transport Association of America. With regard to the testimony of this organization, Senator CANNON says:

(it) was conclusionary and unsupported by any factual studies or analyses to demonstrate why such legislation would not be in the public interest.

The ATA gave the committee only "generalized statements of 'doom and gloom'"—the same "scare tactics," Senator CANNON points out, that are used in

the massive public relations program designed to defeat this proposed legislation. This campaign consists mainly of pamphlets and statements, filled with inaccuracies and misrepresentations, distributed to businessmen, chambers of commerce, mayors, Members of Congress, and the general public.

The objections to ITC's offered by the ATA are based on two claims: First, that they are unnecessary because American domestic fares are low in comparison to European air fares and have steadily decreased during the past 10 years, and second, that they would be harmful because they will result in decreases or complete termination of scheduled air service to many communities.

The committee found these claims to be totally unsupported by any facts or figures.

The committee discovered that, while European international air fares were higher, domestic air fares over a comparable distance were much lower in Europe. European domestic air fares are from 14 to 194 percent less than comparable U.S. fares. Furthermore, the committee found that rather than decreasing, fares in economy class, which 85 percent of today's travelers use, have actually increased at an overall average of 51.1 percent.

Senator CANNON calls the ATA's claim that scheduled service to many communities would suffer as a result of ITC's "a big lie." He points out that S. 1739 contains specific provisions against impairment of essential levels of scheduled service. Emphatically, he states:

This legislation will not cause any community the loss of air service. If the community loses air service or there is a reduction, it will be the result of carrier agreements *presently pending* before the CAB which have nothing to do with this legislation at all.

Mr. Speaker, the findings and recommendations of the Senate Commerce Committee with respect to S. 1739 make it perfectly clear that the House should no longer hesitate to give its serious consideration to the companion bill, H.R. 8570. It appears to me imperative that we follow the lead of the Senate and take immediate steps to resolve the controversy surrounding authorization of one stop inclusive tour charters.

The sponsors of H.R. 8570 have respectfully requested, in a separate letter, that the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee set an early date for these much needed hearings. I urge that all Members of Congress concerned with the well-being of the American consumer join with us in this request.

NATIONAL CITIZENS

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in U.S. News & World Report commented on the results of a questionnaire which I mailed out to my constituents earlier this year.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The editorial described the people of the eighth District of Virginia as "national citizens" and labeled their views as being of utmost interest to "Members of Congress, others in public office, and Government policymakers."

I am frankly quite pleased that the editors of this distinguished publication agree with me that the residents of my district are diverse, informed, and intelligent and I would like to insert a copy of their article in the RECORD at this time:

WHO'S OUT OF STEP?

(By Howard Flieger)

Representative Stan Parris is a Virginia Republican whose district is just across the Potomac River from Washington, D.C.

Its residents range from farmers and small-towners to suburbanites and people who live under typical urban conditions. Thousands of them are Government workers from every section of the country. One could describe most of these people as "national citizens" rather than traditional Virginians.

The area, over all, has a per capita income well above the national average. In education, living habits, personal interests and earning power, its residents undoubtedly are typical of millions of affluent Americans.

What's the point of all this?

Well, the Congressman sent a questionnaire to his constituents earlier this year asking how they felt about some of the issues of the times. He received more than 20,000 responses, a high return for this sort of thing.

The results have been tabulated—and if the attitudes of voters in Mr. Parris' district are a reflection of those in similar neighborhoods across the country, they should be extremely informative to members of Congress, others in public office, and Government policymakers.

For example—

More than 97 per cent of those who answered think Congress should overhaul public welfare. They want incentives built into the program to encourage, or require those able to work to get off relief.

Two out of three are in favor of a national health insurance program.

The same percentage thinks there should be stricter controls on firearms and that these should be enforced by the Federal Government, not left to local officials.

More than 81 per cent oppose amnesty for those young men who left the United States to evade military service during the Vietnam war.

One of the questions the Congressman asked was this: "Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would prohibit the busing of children from one neighborhood to another for the purpose of establishing a racial balance?"

Seventy per cent said "yes." In other words, they would write a ban into the Constitution if that's what it takes to put an end to compulsory school busing.

Government spending is a major concern of these people, thousands of whom are directly dependent on federal payrolls.

Seventy-eight per cent want Congress to put into law a ceiling on annual spending and make it illegal to go beyond it.

On other questions, nearly 70 per cent felt there should be a more thorough and faster-paced campaign to cleanse the environment; 90 per cent would use mass transportation to travel to and from their jobs if it could be made convenient and inexpensive; 73 percent want Washington to turn more power and financial resources over to local control.

No question was asked about Watergate. Indirectly, the subject may have been reflected in answers to this:

"Do you feel that network television and radio fairly present both sides of most issues?"

The responses were almost evenly divided—48 per cent "yes," 52 per cent "no."

Aside from being interesting, is there anything significant about the poll? This: It shows the legislative peace of the current Congress is much slower than this group of voters feels it should be. They want action they are not getting.

Also: They are in no mood for experimentation; these are not the times for such rallying cries as "New Deal" or "Great Society."

In fact, on such things as spending, business and welfare, they feel it is high time to turn around and go back.

MOBILITY: AN AMERICAN HERITAGE

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on September 24, Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, Jr., chairman of the board of the North American Rockwell Corp., gave a very thought-provoking speech to the National Defense Transportation Association on the challenges America faces in meeting our present and future transportation needs. Since I was most impressed with Mr. Rockwell's optimistic projections in this vital area, I wish to share his remarks with my colleagues:

PRESENTATION BY W. F. ROCKWELL, JR.—
MOBILITY: AN AMERICAN HERITAGE

This Nation is rich with men and women, dedicated to the service of their country, quiet people whose energetic and innovative lives are far removed from the headlines. When we have their services, we benefit; when we lose their services, we become that much poorer.

One of these is Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., for eight years the Director, Research and Engineering, in the Department of Defense. He resigned early this year.

I once heard him summarize the objectives of America in a manner I found very satisfying. He said, and I quote:

"Our fundamental national objectives can be stated quite simply.

"We wish to keep America free and secure.

"We wish to make it a better place to live.

"But in order to achieve these goals," Dr. Foster continued, "we need the commitment of our people, the Congress, and our vast technological resources."

John Foster's summation fits exactly the question posed by this National Defense Transportation Forum: What are the transportation objectives of America?

First and foremost, the various segments of the transportation industry want to keep America free and secure. The finest superhighway or the most efficient train, truck, bus, or subway system becomes useless if it's bombed to rubble. The word "command" in the title, "Military Sealift Command," becomes meaningless if some enemy controls the sea.

We want to make America a better place in which to live, and that's exactly why we're here today, because we are concerned about livability.

I want to emphasize that point. Transportation is synonymous with livability, the freedom to move about anywhere we wish and as quickly as we wish in common safety with our neighbors.

To achieve that freedom we need new and improved ways of getting people and freight into, out of, and around our cities.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

October 1, 1973

Mobility has been a prominent characteristic of the American people for more than two hundred years.

In the very heart of my home city of Pittsburgh we have the marks of the pioneers who first came across the Allegheny Mountains, paused a while, and then literally raced down the Ohio River.

In the period just following World War II, the move to California was the greatest short-time migration in the 600,000-year history of man.

C. L. Dennis, head of the Railway Clerks Union, summed up that two-hundred year sweep of mobility in one sentence: "The American West," he said, "was won and the continent conquered far less by force of arms than by transportation." End quote.

The river of mobility flows today just as strongly as it did two hundred or one hundred or twenty-five years ago.

The people will not accept an immobile America. They will not accept as a vision of the future the current waist-high weeds on train tracks in some major passenger terminals throughout the country. Economic history has shown us, time and time again, that the demands for mobility are always met.

President Lincoln anticipated the demands of the people more than a hundred years ago when he standardized the railroad track gauges of America.

Back in 1928 the East and West Coast aircraft manufacturers foresaw a similar demand at a time when there were only 2,000 tons of air freight, 53,000 passengers, and 3,500,000 pounds of mail each year to sustain them.

The national interstate highway builders were answering that demand in 1939 when Americans at the New York World's Fair saw for the first time the concept of superhighways sweeping from city to city.

The demand is still here, but sometimes in the clamor of protest, dissent, and obstruction I wonder if we can hear the voices of the people.

For example, our big trucks too often have been made a villain in the mobility drama. But logically, trucks cannot be legislated off the highways, just as the passenger car cannot be legislated out of existence. Both are a major, integral part of the American way of life and of our transportation future.

We have the finest domestic air service in the world, but it must not be shackled forever to a 600 mph speed. And yet the supersonic jet transport becomes meaningless if it does not mesh into a system of roads or rails that carries people.

I have the greatest respect for the AMTRAC concept, and it should be offered every encouragement to succeed. A railroad right-of-way is a heritage of the American people, an essential part of American mobility; and it must be woven into the pattern of a national transportation system.

There are big obstacles on the road ahead.

Business Week, Newsweek, Time, U.S. News and World Report, Harpers, and our daily papers have all taken turns, and sometimes have acted simultaneously, in enumerating the chamber of transportation horrors.

According to the articles, and most of them are factual, we are drowning in a sea of negatives: traffic congestion, air pollution, environmental degradation, soaring traffic deaths, and inadequate transportation.

You don't need a repetition of the stories that a third of every American city is dominated by businesses which cater exclusively to the motor car. You know about the fissures that are appearing in Roman monuments because of traffic vibrations. The story of the airport terminal traffic jams, such as Los Angeles, would be wasted on you.

Nearly everyone in this room has a personal problem with transportation.

I solved my commuter problem in Pittsburgh by moving so close to work that I

could throw a baseball from my living room and hit our headquarters building.

Quite correctly, urban mass transit gets a prominent place in planning for livability.

But Fortune Magazine just recently pointed out that the land-people ratio in the United States is eleven acres per person. If the whole present world population, 3.7 billion people, were put inside the United States' borders, the resulting density would not be much greater than that of England today.

That abundance of land mass emphasizes the need not for urban transit alone but for all kinds of transportation, a system that embraces autos, subways, trains, trucks, aircraft, buses, barges, and even bicycles. Each is related to the others.

I know each of these areas has occupied the time and energy of countless talented and dedicated citizens. What I am emphasizing is the need to consider all the areas and all at the same time.

We cannot continue devoting our concern on Monday to the railroads, on Tuesday to the trucking industry, on Wednesday to the bus lines, on Thursday to urban mass transit, and on Friday to the airlines. It's all one problem and it demands one concentrated effort for solution.

There's no denying the intramural fights in the industry. The trucks have a chip on their shoulders when it comes to the rails; the bus lines are ready to take on both rails and the airlines at the drop of a hat; and the steamship lines feel that they're orphans of the storm.

Business Week magazine has referred to the necessity to bring harmony to the warring highway and mass transit lobbies, to cool the emotional energies not only of the suppliers of transportation but of the political bodies embroiled in the fight.

I believe the major concerned industries should approach the overall problem with far more enthusiasm and cooperation and less consideration for single industry views than in prior years.

We must devise the finest balanced transportation system in the world that will carry 210 million Americans into the twenty-first century. It's embarrassing to go to a foreign country today and find far better surface transportation than is offered at home.

To achieve the balance I just mentioned, we'll need a national commitment in money, in community cooperation, and in technical talent.

Of the three, some people consider the problem of financing the most difficult. The sheer size of the necessary investment in transport systems in the cities alone is awesome, especially if we are to approach this overall problem in the broad, sweeping manner in which it must be treated.

Our highway construction costs of the past are an indication of what awaits in the future.

In the past 17 years alone we've spent \$40 billion on our 34,000-mile network of interstate highways.

But for the overall period, from the very day we started to make the switch from dirt to macadam, we've spent, according to former Undersecretary of Transportation James Beggs, \$500 billion.

For that money we have the finest highway system of any nation in the world.

Now, turning our attention from highways alone to all transportation on a national scale, the problem of financing becomes monumental.

Funding for urban mass transit in four years has quintupled from \$200 million to \$1 billion. Next year, and I say this hopefully, the \$1 billion funding will become \$2 billion, as more and more cities prepare their plans for participation in the federal program.

Increased incentive in the form of research and development funding, along with definitive prospects for long-term hardware programs, must be made available for prim-

ing revolutionary new concepts in all areas of transportation.

Congress is the keeper of the national purse, and the pressure of priorities is endless.

But to encourage serious planning in any national area, whether it be in defense or people mobility, we must have funding that will make commitments effective. We must not, for example, treat our engineering and scientific teams as so many yo-yo's on a string—a situation that has become a way of life in our defense industries.

Perhaps one of the solutions in this most difficult area will come, as the Harvard Business Review has pointed out, from a totally new concept of financing. Just a few years ago a major milestone in financing created the Comsat satellite, and as a result of that innovative financial thinking the communications industries of the world leaped ahead.

Perhaps business, government, and the general public, through the sale of stock, will participate in the funding of a balanced national transportation system. I don't think our innovative financial planning stopped with Comsat.

Earlier I said that some people think adequate funding is the major problem facing the development of a nation-wide transportation system. Actually, there are many people who think that funding ranks, not first, but second, in our problems.

And they have a point.

In the past decade we've seen many cases where funding was available, but that availability was completely ignored in the local jurisdictional disputes that flared and kept on flaring for years on end.

So, to some people, cooperation—government, business, labor, local jurisdictions—is the most critical problem facing us today.

President Nixon, in his recent letter to the Association, recognized the problem when he urged that we find new ways in which labor, industry, and the government can achieve solutions of transportation problems.

How do we get total cooperation between Government and industry, between industry and labor, between state and state, city and city, and community and community?

The patience of the country in the interest of fairness has been monumental.

We've witnessed an all-out struggle between local governments and Washington, between bus systems and subway systems, between advancing hardware and existing equipment.

We've become hardened to delay, but delays that last for a good portion of a man's adult life are intolerable. It takes about 20 years to go from the concept state to completion for a mass transportation system.

It's almost twenty-five years since the first discussions began on the BART system in the San Francisco Bay Area, and the first train has yet to roll beneath the bay.

And 25 years isn't the record—it takes even longer to plan highways. Construction on the Interstate Highway System was started in 1956, but the actual planning was started in the '30's, and we still have portions of that system incomplete.

We put a man on the moon in slightly more than eight years from the day we received the "go" signal. Why was it possible to do something that was so apparently impossible, and do it with such flawless precision and within such a relatively short time span? Which leads us to that inevitable question: If we can put a man on the moon, why can't we get the commuter trains running on time? The answer is: We can—but it won't be easy.

I think another part of that answer is that the Apollo spacecraft was pointed in the right direction—toward the moon and away from the interminable conflicts on earth.

A handful of major contractors moved with remarkable precision in planned incre-

ments, answering to one central authority, NASA.

We did not have delegations from the dark side of the moon protesting our choice of landing sites.

No one chained himself to our spacecraft. None of the astronauts threatened to go on strike in mid-voyage.

We had a goal.

We had adequate funding.

We had the unstinting support of over 50,000 subcontractors.

We had the complete cooperation of the American people—they wanted to achieve that goal.

We had the greatest technical talent ever assembled.

The result, after eight years and two months, was Neil Armstrong and "one small step for man."

We were fortunate. Once the launch vehicle was ten feet off the pad at Kennedy Space Center, we had the entire universe spread out for us. From then on we had virtually an unhindered journey with the cheer of the world to spur us on.

We can't apply those Apollo precision tactics to an earthbound national transportation system.

The planners will have neither the authority nor the temerity of a Georges Haussmann who literally bulldozed through the streets of Paris the present wide boulevards that are a monument to his genius.

Our planners, and this is correctly so, must constantly be aware that current transportation routes within our major urban areas cannot be altered immediately in any drastic way without disastrous long-term results.

We can't destroy buildings, homes, utilities, or the centers of employment.

That's why I stress the need for a 27-year long-term program, because we must have time to evaluate the total impact. Transportation selection must not only meet current needs, but must have growth potential to meet broad changes in requirements for transportation in the future.

In short, to fulfill present needs and still prepare for the future will require a kind of genius from every one of the hundreds of local jurisdictions who must be involved in the planning, building and operation of effective public transportation.

Finally, we come to the technical aspects of future transportation systems.

I know that advanced technology is an important part, but only a part, of the overall transportation picture. But I hope you'll excuse my preoccupation with that subject for it's one of my greatest concerns.

Metroliners, hovercraft, hydrofoils, high-speed bus systems, innovative trolley energy systems, electric cars, vertical and short-takeoff aircraft, skybus, BART—all of these and others will play a part in the ultimate national transportation system.

Literally hundreds of companies, large and small, are actively engaged in efforts whose end products ultimately will be meshed into the entire picture.

At Rockwell International, new approaches to moving people in an increasingly complex and congested world figure prominently in the long-range planning of our Automotive Group. These include light rail vehicles for mass transit, airport transit systems, and unirail systems for vast amusement centers such as Disney World.

In another of our groups, Utility and Consumer Products, we are supplying undercarriages for both the BART System and the Washington Metropolitan Subway System.

Our Rocketdyne Division is actively engaged in developing propulsion systems for high-speed hydrofoil craft.

We've developed high-performance batteries which can potentially reduce the weight and size of existing batteries to where they may be used in electric automobiles.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Multiply Rockwell International's activities in these areas scores of times over, and you have just an inkling of the immense research and development activity, nationwide, in all these areas.

And I think this is all to the good. I believe it emphasizes the fact that the future of transportation vitally affects many industries—not just the automobile manufacturers, the subway builders, the railroads, the buses, the trucking industry and the airlines, but others who are not normally associated with transportation.

It's to our advantage to get every segment of American society and industry involved in solving the transportation needs of this country. It should be obvious that it's the only way it can be accomplished.

"Our technology," Dr. John S. Foster said, "underwrites the finest way of life of any highly populated area in the earth's history."

Gertrude Stein once said America has lived in the twentieth century longer than any other nation. In the past forty years alone we've reaped forty harvests of world leadership in advanced technology.

That leadership has given us an unshakable confidence in our ability to cope with any technical problem on any scale—local, national, or global.

With a balanced system serving the needs of all Americans, we can move back from the rivers that built Pittsburgh and St. Louis and back from the sea that gave us New York and San Francisco. We can look to the mountains or out to small islands, or wherever the human spirit moves a group of people to live and work together.

Mobility is a necessity, almost a right, and certainly a pleasure, particularly when it's good.

And for that reason we will have, within this century, a balanced national transportation system for both people and cargo in the air, on the land, and on the sea. It will rank with the landing on the moon as one of the greatest scientific achievements of all time.

We can't get started too soon.

Tomorrow's solutions are today's challenges.

Thank you.

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is now painfully obvious that the 1970 Clean Air Act standards for 1975 auto emissions are as scientifically unsound as they are economically unrealistic.

Last month, the National Academy of Science's Committee on Motor Vehicle Emissions testified before the House that 1975 standards for carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and oxides of nitrogen are three times more stringent than necessary. Congress has no one to blame but itself for this. Emissions requirements were legislated in haste with a minimum of scientific information or experimentation.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal speaks for itself. It details the enormous cost the American consumer and economy will bear because of this ill-conceived law. The point is that these standards will eventually be met thanks to the natural forces of competition among domestic and foreign car

manufacturers. Meanwhile, in an attempt to meet arbitrary deadlines with stop-gap technology, the real work to develop a clean and efficient engine is delayed. I hope Congress will face up to the best scientific evidence and advice we now have and adjust the 1970 Clean Air Act to conform with reality for the sake of our environment as well as economy.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 28, 1973]

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

It's now almost a total certainty that Congress erred in setting the stringent auto emission standards of the 1970 Clean Air Act. And unless it amends the law this session, consumers will have to pay for the mistake for more than a decade.

There's no need for this, as testimony before the House subcommittee on public health and environment revealed last week. Perhaps the only completely independent and objective source that has studied the issue told the panel that the federal emission standards are tougher than necessary. Representing the National Academy of Sciences' Committee on Motor Vehicle Emissions, Prof. Arthur Stern of the University of North Carolina's School of Public Health testified:

"An emission limit for CO [carbon monoxide] approximately three times as high as that promulgated by EPA for 1975 vehicles would give assurance of not exceeding the 8-hour air-quality standard of 9 parts per million CO more than once a year."

And: "Present federal emission requirements of 0.41 grams per mile HC [hydrocarbons] and 0.4 g/mi NOX [oxides of nitrogen] seem more restrictive than need be by a factor of about three. . . . These conclusions suggest that the 90% reduction of CO and NOX specified in Sec. 202 of the Clean Air Act may be more than is required to meet the present national air quality standards for CO, NOX and oxidant."

These conclusions are hardly surprising. Congress picked those numbers without benefit of hearings and voted the act in the hectic closing days of 1970; the only remote scientific justification for the numbers rested on assumptions that have since been proven erroneous. From the first, California scientists and pollution experts who had set that state's emission standards argued that the federal standards represent an overkill.

Only a fractional easing of these standards would permit Detroit to avoid the costly and unproven catalyst approach, which involves fitting cannisters that either oxidize or reduce the three pollutants within the exhaust system instead of cleaning the emissions within the engine by more efficient burning of the fuel. By now, competition with Japan and each other is forcing the U.S. manufacturers into alternate systems that are cleaner and more efficient, systems that may quickly make catalysts obsolete. But unless the standards are eased now, before Detroit is locked into contracts and designs for next year's auto, catalysts will be installed on the 1975 models that go on sale in California late next summer as well as on selected models that are sold nationally.

Even if Congress next year recognized that the National Academy is correct about the numbers, it will by then be extraordinarily expensive to pull back from catalysts. The auto manufacturers and catalyst makers will already have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in the catalyst approach. The petroleum refiners will have spent large sums converting a portion of their capacity to unleaded fuel, because catalysts are destroyed by leaded gasoline. And 70% of the nation's service stations will have had to add pumps to supply unleaded gas if they don't already. At the very least,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a midstream switch by Congress would leave the nation with hundreds of thousands of "orphan" autos, for which catalyst maintenance and unleaded gas will have to be supplied as long as they are on the road.

What is really at issue now is whether Congress having been supplied with reliable analysis from the prestigious National Academy, can act on that information. The chief barrier is that Congress adopted the federal standards as an emotional commitment to the environment. Although they now have no scientific justification at all, they have achieved a symbolic life of their own; to adjust them to reality would be taken as a defeat by the environmentalists.

Senator Muskie is unhappy with catalysts, especially if car owners have to replace them every 25,000 miles at up to \$150 a unit. But as author of the Clean Air Act he refuses to believe his numbers are unsupportable. He does his own scientific research by looking out the window. "As I returned from Maine to the Senate," he said recently, "I saw this dirty air mass covering the land, urban and rural areas alike, and darkening the sun."

Congress, though, can't make multi-billion dollar decisions by looking out the window. How will it explain the haze after every auto has a catalyst? Washington now has enough scientific assurance to feel safe in freezing the 1974 standards for a few years, at least until the National Academy can conduct a rigorous analysis of exactly what the air quality standards should be. Otherwise, it's likely the political scientists on Capitol Hill will have fathered an orphan technology and the American consumers will be stuck with the bill.

THE BIG FLAP OVER THE HOUSE AT SAN CLEMENTE

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following articles that appeared September 26 in the Wall Street Journal, which go a long way toward clearing up the issue of improvements on the President's homes at San Clemente and Key Biscayne. These articles represent a series of correspondence that grew out of a recent press conference held by Arthur Sampson, administrator of the GSA, and the resulting Wall Street Journal editorial.

I cannot help but wonder why the press has not given as much front-page publicity to the inflationary effect of all the fiscally irresponsible programs passed by Congress this session rather than attacking legitimate expenditures made in connection with Presidential security.

The text of the articles follows:

THE BIG FLAP OVER THE HOUSE AT SAN CLEMENTE

(Following is a press conference statement by Arthur F. Sampson, administrator of the General Services Administration, on the confusion that surrounded government spending on President Nixon's homes at San Clemente and Key Biscayne; to which is added an exchange of correspondence between the editor of this page and Mr. Sampson concerning landscaping expenditures questioned by Rep. Edward R. Roybal (D., Calif.):

Current public confusion over San Cle-

mente and Key Biscayne expenses is due in part to the way that GSA expenditures have been reported. Over the past two months, a series of dollar figures have been announced in the press, each one higher than the last, each quoting government sources, and each compounding public misunderstanding. A review of the sequence of these events leads us to the conclusion that the government and the media are jointly responsible for this unfortunate development.

In late May, a reporter asked about the specific costs of four items at San Clemente. We supplied the White House with the costs and they released them. One major newspaper erroneously stated that the cost of the four items—some \$39,000—was the total spent by GSA at San Clemente, and the error was picked up hundreds of times across the country. (The Associated Press, which made the original request, carried the story correctly.)

After this the press made many demands on the administration for further information.

In attempting to respond quickly, we compiled our major, one-time costs which totaled about \$460,000 for the San Clemente property. That figure did not include certain recurring costs, but because of misunderstandings within the government, the \$460,000 figure was released as a total for all GSA spending.

A thorough check of our records was then made and we released a report for the San Clemente residence and total Key Biscayne costs, showing the same totals as those we are reporting here. Today we are going one step beyond to release total figures for all the complexes.

The total GSA spending was \$3.7 million, including \$703,367 on the President's home and grounds at San Clemente and \$452,708 on the President's home and grounds at Key Biscayne. The balance was \$2,468,894 in capital and operating expenses for the associated government office complexes, and \$65,930 for the protection of the President and his family at four other locations.

In addition to GSA spending, the military spent large sums on communications equipment and associated items at the same locations. The total spending by GSA, the military and other agencies was nearly \$10 million.

In addition, we have started a complete audit for all expenditures on presidential protection and support during the Nixon administration. The audit is estimated to take up to seven months and will go behind our reports and examine records in detail to verify the accuracy and completeness of the accounting records we have used to date. We expect that this audit will result in less than a 5% difference—plus or minus—from the enclosed report.

Throughout the past few weeks, the press has reported differing figures for various items. Many items reported by the press were wrong and we have issued many statements about the erroneous reporting.

GSA was accused by the press, for example, of installing a "swimming pool heater" at San Clemente. That charge was repeated by the media across the country and is still printed today, even though it has been firmly denied by the administration. In fact, the heater was paid for personally by the President. Likewise, GSA was erroneously credited with installation of a septic tank for the President at San Clemente. In a similar way, without adequately checking the facts, the press has printed numerous stories with widely differing totals on the amounts spent at the various residences.

This has been confusing to the public and grossly unfair to the President and his family. By publishing this comprehensive report today, we hope that we can bring this confusion to an end.

October 1, 1973

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL,
August 24, 1973.Mr. ARTHUR F. SAMPSON,
Administrator,
General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAMPSON: I have been studying your statement and the summary of expenditures for protection of the President at San Clemente and elsewhere. We are considering writing some more on the subject, including reprinting your remarks on how the confusion came about as the figures were released.

However, I would like to have a bit more detail on a few of the contracts being questioned by Congressman Roybal and others, and wonder if you could provide answers to a few questions on the following items:

On page 13 of your summary, contracts C-2470 and C-2471, \$76,000 to repair and replace landscaping & sprinkler and \$7,515 to repair roadways, both damaged by construction work. What was the nature of the damage and how was it caused, and in connection with what other construction?

On page 19 of your summary, contract GS-09B-0-708, \$25,524 for maintenance of landscaping to insure growth. Why was such a large expenditure necessary, and to which landscaping was it applied?

Without tracing down each of the individual contracts, there are a number of expenditures on pages 17, 18 and 19 for replacement of landscaping? Could we have any sort of general description of why this was necessary? Similarly, on pages 20, 22 and 23 there are contracts to landscaping to remove fire and safety hazards. Could these be explained in a bit more detail?

Any assistance you could provide on these few contracts would be greatly appreciated, and I believe would further your purpose of bringing the confusion to an end.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. BARTLEY,
Editor of the Editorial Page.GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
September 7, 1973.Mr. ROBERT L. BARTLEY,
Editor of the Editorial Page,
The Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BARTLEY: This is in further reference to your letter of August 24 regarding expenditures made by the General Services Administration for the protection of the President at his San Clemente, California residence.

Your first series of questions concerns the repair and replacement of landscaping and sprinklers and the repair of roadways. The need for this work resulted in part from the initial installation of conduits for telephone cables, security cables, power lines, TV systems and miscellaneous alarm systems which required extensive excavation of the grounds. Also, other construction work including the blockwall, concrete manhole, and concrete footings required the movement of heavy equipment and vehicles across the grounds.

The excavation for the installation of underground lines and cables required the destruction of existing landscaping and severely damaged existing roadways, curbing, and drainage ditches originally designed for normal automobile use and pedestrian traffic. Therefore, extensive repairs were required throughout the grounds, including replacement of the sprinkler system where damaged. All other work considered the responsibility of the President was accomplished by his personal representatives.

The maintenance of the landscaping was continued for the period from September 1969 through April 1970. The government had removed and replaced extensive shrubs, flowers and lawn area and the continued maintenance was necessary to insure growth of the government-installed material. During this

period it was also necessary to adjust trees, plants and shrubs to accommodate the surveillance requirements of the Secret Service. The contracts for maintenance were originally established for a one year period from October 1969 to October 1970 and were terminated in April as soon as it was felt that the owner should take over the maintenance. The expenditures you referred to on pages 17, 18 and 19 were those incurred during the above maintenance period.

The expenditures listed on pages 20, 22 and 23 were requested by the Secret Service and resulted in the elimination of a large area of dry weeds along the northern perimeter of the property constituting a serious fire hazard. Dead and broken limbs from the large trees on the property were considered a hazard to the President, the Secret Service employees who patrol the property, and official visitors the President might have, and were removed. Trees were relocated in order to interrupt line-of-sight vision from the exterior of the property for security purposes.

I appreciate your interest in an accurate and complete understanding of these expenditures.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR F. SAMPSON,
Administrator.

A Non-Story

Today we are printing certain documents concerning the spending on President Nixon's homes. We note that the subject has more or less died out of the news, which is too bad. Once hints of scandal have been raised in the news, we of the press ought to stick with them until the full story is told, even if nothing juicy seems likely to result from further investigation.

Government spending at San Clemente and Key Biscayne did make headlines, especially since the total seemed to be going up and up as the press put on pressure for further details. But elsewhere on this page GSA Administrator Arthur Sampson makes a good case that part of the confusion was created by the press itself. We do not remember this part of his statement being reported in the stories on his remarks. Indeed, in reporting his press conference, The Washington Post said, "It was GSA's third attempt to provide an accounting of improvements, security expenditures and the installation of office facilities at Mr. Nixon's homes. The estimate has risen in steps from \$39,000 to \$1.3 million to \$3.7 million."

When the GSA's \$3.7 million is added to \$5.8 million in military spending and \$300,000 by the Secret Service, the total outlays are nearly \$10 million. But as this figure has been taken apart in efforts to find unjustified expenditures, the total that could reasonably be challenged has stopped going up and has been going down and down. Some of this has been reported, but somehow it has not attracted the same attention.

Rep. Edward R. Roybal and Rep. Jack Edwards toured San Clemente on behalf of the House Appropriations Committee, and concluded that most of the spending there had been justified for security purposes. News stories did report this, but they did not receive widespread notice, though to its credit The Washington Post did play the story prominently on page one. The stories said Rep. Roybal was particularly impressed by the landscaping for security purposes, as for example relocation of a palm tree to obstruct a window where the President might have been exposed to the aim of a distant marksman.

Rep. Roybal had been especially critical of the San Clemente spending at a previous committee hearing and could be counted on to single out its most questionable aspects. Actually, he thought the news reports of his comments went too far in exonerating the spending, and he later issued a press release

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

saying that the expenditure of \$13,500 for a heating system and \$165,990 on landscaping and residential improvements were "clearly for personal comfort and esthetics." He said they "definitely enhanced the value of the President's property."

The great bulk of the \$165,990 consisted of landscaping not done directly for security purposes. Mr. Sampson explains these contracts in the correspondence following his statement, and quite convincingly too. Surely it's difficult to doubt that the government should pay for restoring the grounds to their original condition after it has torn them up to install underground communications and security systems.

If you deduct these expenses from the Congressman's total, you are left with a sum quite different from the original \$10 million. There is the heating system, replaced because the Secret Service decided gas heat is inherently unsafe. Rep. Roybal also questions an overhead fire sprinkler system in the President's home, and believes a concrete fence should have been extended only partially around the President's property rather than entirely around it.

Now, there is no intention here to demean Rep. Roybal, who was conscientious enough to investigate and honest enough to alter some of his initial views. He may be right that Congress should limit presidential homes outside Washington to one per President, though others may feel a President ought to be able to go where he likes. More realistically, Rep. Roybal asks that Congress ought to approve presidential-security expenditures in advance rather than giving blanket approval.

But if Congress had been asked to spend \$13,500 to protect the President from the remote possibility of gas leaks, or to fence in the whole estate rather than part of it, can anyone imagine there would have been a murmur of opposition anywhere in either house? Possibly H. R. Gross, who once questioned the cost of the eternal flame on John F. Kennedy's grave might have risen to the occasion. But we doubt even that.

In short, despite all those headlines the spending at San Clemente seems to have been a non-story. We recognize that not every question has been settled. The military spending has not been detailed, the President has not explained where he got the money to buy the homes or released the details of his tax returns and so on. We know, too, that lately it has been popular to take every explanation not as a settlement of the charges it addresses but a backhanded confirmation of the charges it does not address. But we don't subscribe to that philosophy; indeed, we suspect it is one of the best ways for non-stories to catch on.

So we think it wise to pause for a moment to chalk up the flurry over the GSA spending at San Clemente as something akin to the flurry over the false stories about 28 Black Panthers being killed by police. It might be wise, too, to think about how the press might undo non-stories when they arise.

MUSIC TEACHER NOELANI KANOHO MAHOE: DEDICATED TO BRINGING HAWAIIAN MUSIC TO YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, Hawaiian music is among the most beautiful in the world. Noelani Kanoho Mahoe, a Ha-

waiian elementary school teacher is a leader in preserving Hawaiian culture through music. Working with the Governor's Committee on Hawaiian Text Materials, she has compiled a book of Hawaiian songs and recorded them on cassettes which are available to all schools. Her booklet contains nearly 50 songs, in both Hawaiian and English, with chord and music changes for teaching the ukulele.

Mrs. Mahoe has had an extensive musical background, including professional performances and recordings and other published books about Hawaiian music.

Mrs. Mahoe's aim is to make these new musical resources readily available to all teachers, so that Hawaii may preserve an important part of its unique cultural heritage, its lovely music, through its young people. In tribute to a great artist and culturist I include at this point a recent article about Noelani Kanoho Mahoe from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

ALL THE STUDENTS MAY "SING ALONG"

By this time next year, Noelani Kanoho Mahoe should have one of the most easily-recognized singing voices in the State.

In fact, if school teachers take advantage of a new program being offered them this fall, every one of the more than 180,000 youngsters expected to register in Hawaii schools next week could learn to sing Hawaiian songs from Mrs. Mahoe.

Mrs. Mahoe, who teaches Hawaiian at Pope Elementary School in Waipahu, has compiled—for use in schools—a booklet called "E Hineni Hawain Kakou (Let's Sing Hawaiian Songs)." With the booklet are three tape cassettes on which she has recorded all of the songs—singing alone, pronouncing the Hawaiian language clearly and correctly, and accompanying herself with a ukulele.

There is no other accompaniment to distract from the educational value of the taped music and voice.

The booklets and tapes already have been distributed to all public and private schools. And they are geared for use by teachers of all grades, kindergarten through ninth grade.

The program is one of four put together by the Governor's Committee on Hawaiian Text Materials. Others include booklets and film strips on the Aquatic Sounds of the Hawaiian Islands, the Hawaiian Artistic Tradition and a complete curriculum resource guide titled "Our Cultural Heritage/Hawaii."

All are available in the schools, but only the Hawaiian music program is geared for use by all grades.

The curriculum resource guide is intended for use by grades seven through 12. The study of aquatic booklets is intended for use at fourth grade level, where it blends in with the regular studies of the student. The history of Hawaiian art is geared for seventh grade students.

"We felt there were a lot of good things going on in Hawaiian . . . things being done by the teachers . . . things that needed to be tapped," said Ka'upena Wong, production manager for the Hawaiian Text Materials programs.

"Some were things such as Noe's."

Wong, himself an authority on Hawaiian, said the committee conducted a survey to find what aids the teachers themselves had prepared to help teach things Hawaiian.

"We found many of the teachers doing great things," he said. "And some of them were willing to share."

So the committee set about gathering the material and preparing the text and related materials.

"These are all products made by front line people, the teachers themselves," Wong said.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Wong said the overall aim of the Governor's Committee is to "make educational materials and curriculum meaningful, alive and relevant to the life styles of the children of Hawaii."

"We needed to find things that were already working," he said.

A major thrust then has been to find useful teacher-created instructional materials and to make these materials available throughout the State.

One such "Discovery" was a book of collected Hawaiian songs with accompanying tapes—already used at Pope School by Mrs. Mahoe.

"The majority are songs I had already done for our school," Mrs. Mahoe said.

The booklet of songs—in a mimeographed form—has been used by Mrs. Mahoe since the 1970-71 school year. In her full-time job, Mrs. Mahoe teaches ukulele, hula, music (including singing Hawaiian), language and Hawaiian history.

She has been playing ukulele since she was 4 years old.

In 1971, Kuulei Ihara of the Bishop Museum and a member of the Governor's committee, suggested that Mrs. Mahoe submit her collection of songs to the committee.

She did. And it was immediately accepted.

Although her original booklet "Kekahi Mau Hineni No Ke Kamali'i A Pope Elementary (Some Songs For The Children Of Pope Elementary)" was intended for only kindergarten through sixth grade, Mrs. Mahoe and Wong decided the program should be made suitable for high school students as well.

"We eliminated some of the real kiddie songs and put in some others," she said.

Then she turned her tapes over to Wong and last April she re-taped all of the songs in a professional studio to provide masters from which the cassettes could be made.

Byron Yasui and Vernon Read of the University of Hawaii performed the tedious job of transcribing the recorded tapes and producing pencil-copy melody lines for all of the songs.

The result is a booklet of nearly 50 songs, complete with the correct Hawaiian words, music and chord changes and an accurate English translation of each song.

Songs range from such old standards as "Ekolu Mea Nui," "Hawai'i Aloha," and "Pupu O Ewa" to cute little ditties such as "C A T, Popoki Make A Cat."

There also are songs by such well-known composers as Alice K. Namakelua and Mary Kawena Pukui.

An entire section is devoted to hulas, with songs such as "Laupahoehoe", by Irmgard Farden Aluli and "Kahuli Aku" by Helen Desha Beamer.

In the booklet, Mrs. Mahoe suggests uses for the songs. There are chord charts to aid in teaching ukulele. Teachers are asked to use the book by projecting it onto a screen with an overhead opaque projector—standard equipment in the schools.

Mrs. Mahoe has recorded, professionally, 12 of the songs included in the booklet.

In 10 years as leader of the Leo Nahenahe, a recording group, she has put out four albums and several singles. Best known perhaps is the Leo Nahenahe album, "Folk Songs of Hawai'i."

Mrs. Mahoe also has sung and played for albums with other entertainers.

"Hawaiian music has always been a part of me, something I enjoyed," she said.

When she entered the University of Hawaii, she realized that singing and playing Hawaiian music was something not everyone could do. "It was at that time that I started collecting Hawaiian music," she said.

She has co-authored with Samuel H. Elbert a book called "Na Mele O Hawai'i Nei, 101 Hawaiian Songs." It is used by nearly all Hawaiian entertainers and is looked to as the

authority on the correctness of many of the favorites.

Mrs. Mahoe is a vice president of the Hawaiian Music Foundation in charge of many of the Foundation's projects—including the recent slack key, falsetto and steel guitar concerts—and is vice president of Hawaiian Music Productions Inc., a new commercial venture formed recently to promote Hawaiian music.

She also is associate producer of a Hawaii Public Television (KHET) Hawaiian music series being filmed now for broadcast later this year.

—And she is not through with this school project

"We need to see that the teachers know they are available," she said of the tapes and booklets. "Then we need to review the program two or three years from now to see how much they've been used."

REPRESENTATIVE ABZUG URGES
AUSTRIA TO KEEP SCHOENAU
OPEN

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in response to a reprehensible Arab terrorist attack on a train carrying Soviet Jews to Vienna on their way to Israel, the Austrian Government has decided to close Schoenau Castle transit camp. Schoenau Castle has for years been used as a processing and orientation center for tens of thousands of oppressed Jewish people seeking to begin life anew in their national homeland.

The decision to close the transit camp is not justifiable. Austria has in the past done much to assist Jewish emigres. Why that country has chosen this moment, when so many Jews are leaving the Soviet Union, to make so momentous a decision will perhaps never be known. Suffice it to say that the dream of freedom may be dashed for many thousands of Soviet Jews who would find it difficult to travel to Israel without the assistance of the Schoenau facility.

Because I cannot sit idly by when a blow against freedom is struck, I have sent a letter to Ambassador Arno Halusa urging that the Government of Austria rescind its decision to close Schoenau. I strongly urge all of my colleagues, in the interest of freedom of thought, religion and national identity, to send similar correspondence.

The text of the letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 1, 1973.
Mr. ARNO HALUSA,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Office of Embassy, Republic of Austria, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I am disheartened at the decision of your Government to close the Schoenau Castle Transit Camp in response to Arab terrorist activity.

While I appreciate Austria's difficult position in attempting to save the lives of innocent hostages, I find no justification for the order terminating the processing of Jewish emigrants at Schoenau Castle. For years Schoenau Castle has symbolized a refuge for Jewish people emigrating to Israel to fulfill

their national and religious identities. Cessation of activities at Schoenau would place extreme hardships upon those people emigrating from lands of religious oppression to religious freedom in Israel.

Let me assure your government that as a Member of Congress I will take all possible steps to encourage future United States participation and cooperation in assisting Jewish refugees.

I urge Chancellor Kreisky to rescind his order closing Schoenau, and honor Austria's commitment to neutrality and free passage for the world's citizens.

Very truly yours,

BELLA S. ABZUG,
Member of Congress.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION ENGAGES IN FAVORITISM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks there have been allegations that the General Services Administration—GSA—has engaged in political favoritism in its awarding of bids. Although the veracity of these charges has not yet been established, it is clear that GSA is engaging in favoritism of minority contractors in its solicitation of bids.

This favored treatment consists of the inclusion by GSA of the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of minority subcontractors in the official bid package. The purported reason for such a policy is in order to compensate minority subcontractors for "past discriminatory practices within the business community."

In its "Specification and Bid Forms for Landscaping for Bicentennial Improvements"—contract No. GS-OOB-01473—the GSA states that "you—the contractor—are encouraged to solicit subcontract bids from minority contractors that have the ability to perform as your subcontractor." A list of minority contractors from the Washington, D.C., area is then included in the bid forms "to assist you in soliciting subcontract proposals for this project."

Inclusion of similar letters and accompanying lists of minority contractors in bid packages is part of general GSA policy set forth in a memorandum by Administrator Robert Kunzig. Kunzig's April 23, 1971, memorandum to all regional administrators states:

In the future, information on the availability and capabilities of minority contractors shall be furnished to the prospective prime contractors by means of a letter included in each bid package persuading them to solicit subcontract bids from these minority firms.

The listing of minority contractors in the bid package along with addresses and telephone numbers clearly gives these contractors an unfair competitive advantage over nonminority contractors. Minority contractors are enjoying free advertising at the expense of the Government while other contractors must expend their own finances for such recog-

October 1, 1973

nition. And, at no price whatsoever could they secure similar advertising in the bid package itself.

When asked to explain this policy, Gerald Patterson in GSA's Design Branch of the Design and Construction Division stated that a white subcontractor probably would be better known by a general contractor than would a minority subcontractor. He conceded, however, that a small white subcontractor probably would not be any better known than a small minority subcontractor. Therefore, in Patterson's opinion "a small white subcontractor would be at a competitive disadvantage in that he does not qualify as a minority."

Allan Kaupinen, Assistant Administrator at GSA, however, contends that—

(t)he listing does not give the minority subcontractor an unfair competitive advantage, but rather it is providing the minority subcontractors with the opportunity to be fairly considered for subcontracts. The opportunity to be competitive with other subcontractors has been previously denied to minority subcontractors because of past discriminatory practices within the business community.

Almost everyone would agree that minority subcontractors should have equal opportunity to bid on Government contracts. Any Federal program designed to achieve such opportunity, however, should guarantee equal opportunity for all contractors, both minority and non-minority. Extending an unfair competitive advantage to minority contractors results in further inequalities rather than solving the problem.

GOING METRIC

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD today, the keynote address by Dr. Betsy Ancker-Johnson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology, to the conference, "Going Metric: Meeting the Conversion Challenge," that was recently held at the University of California at Los Angeles. In a short time, Congress will be considering metric legislation and I believe that the following speech answers many of the questions raised when discussing the subject of metric conversion in the United States. The address follows:

U.S. METRICATION: BACKGROUND AND PROGNOSIS

(By Dr. Betsy Ancker-Johnson)

Scientific American once said, in an editorial: "There exists no good reason at all why the meter-liter-gram system has not been adopted by the people of the United States . . . except that deep-seated quality of human nature which causes us all to put our backs up and resist changes until they are forced on us . . . Many American manufacturers, however, already are using the metric system of measurements today for the production of export articles. What remains to be done is . . . to convince the average man of the desirability of the change . . .

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to demonstrate to him that he should contribute his share to making the change."

Sound familiar? The editorial appeared in the July, 1923, issue—50 years ago!

As the metric controversy goes, that was only yesterday. In his first message to Congress, in 1790, President Washington suggested that there be established standards of weights and measures. The matter was referred to Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson. Now there was an inventive genius, Jefferson, as well as a statesman. He developed two plans, neither of which the Congress was willing to adopt. Meanwhile, the Paris Academy of Sciences had constructed a system based on the best scientific principles of that day. It was wholly rational, quite simple, and internally consistent. Its keystone was the "meter," a unit of length defined as a specific fraction of the earth's circumference. Hence, the name, the metric system. Then, 150-years ago, John Quincy Adams conducted a thorough investigation of all known measurement systems and sent the Congress a report on them. Although Adams believed the metric system approached "the idea of perfection of uniformity applied to weights and measures," he rejected it because he felt that the time was not right for it. Most of our trade was with inch-pound England, and the metric system was not even firmly established at its home country, France, let alone in the rest of the world. Better to wait, Adams concluded, until a uniform international measurement system could be worked out.

Only in the last quarter-century has the metric system become the dominant language of measurement throughout the world. The U.S. is the only major industrial nation which has not yet adopted it. In fact, we find ourselves among only 10 countries which are not metric or going metric. All the other nine are small, less-developed nations.

RECENT METRIC STUDY

After a decade of questioning and discussing, the Congress acted in August, 1968. It passed the Metric Study Act directing the Secretary of Commerce to arrange for a broad inquiry and evaluation. He assigned the task to the National Bureau of Standards, one of six units of the Department of Commerce reporting to the Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology. The law required the Secretary, on the basis of the findings and conclusions of the study, to make "such recommendations as he considers to be appropriate and in the best interests of the United States."

In July, 1971, the Secretary of Commerce released a 170-page report to the Congress whose title sums up its conclusions: "A Metric America: A Decision Whose Time Has Come."

The Secretary accepted all the conclusions of the report. He primarily recommended "that the United States change to the International Metric System deliberately and carefully; that this be done through a coordinated national program; and that early priority be given to educating every American schoolchild and the public at large to think in metric terms." I shall cover the remainder of the Secretary's recommendations shortly, for he endorsed all of the findings and recommendations of the study itself—nine in all.

Twelve supplemental investigations resulted in interim reports covering many aspects of the metric question, including manufacturing and non-manufacturing firms, impacts on education and foreign trade, international standards, engineering standards, and effects on the consumer.

Already we see many fields either already metric or going metric.

Ford is manufacturing a 2.3 liter Mustang II motor, at its new Lima, Ohio plant, to be

used in the Mustang and the Pinto. Some of the bearings on most U.S. made cars are metric. And every automobile has at least one metric part, the sparkplug, the thread portion of which is metric.

Everybody is familiar too, with 16mm and 8mm movies. So, you see, the metric language is like prose: we've been speaking it all our lives without realizing it.

The pharmaceutical industry is altogether metric. The physician prescribes, and the pharmacist fills the prescription, in grams or liters. The *Journal of the American Medical Association*, and the 10 specialty publications of the AMA, use only metric terms.

Everybody who's ever participated in track, or watched the Olympics is familiar with the 100-meter dash. My first introduction to metric was in junior high when I was an AAU swimmer—my favorite was the 100-meter backstroke.

Most children who have been in grade or elementary school in the past five or six years have been exposed to the metric system in their mathematics courses. Teachers and parents, alike, are concerned that children waste an inordinate amount of time learning one system of measurement which is having less and less use to them. If they are serious about science, then they have to learn another system, the metric. Learning is fun, real learning, but dull problems in conversion are no fun—they're just a dastardly trick on the children. What a way to make children think science is boring or too hard! When, in fact, science is fun, and, as you who are teachers know, the physical laws of nature are a cinch to understand, like Newton's equation in metric.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE METRIC SYSTEM

There were five major findings of the metric study:

First, the United States already makes some, even considerable, use of the metric system of measurement. In addition to the fields mentioned, space exploration, auto emissions standards, and bearings are all metric.

Second, metric use in the U.S. is increasing. One hundred major U.S. industrial concerns are committed to going metric. IBM has adopted its own 10-year conversion plan. Deere and Company is manufacturing, for export, farm equipment to metric measurements. International Harvester, at its plant in Illinois, is producing bulldozers and other construction equipment to metric—only to name a few.

Third, the metric study found that 70 percent of the manufacturers surveyed said that they favored increased use of the metric system, as in the best interest of the nation and its economy.

Fourth, more than 90 percent of the manufacturers surveyed did not want to drift into this change. They preferred a coordinated national program.

And fifth, whether we go metric by design, or whether we go metric by accident, the changeover will involve costs. The best estimates that can be made are that it would cost less in actual dollars if we plan for a metric changeover than if we just allow it to happen. As it is, we are drifting into becoming a metric country. Because we are all concerned about costs, let me repeat: The costs of continuing to drift are bound to be higher, over the long run, than a planned and orderly change. It goes without saying that if the *Scientific American* editor had had his way 50 years ago, or better still, if John Quincy Adams had carried through on his convictions, we wouldn't be worrying about metric costs today!

A planned metrification should and would involve four basic principles. These are:

1. The rule of reason
2. Costs lie where they fall
3. Voluntary changeover
4. Private sector initiative

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

October 1, 1973

I shall return to these four basic principles when I conclude with a discussion of pending metric legislation.

Last November, Australia embarked on a 10-year changeover with a plan similar to the Nixon Administration bill now in the U.S. Congress, which I shall explain in a few moments. Can you imagine what problems Australia has encountered? The Australian Government estimates the changeover will require only 6 or 7 years, not 10.

Great Britain, which got us started using English units in the first place, is now leaving us behind and going metric.

A POTENTIAL METRIC CONTRIBUTION TO THE ENERGY CRISIS

Consumers already have many challenges in selecting and using products in the home, confronted as they are by matters such as reliability, safety, and effectiveness. Now we all have a new concern: How much energy does this appliance or that appliance consume? One cannot tell readily because we measure energy in Btu's, calories, kilogram calories, therm, foot-pounds, and kilowatt-hours. In response to a directive of President Nixon—contained in his Energy Policy Message of April 18—we, in the Department of Commerce, are developing a Voluntary Labeling Program for Energy Conservation. After I announced the procedures in the *Federal Register*, we received over 30 comments, from manufacturers, retailers, associations, consumer organizations and individuals. These were overwhelmingly favorable to the concept of energy labeling. I am now having the National Bureau of Standards analyze these comments, and during the next month I expect to be able to publish in the *Federal Register* a proposed Voluntary Energy Conservation Specification. I regret that it may not include any metric terms because each industry has gone down its own path. But, eventually, I believe we will come to a standardization of energy language. In fact, I would like to propose one here today—the joule. For the consumer, the use of a single metric unit, the joule, for measuring energy consumption in various uses might be advantageous. In heating, for example, the relative costs of various available fuels (gas, oil, coal, or electricity) per joule would be a guide—to be used judiciously, for sure—as to which fuel is most economical.

In the case of air conditioning, the use of a single unit, the joule, could be used for measuring both energy intake and cooling output. Knowing what goes in and what comes out would readily yield an "efficiency" rating. When that rating is divided into the cost per joule for each fuel considered, one would have the cost per unit of cooling. Once we are assured that such labeling would not unduly complicate the Voluntary Energy Conservation Labeling Program, it will be adopted. But that will not come for perhaps a year or more.

U.S. METRICATION: PROGNOSIS

The Administration's metric bill has six features, which I would like to list. They reflect the basic principles mentioned earlier. The first is voluntary change to predominant use of the metric system. All sectors of the society would be encouraged to use the metric system of weights and measures. Not required—encouraged. This follows the rule of reason. There should be almost no replacement of capital goods. Clearly tools and dies and machines cost a lot of money. The manufacturer should not replace them insofar as possible until the normal time of replacement, since in almost all cases they can be modified by replacing a scale or a dial—if a change is needed at all.

The second principle is "costs lie where they fall." As a corollary, the proposed changeover plan would provide no government subsidies. Let me interject here, however, that if—not when, but if—a burden develops for any business, we hope to hear

about it promptly. We want any citizen who is adversely affected to make his case. And we are your servants to try to ease inequities, should any arise, and if we can.

Third, the Administration's bill would establish a National Metric Conversion Board composed of up to 21 distinguished private citizens appointed by the President, 2 members of the House of Representatives selected by the Speaker of the House, and 2 members of the Senate.

Fourth, the primary assignment of this Board would be to develop and submit to the Secretary of Commerce, within 12 months after funds are appropriated for it, a comprehensive plan to accomplish the changeover to the metric system in the United States. In developing the plan, the Board would be required to consult with U.S. commerce and industry, including small business, science, engineering, labor, education, consumers, nationally recognized standards developing and coordinating organizations, government agencies, Federal, state, and local, and, where appropriate, with foreign governments and public international organizations. The Secretary would approve and transmit this final plan to the President. The bill would give no compulsory powers to the Board, and the changeover proposed by it would be entirely voluntary.

Fifth, upon approval of the plan by the President, it would be submitted to the Congress. The Board would begin implementing the plan 60 calendar days following the date it is delivered to the Congress.

Sixth, while voluntary for the private sector, the plan would be, in effect, compulsory for the Government. Let me reiterate, it is the goal of the bill that metric units would become the predominant, though not exclusive, language of measurement within 10 years from the date the Board commences implementing the changeover plan. Those U.S. engineering designs, practices, and conventions that are internationally accepted or embody superior technology would be retained in the new metric language. The program unquestionably would include extensive public information and educational programs to acquaint the public with the meaning, applicability, and advantages of the metric system in their daily life. The bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the National Science Foundation to counsel and consult with educational groups to assure that the metric system is made a part of the curricula of the nation's educational system, and that teachers are properly trained to teach in metric terms. Finally, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to consult with the National Conference of Weights and Measures so as to assure that state and local weights and measures officials are appropriately informed of the changeover. After all, they will have to accomplish timely amendments to weights and measures laws.

Personally, I see no barriers to the United States going metric in an orderly fashion. The American people are pioneers—in every way except metric. We are open-minded to change. In many instances, the changeover will require less than 10 years. For example, multi-national corporations cannot wait that long. Some industries and businesses may require much longer than 10 years. I predict that students will be delighted to junk the irrational, old system.

Where does the legislation stand today? Congressman John W. Davis's Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, has held hearings on H.R. 5749, the Administration metric bill, which I have described, plus 12 additional metric bills. Soon after Congress reconvenes, I expect the Subcommittee to report a bill to the full Committee. The Senate Committee on Commerce, chaired by Senator Warren G. Magnuson, has

before it another bill, S. 100. The Senate, also in the fall, will probably take action on S. 100 or on the metric bill reported out by the House Subcommittee. Thus, we have a prospective bill heading to the floor of both houses of the Congress, probably before the end of the year. That is as far as a prudent person should go in prognosticating anything that the Congress might do. All the evidence, however, is that the key individuals in Congress want a strong metric bill as soon as feasible. So does this Administration, and I think so do all of us.

California is leading the nation in "progressive metrification." Last month the Division of Oil and Gas switched to metric, and I believe this is the first state agency in any of the 50 states to take that step. Your Superintendent of Public Instruction has announced that California schools will convert, starting immediately. By the fall of 1976, our bicentennial year, all mathematics and science textbooks used in all the schools of the state will use only metric measurements. I hope the other 49 states will follow, because California—again—has the right idea.

THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION ACT OF 1965

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Congress has long made it clear that its intent regarding its immigration and nationality laws was to keep family units together and to preserve family ties. To do so, it has been willing to acknowledge the less than rigorous enforcement of the immigration laws.

The Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965, improving upon earlier immigration legislation, demonstrated our humanitarian interest and concern for the peoples of the world by equalizing treatment under our laws all people wishing to emigrate to our country from both the Western and Eastern Hemispheres. This new preference system initiated in 1965 has functioned well, but there are a few points which I feel need correction.

The bills which I am introducing today will enable sons and daughters and parents to be more easily united with their families; facilitate naturalization despite language difficulties; and update adjustment provisions for law-abiding persons who are ineligible for permanent residence despite having resided in this country continuously over a long period of time.

Two of the bills essentially clarify the language of two sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act by substituting the words "son, or daughter" for "or child." It is necessary to do this because the law defines a "child" as being an individual under 21 years of age; therefore, sons, and daughters of citizens who are over 21 are ineligible for the privileges accorded a "child" in these sections of the act. This substitution would make the Act consistent with the intent of the Congress in seeking to reunite families by excluding spouses, parents, "sons or daughters" of U.S. citizens or permanent residents from deportation or excludability because of fraudulent information

on visas or other documents necessary to gain entrance to this country.

Other provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act stipulate that understanding, reading, writing, and speaking English is a prerequisite to naturalization. Only people over 50 years of age and having resided in the United States for at least 20 years at the time the law was enacted in 1952, or those physically unable to comply, are exempt.

This measure should be extended a bit further in light of the Supreme Court rulings on literacy as a qualification for voting rights. Essentially, the Court has ruled that citizens are considered intelligent enough to exercise their franchise without literacy tests, or with a knowledge of Spanish or Hawaiian. In view of this ruling, my bill proposes that people over the age when they can successfully master a new language, who are literate in their native tongue and meet all other qualification standards, should be permitted naturalization.

Further, this bill would allow those over 60 years of age and having resided in this United States for at least 20 years, to waive the literacy requirement if they otherwise are qualified for naturalization.

The last bill which I am submitting today is a further continuation on the same theme, and attempts to cope with the estimated 1 or 2 million illegal aliens presently in our country. Although not a solution to this problem, my bill would permit persons who have resided continuously in the United States since 1965 who have conducted themselves in a lawful manner, and are of good moral character to be allowed to take their place in our society without fear of deportation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, these bills do not present a departure from previous immigration policy, but merely reaffirm the Congress' humanitarian inclination to relax the enforcement of immigration laws when it comes to family units. This country has traditionally welcomed those from abroad seeking a new life in this country, and although we have been forced to limit the number of people admitted to the United States, it has never been the intent of the Congress to break up family units or to threaten deportation of those who have lived a substantial portion of their lives as normal, law-abiding citizens in the interests of rigorously enforced immigration laws.

Favorable action on this legislation is then a further testament to the Congress' purview on this matter.

OEO COMMUNITY WORKERS AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, strange the company that some of the employees of the Office of Economic Op-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

portunity keep. A case in point is the story in the People's World of June 2, 1973, the west coast's official organ of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. It mentions OEO community workers as helping to provide a massive security guard for a meeting with Beulah Sanders of the National Welfare Rights Organization. Among the groups also listed as providing security were the Young Socialist Alliance, the Black Panther Party, and the Communist Party. The question arises as to why this association exists, and I think this sort of activity merits closer scrutiny by the Congress. The article follows:

[From the People's World, June 2, 1973]

WRO ALIVE AND GROWING

SEATTLE.—A dramatic demonstration of community support and a determination to build issue-oriented coalitions based on that support highlighted a Washington State Welfare Rights conference here May 23 to 26.

Repeated threats from the National Caucus of Labor Committees led the WRO leaders to call on the community to guarantee the security of the conference. Seattle clergymen, the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice, the Rank and File Trade Union Committee, Blank Panther party, the Young Workers' Liberation League, the Communist party, the Young Socialist Alliance, Tacoma's Half-way House and OEO community workers provided a massive security guard for the kick-off banquet honoring Beulah Sanders, National WRO president. Ample security was also provided throughout the conference, and there was no disruption.

Speaking briefly at the banquet, Ms. Sanders heaped contempt upon the NCLC and said, "No one needs a new WRO. No one is rebuilding WRO. It never fell apart. It is alive and growing."

Two days were spent in intensive analysis of budget cuts and new repressive regulations in federal and state welfare programs. Cost over-runs in military procurement programs, Elaine McLean said, are higher than the total cost of all federal social service programs.

Saturday was devoted to planning for increased membership and a continuing research, education and advocacy program. Elaine McLean was elected state president and Kathryn Smith first vice president.

The conference wound up with an unexpected appearance by Will Parry, president of the Northern Washington District Council of the Assn. of Western Pulp and Paper Workers. He told how labor support had helped force the 1973 legislative session to provide supplemental public assistance grants to unemployed fathers.

"All working people have common interests," he declared, "whether they are on the job, on unemployment, or on welfare."

He urged the WRO to support such labor legislation as higher minimum wage laws and extension of protective legislation to all workers.

STILL MORE ABOUT URANIUM ENRICHMENT

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to keep the Congress posted on the important subject of the future structure of the uranium enrichment industry in the United States. This entry

today is a continuation of that effort and is preliminary to phase II hearings on the subject before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which commence tomorrow.

On September 5 at page 28429 of this RECORD will be found my basic statement on the subject. On September 10 at page 28973-74 are questions and answers relating to a plan I proposed for the transition of the industry from a government monopoly to private enterprise. Later, at page 30946, is found my letter to Roy Ash, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, further discussing my plan.

Below there is reproduced Mr. Ash's communication to me dated September 28 reiterating the administration's previous positions on the subject and my October 1 reply thereto, which enclosed the tables referred to in its text:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1973.
Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CRAIG: I am responding for the Administration to the plan you have outlined to establish a Government corporation to provide uranium enrichment services for the growing nuclear power industry.

I was very glad to have an opportunity to discuss this important matter with you on September 12 and again on September 26, to get the benefit of your knowledge of the intricacies of this important subject.

The details of your proposals to create a new U.S. Enrichment Corporation (USEC) and the comments conveyed in your letter of September 21 have been carefully reviewed by my staff, working closely with the AEC, Governor Love's Energy Policy Office, the Domestic Council, and the Council on International Economic Policy.

As I understand your position, you believe that private industry must ultimately be expected to meet future needs; that there is a danger of a shortage of uranium enrichment availability for the nuclear power industry, both domestic and foreign, in the early 1980's; that there is a need to make effective contractual commitments for enriched uranium; that construction of additional capacity by AEC itself would be beyond the legitimate scope of the Government's responsibilities; and that a new Government corporation, patterned after TVA should be established to provide at least the initial increments of additional capacity.

We recognize that this is a very significant matter. The issues are not new, but they have indeed been underscored by the understandable desire of the electric utilities and our foreign customers to have assurances that an adequate supply of enriched uranium will be available to meet growing demands. The hearings conducted by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy this past summer and your efforts in particular have been very helpful in focusing attention on the matter.

The President feels very strongly about the importance of nuclear power in helping to solve our energy problem, and the enrichment of uranium is, of course, a vital part of the process of producing nuclear power. As you know, the Atomic Energy Commission is currently expanding its uranium enrichment plants at a cost of nearly a billion dollars. Moreover, AEC has been conducting important research to develop an improved uranium enrichment process, and it is making the technology available to American industry under appropriate safeguards. We consider this "access program" to be of great importance, and we understand from the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

industrial participants that it is working well.

The President continues to believe, as he has stated publicly on several occasions, that now is the appropriate time for private industry to begin to shoulder responsibility in this area. In his April 18, 1973, message on energy, he stated explicitly that the Government is looking to private industry to provide the additional uranium enrichment capacity that will be required beginning in the early 1980's.

We have reviewed this entire matter carefully and have concluded that there is a high probability that private industry will be both willing and able to provide the next increments of capacity for producing enriched uranium in the early 1980's that will be needed to fulfill requirements in this country and to maintain our leadership in world markets. As you and I have discussed, we must make certain that the transition to the private sector does not result in a "nuclear fuel gap." We agree fully with you and the utilities who will be dependent upon the fuel that this must not occur. We are confident that the Administration's plan does not run this risk. If at a later time we find that private industry fails to meet our expectations, the Administration would, of course, have to consider other approaches, including a Government Corporation. At the present time we believe the best course is to continue to encourage private companies to enter the business rather than to come forth with a new proposal.

In this connection, AEC has advised us that it can make adjustments within reasonable limits in the future operating mode of its enrichment plants (i.e., raising the "tails assay") in such a way as to increase the supply of enriched uranium to be compatible with a range of completion dates for new private plants. The precise dates can be established by the joint efforts of private suppliers and their customers.

One of the primary objectives cited for the Government Corporation which you propose would be to continue the uninterrupted offering of contracts for separative work, thus avoiding the possibility of a "contracting gap." Actions necessary to deal with any potential "contracting gap" can be taken by the AEC under existing legislative authority without creating a new Government entity. Contracts signed by the AEC in advance of those offered by private companies would later be terminated when private contracts are available, thus giving customers an opportunity to negotiate the most favorable arrangements with private suppliers.

As indicated, we are much encouraged by the expressed determination of several companies to enter the enriched uranium field. We are concerned that establishing USEC could prove to be a disincentive for companies interested in entering the field and thus perpetuate the Federal Government in an industrial activity which can and should be conducted by the private sector. There are many functions which only the Government can sensibly undertake, but I question whether this is one of them.

In summary, we believe that our plan to have private industry provide the necessary increments of capacity is the correct approach and will provide the additional capacity when it is needed. The Government will continue to provide assistance in key areas through the conduct of necessary research and development and access to AEC's technology. In addition, AEC will operate its enrichment plants in a manner conducive to the entry of private firms on a realistic and achievable time schedule. We believe it is in the best interest of this country and our valued foreign customers to assure the estab-

lishment of a private enrichment industry. We will continue to follow the whole matter closely.

We welcome the support of future enrichment suppliers and customers for the Administration's plan. We also welcome your basic support for the objective of private enrichment activities, and we look forward to further discussions of this vitally important matter.

With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

Roy L. Ash,
Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 1, 1973.

Re: Uranium enrichment.

Hon. Roy L. Ash,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
Executive Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR ROY: This responds to your September 28 letter reaffirming the Administration's view that private industry will be able to make a timely phase-in to the uranium enrichment industry which would avoid (a) an actual nuclear fuel gap in the 1980's and (b) a contracting gap in the 1970's for separative work which would result in a competitive disadvantage to the United States in the world market for this service.

Despite your impressive recital that the views expressed in your letter have been backstopped by the Domestic Council, Governor Love's Energy Policy Office, the Council on International Economic Policy, et al., I nevertheless find them indicative of a somewhat superficial understanding of the intricacies of the enrichment game in relation to the facts as I understand them. This could be the case, since uranium enrichment questions have had a very low priority at the White House up to now.

Please refer to my enclosed document dated 9/27/73 which lists (a) the assumed intentions of the AEC's industrial participants and associated consortia, and, (b) the year-by-year addition of enrichment capacity which AEC says must occur in the 1980's. Since giving the latter data to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy last month, I understand AEC now feels there may be up to a year's slippage in dates the requirements will fall due. That will affect timing, but not the fact that within a period slightly over 36 months 25.5 million s.w.u. of new enrichment capacity will be needed. This almost equals the 27.5 million s.w.u. enlarged capacity of AEC's three big diffusion plants. Moreover, within the next following year the installation of another 6 million units must occur.

With that very large amount of industrial activity within a very limited time period in mind I now refer you to the portion of the document which lists assumed intentions of the above-mentioned participants. In contrast to it, your letter states that you are "much encouraged by the expressed determination of several companies to enter the enriched uranium field." I would be very pleased to know who expresses such determination. I only know that certain industrial participants listed in my document are looking things over and that the consortia indicates 1974 as the year they will make decisions about getting into the business or not. If you can furnish me the names and plans of any people now committed to installing capacity it will ease my mind considerably.

Let us assume that those names will be the two consortia and that both are committed to build a 10,000,000 s.w.u. capacity enrichment plant costing \$1-\$1½ billion in each case. If done in a mature fashion, that will give us 20,000,000 units against the 25,500,000 I men-

October 1, 1973

tioned earlier, leaving 5.5 million begging for that year and another 6 million the next year. Who will pick up that total of 11,500,000 s.w.u.'s?

Within this scenario, not only must that 11.5 million be on the line in time to avoid a nuclear fuel gap, but the decision to put it on the line must have been made and contracts offered to utilities to supply it nine years earlier in order to avoid the contracting gap discussed in your letter.

Your people have indicated to you that this gap may be avoided simply by having the AEC issue contracts pursuant to what you describe as "existing legislative authority" to supply separative work which it does not have capacity in being or dedicated to construction, which contracts can be terminated if private suppliers make their timely entrances into the picture. My understanding of the anti-deficiency statute indicates to me that such a practice would constitute a clear violation of law. Thus my second request is that you obtain an authoritative legal opinion on this point which will indicate whether or not legislation will be needed to carry forward your scheme. From past experience we know that tampering with the anti-deficiency statute has never been looked upon kindly by the Congress.

Along this line, and although it may or may not bring up another legal question, I believe you and those who are advising you may want to achieve a more perfect understanding of what may be involved in the expedient of raising tails assays to stretch out the date by which new capacity may be needed to avoid any actual fuel gap.

The option even to consider this gimmick arises from the historical accident of AEC's considerable stockpile of uranium built up from policies in the 1950's encouraging uranium exploration. Many millions of dollars went into this stockpile. Later, when the apparent need for uranium subsided, the presence of the massive stockpile turned into a real threat to the viability of the uranium mining and milling industry. Some very clever persons suggested that the threat could be alleviated by raising the tails assay which produces the same amount of enrichment service for a lesser amount of power. There is a trade-off of uranium feed for electric power. But, if you assume the AEC enrichment complex continues to operate at the standard rather than the adjusted tails assay, there is no difference in actual cost to be reflected in the AEC's price of its product to customers.

However, Roy, under the circumstances you relate, jimmying the tails assay will not be done to keep the mining and milling industry alive, but for the purpose of delaying the required date for new private enrichment capacity. In the first case apparently nobody is being hurt so no one has raised the question of the legality of disposing of the uranium stockpile in this way or the legality of AEC's failure to recalculate its costs and, therefore, its charge to customers while operating under a changed mode. In the second case that inquiry will become increasingly pertinent in relation to the actual shortages of uranium (and therefore increased value of the stockpile) projected by George Quinn in his Phase I testimony. Further, the first case is one of juggling public assets for public purposes. The second case is one of expending a public asset, uranium feed, for the benefit of some private corporation's schedule for entering the enrichment business. Additionally, there are philosophical and economic ramifications to the problem of how much higher cost uranium should one plan to trade off during an energy shortage era for how much electric power to achieve what ultimate ends. Maybe you could furnish me some thoughts on these tails questions, along

with any ideas on the legal question raised as to pricing the AEC's product.

It is not my purpose to be querulous in requesting the data I have asked for in this letter. Rather, it is my purpose to put the kinds of questions to you and your advisors which will dispel the hint of superficiality signalled by your letter.

After that, I really think that some detailed discussion with the President on this subject ought to be arranged. Your people all speak in his name and of such things as the President's policies, but we know that

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the contents of your letter to me are the views of you and your associates in your capacities as aids and subordinates of the President. I think that somewhere along the line the issue is quite important enough to justify so much of the President's personal time as may be necessary for him to fairly hear my views as well as yours and render the decision that is Constitutionally his.

With best personal regards,

Cordially,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

ASSUMED INTENTIONS OF INDUSTRIAL PARTICIPANTS AND CONSORTIA

Will decide about building an enrichment plant sometime in 1974: GE/Exxon; Westinghouse/Union Carbide/Bechtel (UEA).

Want to sell centrifuges and components to someone else: Garrett; Goodyear; United Aircraft; Electro-Nucleonics/Hercules Powder/Burns & Roe.

Want to sell coal by building diffusion plant over coal mine: Reynolds Metals.

Intention not yet subject to assumption: IT&T.

NEW U.S. ENRICHMENT CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS BEYOND AEC's EXISTING PLANTS

[In millions of separative work units per year]

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1990-95	1995-20	2000-05	2005-10	2010-15	2015-20
Annual.....	1.3	13.8	3.8	6.6	6.0	4.6	5.6	7.1	26.0	26.4	16.0	-3.2	-22	-35
Cumulative.....	1.3	15.1	18.9	25.5	31.5	36.1	41.7	48.8	74.8	101.2	117.2	114.0	92	57

From this exchange of correspondence, I conclude that there is loose and ambiguous kind of agreement between the administration's position and my beliefs in three general areas, as follows:

First, although a nuclear fuel gap could be avoided by heroic measures, if necessary, it is more intelligent to plan in advance for an orderly supply of enrichment capacity as needed to meet demand in order to avoid future nuclear fuel supply crises.

Second, in the interest of continuous U.S. competition in the world enrichment market, a nuclear fuel contracting gap should be avoided. The date by which a U.S. unity with capability to offer contracts to provide enrichment separative work for this purpose is now approximately mid-1975 instead of the latter part of 1974 as previously estimated by AEC. This is due to a general delay in installing nuclear reactors and the less than previously estimated capacity at which they are being operated.

Third, private enterprise should be encouraged and reasonably assisted to assume the burden of adding new capacity to meet new demands for separative work as soon as possible.

However, there exist divergencies between the administration's outlook on the future structure of the uranium enrichment industry and my own views on the subject which include the following:

First, whether private enterprise can move fast enough to supply new increments of enriching capacity totaling initially some 31.5 million units of separative work capacity which, according to AEC's calculations, must be installed in a period of just a little over 48 months. Assuming the two identified consortia—GE/Exxon and Westinghouse/Union Carbide/Bechtel—proceed to install 10 million units each during this period, another 11.5 m.s.w.u.'s still will have to be provided by them or someone else. Presently, no one is identified as seeking to pick up this business, and my conclusion is that it will go begging unless someone pleasantly surprises us.

Second, whether the meaning of private enterprise in the context used above means competitive private enterprise or just a duopoly consisting of the two named consortia. It is my feeling that a truly competitive economy is required to

protect electric utility purchasers of separative work from the oppressions of monopolists, and to get enough companies in the centrifuge and enrichment component supply businesses to build a sufficient manufacturing base soon enough to get the relatively large amount of capacity installed during the mentioned 48-month period in the mid-1980's which will be needed to supply rapidly growing nuclear fuel needs.

GASOLINE SHORTAGE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, the Mobil Oil Co., published an open letter in the Washington Post to Congressman GILBERT GUDE and myself. An identical copy of this letter was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 11, 1973, by Congressman MICHAEL HARRINGTON.

According to Mobil, political decisions produced the current shortage of gasoline.

Since this open letter contained Mobil's "facts" about the gasoline shortage, I wrote a letter to the Acting Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency asking him to reply to the statements set forth in Mobil's letter.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD, my letter to the Environmental Protection Agency and the reply I received from the Acting Administrator, Mr. John Quarles:

JULY 26, 1973.

Hon. ROBERT W. FRI,
Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Waterside Hall, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: In The Washington Post of July 10, 1973 there appeared an open letter (advertisement) from Mobil Oil Company to Congressman Gilbert Gude and myself. This open letter appeared to be part of a nationwide press campaign. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 11, 1973 there is the "open response" of Congressman Michael Harrington to Mobil Oil. Since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD includes the wording of the advertisement and the response, I am enclosing a copy.

I have noted two trends which have arisen since the so-called "gasoline shortage". The first involved contracts for major users such as Prince George's County. The County found it necessary to drastically curtail consumption even for essential services such as trash collection and police vehicles. The County at the time was busing for racial balance the greatest number of students ever ordered by the U. S. Courts. Alternate supply sources have now been explored and, of course, the schools are currently in their summer vacation period. We cannot foresee what may happen in the fall when schools are reopened.

The other trend is the greatly increased price for gasoline on major contracts. Of lesser note was the effect of decreased supplies to the independents.

I will certainly appreciate your comments on the "open letter".

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,
Member of Congress.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1973.

Hon. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOGAN: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Mobil Oil Corporation's "Open Letter" to Members of Congress regarding the gasoline shortage. Without a doubt environmental considerations have become an important factor in energy decisions and will become increasingly more important in the days ahead. Through the balance of this century the public, directly and through their elected representatives, will be making many energy-environmental decisions. We will need all the facts we can get.

Mobil claims to set out facts. They do, but not all of them. And sometimes the omitted facts are the most important ones. Also, in many cases, a direct cause and effect relationship between the stated facts is subject to question. My first response to Mobil's assertions is "yes, but..."

Gasoline production is at an all-time high this year—as it has been almost every year since World War II. This year's increase in demand has not been as great as last year's, which was abnormally high, and refineries have been able to increase production to match the demand. In fact, for the first time in years, industrial stockpiles of gasoline are larger in August than they were in May.

There have been some shortages in gasoline in certain areas. These have not been caused because gasoline was in overall short supply, but because some companies did not have as much access to new crude supplies as others and were unable to meet the growth in demand. Many companies rely on domestic crude oil but need to buy imports because

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

production is depleting in most domestic fields.

Secondly, since domestic refineries are running at full capacity, there is no incentive for refiners to cut prices, or sell at wholesale, in order to increase sales. With refineries in full production, the refiners are attempting to sell as much at retail as possible, so that maximum revenues and profits can be gained. The result is that independent marketers lose their sources of supply and shortages develop where consumers depend on independents.

Mobil contends that environmental considerations have barred offshore exploration activities and, in some cases, that is true. The public, and in turn the government which is accountable to the public, is apprehensive about offshore oil spills and well blow-outs because these events have occurred. The principal reason for this apprehension is that offshore production can be very harmful to the environment under certain circumstances, and can be benign under others. What is important is that every lease sale be evaluated in detail, as they now are, so that sales can continue if they are adjudged to be more beneficial than harmful.

The United States is going to need the oil and natural gas reserves in the outer continental shelf areas. In determining whether offshore drilling in any particular area is worth the risk, three factors should be considered: (1) the value of the area exposed to the risk in relation to the value of the potential reserves; (2) the stability of the geologic structure to be drilled into; and (3) the operating practices and performance of the companies seeking drilling rights. The greater the risk, the more stringent the U.S. Geological Survey operating rules and EPA permit requirements should be for offshore production.

Mobil blames environmentalists for delaying the development of Alaska's North Slope oil and gas reserves and exonerates the oil companies. The companies' original plan for moving the oil out of Alaska had many environmental deficiencies and was bound to engender opposition. The companies have modified their proposal to eliminate many of the deficiencies so that the transport system that is now planned is much stronger than the original one. Had the stronger plan been proposed in the first instance, much of the delay probably would have been avoided.

Mobil says environmental constraints have blocked the construction of refineries and ports for supertankers. Most of this opposition has been at the local level because, historically, refineries and tanker facilities have not always been good neighbors. Had the companies built and operated refineries and tanker facilities with proper environmental safeguards, there would have been less reason for the degree of local opposition which most large industry has encountered.

Mobil contends that pollution control equipment and convenience devices on automobiles are responsible for a large part of this year's increase in gasoline demand. Undeniably, emissions control devices reduce gasoline mileage for some cars. This loss has been about 10% for the average of all 1973 vehicles as compared with the average of all models for the last ten years without emission controls. Small cars have shown no loss at all, but large cars show losses up to 18%. But other factors have had an even greater impact. Air conditioning, in addition to adding to vehicle weight, can cut fuel mileage up to 20 percent depending upon weather and traffic conditions. Weight is another factor to be considered—a 5,000-pound car consumes twice as much gasoline as a 2,500-pound one and the trend has been towards heavier automobiles. Between 1962 and 1972, even with a rise in the number of American-made compacts, average domestic car weight increased from about 3,500 pounds to 3,850 pounds. The

inclusion of an automatic transmission may also cause a fuel penalty. On the other hand, at least one American manufacturer expects to improve the gasoline mileage of new cars with the introduction of the 1975 catalytic emissions control systems.

By limiting the amounts of pollutants released into the community's atmosphere, control devices continuously provide a valuable social function. They are clearly necessities, not luxuries. Gasoline is being wasted by air conditioning, superfluous weight and automatic transmissions and other powered accessories, not by emissions controls.

The number of automobiles in the United States increases substantially every year. Cars are bigger and more powerful. There is a boom today in campers, off-road recreational vehicles and pleasure boating, all of which drain gasoline supplies. Americans do use too much gasoline but by no stretch of the imagination can pollution control devices be held accountable for a large part of the gasoline demand.

Mobil blames ill-advised government regulatory policies for the shortage of natural gas last winter which forced industrial plants to burn large quantities of heating oil, causing a shortage of that fuel for homeowners. The oil companies, in fact, were tripped up by their computers and the weather. According to their computers, the level of fuel oil inventory for the 1972-73 heating season did not need to be maintained at the same high level as the previous year. Unfortunately, the weather did not cooperate.

Mobil defends the oil industry against conspiracy accusations by saying that conspiracy requires secrecy and the oil industry operates in a fish bowl where secrecy is impossible. To conspire is to work together for a common objective; it need not be done secretly. The Federal Trade Commission has initiated legal proceedings to determine whether such a conspiracy has in fact occurred, as the FTC believes it has.

Mobil contends that: "Oil is one of the least-concentrated major industries in the world. No oil company supplies as much as nine percent of the U.S. gasoline market." True, there are thousands of oil producers but eight major companies easily dominate the industry. And as Secretary Shultz pointed out in his 1971 analysis of import quotas, the industry has the ability to manipulate data to reflect whatever situation it desires.

Mobil maintains that the major companies are not cutting off gasoline supplies to independent retailers. Yet in 1968 independents had 19 percent of all retail gasoline sales and by the end of 1972 this share had grown to 26 percent. Since January the sales by independents have dropped back to 19 percent.

The issues that Mobil raises are typical examples of how our fragmented way of developing new energy sources results in a bewildering exchange of energy thrusts and environmental parries. At a time which demands dispassionate analysis and sound judgment we seem instead to be getting escalated psychological warfare. We simply cannot afford the luxury of reflexive opposition, whether it be industry opposition to environmental regulation or environmental opposition to industrial development. Such behavior only leads to conflicts which delay decisions, often for so long a time that the ultimate decision must be made between poorer alternatives than were available in the first instance.

If I can be of any assistance with specific inquiries, please let me know.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. QUARLES,
Acting Administrator.

October 1, 1973

CROCODILE TEARS BY SOME "FRIENDS" OF ANIMALS

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, an article written by Roger Latham and appearing in the September 9, 1973, issue of the Pittsburgh Press is both factual and thought provoking.

The writer is not an "instant expert" in the field of ecology and conservation. This is indeed refreshing, because statements made by witnesses at hearings I attend are proof positive that we have far too many of this "instant" type of expert. They are far more emotional than factual.

I have known and been associated with Roger Latham in the field of conservation for a quarter of a century. He is an authority in the field of conservation and is recognized as such by organizations and individuals everywhere who are knowledgeable in this field.

I submit this very fine article to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

CROCODILE TEARS BY SOME "FRIENDS" OF ANIMALS

(By Roger Latham)

All my life I have "rescued" baby rabbits and other helpless mammals from dogs, cats and other predators, fed them milk from a bottle and carefully nurtured them until they were old enough to release.

I have done the same for birds. I have set many a broken wing on hawks and owls which had been shot by a farmer who just didn't know the error of his ways. I have gathered up nestlings and dropped worms, insects or meat down their throats for days on end.

I have raised more "orphan" fawns than most people have ever seen—as high as 75 in a single spring. And I have carried starving deer out of deep February and March snows.

My profession for more than 20 years was wildlife biology—a career dedicated to the protection, preservation and management of birds and mammals.

Yet in spite of this obvious concern for animal life, I find myself being "turned off" almost totally by certain individuals and organizations professing to be "friends of animals." I am convinced that most of the tears they shed for the poor, defenseless animals are crocodile tears.

For people who can't bear to see a baby seal killed for its valuable fur, they are mighty callous about the lives of other animals. I'm convinced that this is because skunks, opossums, weasels, minks, foxes and other furbearers, killed by the millions for their fur, are not sufficiently photogenic to arouse the check-writing instincts of wealthy dowagers.

I also wonder why their concern seems to be limited to animals, and only certain animals at that, when millions of humans are underfed and starving, miserable beyond all comprehension, and dying by the tens of thousands.

I am not even a little bit amused by their suggestion that hunters should hunt and kill each other instead of shooting poor defenseless animals. This sounds a little blood-thirsty for the kind of sympathetic souls they profess to be.

Neither am I amused by their obvious ignorance. Their propaganda, sent indiscriminately to the public, is loaded with un-

truths, half-truths and downright lies. Some of their statements make professional wildlife biologists groan. Not one of these organizations I have in mind employ qualified biologists or ecologists.

But most of all, I condemn them for "dirty pool"—for being absolutely ruthless in their misguided and misdirected propaganda projects to dupe the public and raise more funds. They are often totally unethical and dishonest in their approach.

For example, the outrageous, slanderous film "Say Goodbye" is being distributed to libraries and school systems as an educational film. It is listed under the title "Man's Impact on the Environment—Wildlife."

Among the "lies" portrayed in this film is a horrible sequence showing a mother polar bear being shot by hunters from a helicopter. A great point is made that the poor twin cubs will now be left to starve.

Actually, the sequence was taken when game biologists were immobilizing the polar bear by using a tranquilizing gun. She was examined and ear-tagged while asleep and then restored to consciousness with a counteractive drug. Minutes later she walked off with her cubs, none the worse for her experience.

Even Walt Disney, that Hollywood personality who gave human emotions to animals, has been guilty over and over again of gross misrepresentation and prejudice. He has always pictured the hunter as the "bad guy," trying to kill Bambi's father, or Bambi himself for that matter.

He never cast the hunter as a sportsman or a conservationist in his films. Yet, it was the hunter and the hunter alone who was responsible for increasing the nation's deer from a few thousand at the turn of the century to a few million 20 or 30 years later. If it weren't for hunters, Bambi might never have been born!

Disney's favorite scene was the father deer with his lordly set of antlers, the mother deer, sweet and graceful with long eyelashes, and Bambi, beautiful innocent Bambi, with big sad eyes and spotted coat, all being pursued by mad, law-breaking, soulless hunters.

But anyone who knows anything about deer knows that there is no such thing as a deer family. The buck mates with as many as 8, 10 or more does in the fall and forgets them. He makes no effort to see any of his "wives" again, once the mating job is done. Certainly, he never knows whether he is a father or not.

Those who know deer also know that a buck has no antlers in the spring and summer when the fawns have spots. And they know that deer are not hunted anywhere at that time of year.

Yes, Walt Disney was guilty, too, even though I dislike condemning someone who was obviously talented. But he could have been honest and told it like it is.

This past winter, an article entitled "Hunting for Fun—Should We End It?" appeared in *Science World*—a weekly periodical circulated among the nation's secondary schools.

In one lead paragraph it read: "During the opening hours of the hunting season, thousands of shots may be fired. A few hundred of those shots may even hit deer. And, game wardens say, out of every five deer that are hit, one may be killed on the spot. What happens to the others?"

"Wounded deer flee through the woods. Most of these hurt, terrified deer will die later—out of sight of the hunters."

This is the kind of garbage your children are reading—material written by someone who obviously never got closer to the deer woods, or a conservation officer, than a Park Avenue apartment.

Ecology Kit I from the Follett Publishing Company in Chicago is used by many schools.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It flatly states: "Hunting is the biggest single threat to endangered species."

That is just as untrue as "Say Goodbye" and "Bambi." Sport hunting has never been the cause of the extinction of a single species.

Even the staid *Wall Street Journal* had an item by John E. Cooney with subheads as follows: "What's Beagling? It's Cheering As Beagles Rip Up Rabbits. And It's Great Family Fun."

Beaglers will gag on this one!

Don't misunderstand—there are highly respected organizations like World Wildlife Fund, Wildlife Management Institute, National Wildlife Federation and others which are legitimate and are doing wonderful work. But their activities and programs are directed by scientist-conservationists, not by emotional sentimentalists.

Against these latter unethical and uninformed people, I would like to see the sportsmen of this country rise up and shout "Foul!"

A BILL TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT TRAVELING IN OFFICIAL BUSINESS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. JOEL T. BROTHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. BROTHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill, H.R. 10539 on September 26, 1973, to increase the per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, to include experts and consultants and individuals serving without pay.

This bill would provide a per diem allowance of \$35 per day for travel inside the continental United States. This allowance is currently established at \$25 per day, which simply is inadequate to cover the costs for quarters, meals, and incidentals for today's traveler. When the maximum per diem allowance would be much less than expenses due to unusual circumstances of the travel assignment, this maximum named in the travel authorization may not exceed—\$55 for each day in a travel status inside the continental United States—current authorization is \$40 per day—the maximum per diem allowance plus \$33 for each day—increased from \$18 each day—in a travel status outside the continental United States.

Mr. Speaker, the last increase in per diem allowance was authorized in November 1969. I need not remind my colleagues of the rising cost of living, particularly severe during the period of time since the last per diem increase was authorized. When we consider this factor, along with the realization that many employees of the Government traveling on official business must now obviously defray expenses from out of pocket, it would seem to me that it is our responsibility to correct this inequity at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this a good bill and overdue. I urge its enactment.

WILDLIFE CONFLICT IN THE WICHITAS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Wildlife Conflict in the Wichitas" by Mr. Bill Foster appearing in the *Tulsa, Okla., Tribune* of Wednesday, August 15, 1973.

WILDLIFE CONFLICT IN THE WICHITAS

(By Bill Foster)

MEERS.—"I'll tell you one thing for sure," Roger Johnson said as we sat watching a covey of young quail dusting themselves in the warm sunshine. "We're not going to make another Yellowstone Park out of this place. If that happens, you can bet the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife won't be here."

As manager of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge adjacent to this small farming and ranching community 25 miles northwest of Lawton, Johnson has been at the center of the most heated policy controversy over the use of this 59,020-acre wildlife sanctuary since the mid-1950s when more than 10,000 acres of prime habitat were lopped off the refuge to create a safety zone to protect visitors from the big guns at nearby Fort Sill.

That drive was led by citizens of Lawton who felt their city faced economic disaster unless the firing range at the Field Artillery Center was expanded. "Who gives a damn about a few deer," was the often heard argument up and down the town's main streets.

Today, nearly two decades later, the issue is different. This time it is public use of approximately 20,000 acres, some of which has been abused almost to the point of being damaged beyond repair.

"This is a unique area," Johnson points out. "There is not another place like it in Oklahoma or northern Texas."

"The deer, the elk, the buffaloes, the longhorns and the wild lands we have here need to be preserved in as near a natural state as possible. We also need to leave some decisions for future generations. If we allow the land to be destroyed in the name of public recreation or for any other reason, there won't be any decisions left to be made."

And it is the partial elimination of non-wildlife oriented recreation—particularly swimming and camping—that has brought a storm of protests from local folk whom Johnson feels sometimes lose sight of the primary function of the refuge.

To date, he has closed four small recreation sites, primarily because there were no sanitary facilities at any of them. Two beaches which were closed accounted for only 34 percent of the swimming use during 1972.

"I think our (the bureau's) biggest failure has been to recognize there is a capacity for people on the refuge and we've attempted to accept all forms of use that are even remotely permissible on such an area."

"We find now that because of spacial, resource and monetary considerations we have to initiate some controls to bring the people use of the refuge into balance with the capacity to handle visitors."

The first time more than a million persons visited the refuge in a single year was 1962. That figure climbed steadily until it reached a high of 1.5 million in 1968. In recent years, the number of visitors declined to 1.3 million annually with the exception

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of last year when it was back at the one million mark.

Johnson says days of peak use create major difficulties and adds he feels this is partially the reason for the decline in visitors, 69 percent of which come from out of state.

"People come here to enjoy the wildlife and to escape the pressures of modern living. Instead, they find pressures in the form of mechanized camping, traffic jams and over-crowding."

There are 10 campgrounds on the refuge, none of which have electrical hookups and even the best would have to be classified as primitive.

The biggest problems, however, come under a classification Johnson calls "Other Use," which includes nighttime activities not associated with any of the refuge's major uses. This includes beer parties, drug use and other anti-social and criminal behavior.

Johnson says there are four categories of use best suited for the refuge's role in serving the public. They are basic and applied research in terms of wildlife management and public use; environmental education in which the refuge serves as an outdoor classroom, interpretation of wildlife and wild lands and fishing, hunting of surplus game populations and wildlife observation.

Already, programs are being initiated to bring the public use into line with wildlife oriented themes. The first will begin in September with a series of 13 guided tours to view bugling elk. Additional programs are being arranged for each month of the year.

The refuge was set aside in 1901 as a forest preserve but became a game sanctuary in 1905 when it became apparent that unless remedial measures were taken promptly the bison would become extinct. Over the years, additional species native to the area were added.

Between 1945 and 1965 some 4,222 deer were trapped and transported to other areas of the state. These animals served as foundation stock for many of the state's present deer herds.

The future role of the refuge rests in the hands of the Oklahoma congressional delegation and Sec. of Interior Rogers C. B. Morton. Petitions with names of more than 7,000 persons have already been sent to the congressional delegation asking that camping and swimming activities not only be maintained at the present level but increased.

And who cares about the damage or loss of a few more thousand acres of unique prairie and mountain country, especially if you don't give a damn about wildlife?

THE LIFE OF TOM VAIL

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, measured chronologically, the life of Tom Vail was a short one. But in terms of accomplishments, personal, and professional, it was full and rich. Few men who have lived twice as long have achieved half as much.

During more than two decades of congressional service as a member of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and as counsel to the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. Vail contributed importantly to the development of legislation which has improved the lives of many millions of Americans. Our Nation's tax, trade, social security, medi-

care, and medicaid laws are better statutes because of him.

At critical points in the course of such measures through the congressional process, he was often a calm force in a legislative storm. He had a justifiable reputation for keeping a cool head in the midst of controversy and a firm grip on key issues. He set a high standard in staff performance.

I know that I speak for all Members of the House who had dealings with him when I say that his passing will be felt throughout the Congress.

My entire family joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mr. Vail's family.

THE MURDER OF A LITTLE GIRL

HON. BILL GUNTER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, my constituent and friend, Samuel Roen, has recently written a book entitled, "Murder of a Little Girl." It is a meticulous and artful compilation of the facts surrounding a heinous crime, which I vividly recall, committed in central Florida. This book is well worth reading by every American who wants to be aware of the problems that exist in our communities—problems, which as responsible citizens, we must face up to and eliminate.

I commend the following article from the New Orleans Times-Picayune to my colleagues so that they may have a better understanding of this important work:

[From The Times-Picayune, Aug. 19, 1973]

MOLESTERS ARE SAID CAPABLE OF MURDER

(By Don Gross)

The same "criminal mind" inclined to sexually molest young children is behind the recently disclosed "homosexual torture ring" in Houston, Tex., according to a contemporary author.

Samuel Roen, author of the soon-to-be released "Murder of a Little Girl," said in a recent interview that American society is riddled with sexual deviates, fondlers, ex-posers, and peepers who prey on young children.

"When backed into a mental corner, these kinds of deviates will try to alleviate their tensions through a sexually related murder," he said. "There is an emotional disturbance in this type of person that receives sexual gratification from heinous activities," he added.

Roen paralleled the Houston murders with the story line of his new book, a true record of the celebrated 1969 murder of eight-year-old Camellia Jo Hand in Ocoee, Fla.

Roen spent three years studying the murder of the young girl as well as the police manhunt, arrest, and trial that led to the conviction of the murderer.

He has written a book that reveals the motives and background of this man while relating the incidents surrounding the case.

Kenneth Ray Wright, now serving a life sentence in a Florida penitentiary, had a criminal record from the time he was 14 years before the Ocoee murder at age 29.

"His life story is one incident of lesser crimes after another," Roen said. "He exposed himself publicly, forced himself into homes where he then exposed himself, and kept a Volkswagen van in a vacant lot into which he tried to lure passing girls."

October 1, 1973

"Every police station in this United States has reams of complaints about this type of person who is running around loose," Roen said. These small incidents are indications of the type of person who is driven to commit sexual murders, he added.

"Society is guilty of hiding this type of criminal. Rather than putting him into jail, he is ordered to leave town—just ordered out of one community and into another," he said.

A young girl or boy is an attraction for this kind of mind because the child offers no resistance or is incapable of resisting, Roen noted.

But what makes it so frustrating to deal with is that society presently has no way of detecting this kind of criminal before he commits his crime. Neither can increased police protection serve to prevent it.

In Roen's view, only "total awareness" can protect society against that type of criminal. Parents should know the whereabouts of their children at all times and the children should never be allowed to go out of their immediate neighborhoods by themselves.

He said parents should advise their children of dangers from strangers "not in brutally frank language, but in a way they can understand."

"Children can be taught to be observant and notify their parents of persons who are hanging around a schoolyard or are unknown in the neighborhood. They can be told to jot down the license plate numbers of suspicious vehicles," he said.

The presence of these strangers is often the prelude to a crime or an abduction, because sexual criminals will often case an area before taking any action.

Roen said he thinks his book will have a great impact because it is being released at a time when there is great interest in crime and sexual murders.

He hopes it will shock the public into greater awareness of these "most horrible crimes."

"My book is not really the story of the murder of one little girl, but the story of the murders of all little girls and little boys throughout our nation," the author said.

RE CLINTON COW CHIP THROWING CONTEST

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, with the summer's harvest in Montanan's find it a time of gaiety and relaxation. Sometimes they engage in lighthearted diversions which may seem like tales from the Old Wild West. One such celebration took place in the tiny town of Clinton, Mont., in the heart of Montana's cattle country. The event was the first annual Clinton Cow Chip Throwing Contest; where mighty men came from miles around to hurl droppings, baked to a golden crisp in the summer's sun. Throwing form was of no concern, and the rule was simple: The best throw wins the bull-throwing title. Needless to say the talented group got a feel for the sport right off and soon learned that yesterday's grass belonged where it landed.

With the permission of the town fathers of Clinton, I propose to enlarge next year's field and divided it into professional and amateur ranks. I would invite Members of Congress, old hands at tossing the bull, to compete in the ranks of the professionals and invite other con-

testants to join in the festivity as amateurs. I would not guarantee that Congressmen and Senators would log the best throws, but they would be at the top of the heap when it came to shooting the bull. I would propose also to the Clinton town fathers to rename the event First Annual Pro-Am Clinton Cow Chip and Bull Shootin' match.

I would urge Members of Congress to reserve a date on their calendars and come to Clinton next fall and give it a fling. Please, no practice is needed.

PART OF BOSTON

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am deeply upset that the Port of Boston was denied the status of a "most-favored port," under an October 1972 agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. Today I am announcing a renewed and expanded effort to urge the Nixon administration to reconsider its arbitrary and discriminatory position regarding the current "underprivileged" status of the Boston Port.

According to the Agreement Regarding Certain Maritime Matters which was negotiated between the United States and the U.S.S.R. in October 1972, President Nixon, by virtue of his authority to make "Executive agreements," designated 40 ports in the United States as "most-favored ports." The status of "most-favored port" allows these special ports to forego much of the regular red-tape and other governmental regulations, thus offering special incentives for attracting and expanding their commercial activities with Soviet shipping vessels.

Unfortunately, the Port of Boston was denied the status of "most-favored port" by the President, resulting in an increase in business for those ports given the special status, while economically hurting and limiting the commercial vitality of the Boston Port. The total spill-over effect on the already dismal economic situation of the New England economy will only help to make the economic picture of the entire metropolitan Boston area and all of New England more dim and bleak.

Thus, while many Soviet ships sail up the St. Lawrence Seaway on their way to "favored ports" in the Midwest, the Port of Boston is totally removed and untouched by the new economic activity generated by increased commercial trade with the Soviet Union.

Because I am already concerned about the depressed economic situation of the Boston and larger New England area, I feel that the situation will not improve in the foreseeable future until the President and the administration reconsider the present "underprivileged" status of the Port of Boston and give the Boston port its place alongside the many other great ports in this Nation. This will only happen when "most favored" status is

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

conferred upon the Boston port, which can only be done by the President.

The President must allow the Port of Boston the opportunity to expand its commercial activities without suffering from the arbitrary regulations and prohibitions which the Port of Boston is now forced to cope with.

With regard to this distressing fact, I have transmitted my deep concern to the Secretary of the Treasury, George P. Shultz and the Secretary of Commerce, Frederick B. Dent, both of whom are presently in the Soviet Union to negotiate further trade accords with Soviet officials. I hope that the American officials participating in the negotiations will make every effort to see that the Port of Boston is included in any and all negotiations concerning new and increased trade with the Soviet Union.

In addition to communicating with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury, I have also expressed my deep concern to the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, the Secretary of State, Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, and the Secretary of Defense, James R. Schlesinger. I stand ready to meet with the President and the various members of his Cabinet at any time in an effort to obtain "favored status" for the Port of Boston and thus enable the Port of Boston to attract new economic activity vital to Boston and New England.

Following is the text of the letter I have written to the President and to the Secretaries of State, Commerce, Defense, and Treasury, requesting that the administration extend favored port treatment to the Port of Boston. Also included for the RECORD is the October 1, 1973, Boston Globe article detailing the "underprivileged" status accorded the Port of Boston by the present administration's policies:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write to you concerning a matter of extreme importance and grave concern to the people who work and live in Boston and the surrounding area. I refer to the Agreement Regarding Certain Maritime Matters which was signed in October of 1972 by representatives of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Under the terms of this agreement, which, by virtue of it being an Executive Agreement, was negotiated solely by the President of the United States, with neither formal debate nor the concurrence of either House of Congress, a set of "most favored ports" in both the United States and the Soviet Union were declared open to regular merchant traffic from the other side. Unfortunately, the Port of Boston was not included as one of the forty "most favored ports" in the United States. This distressing fact will, I believe, have serious ramifications upon the economy and the economic development of the Boston area, and will further contribute to the economic decline of the overall New England area. This is a matter of grave concern to me and to my constituents, and to the many people who work and live in the Boston area. The refusal to designate the Port of Boston as a "favored port" will only contribute to a more dreary and bleak economic picture for New England in the future.

It is a well-known fact that the unemployment rate for the Boston area is significantly higher than the overall unemployment rate for the rest of the United States.

The current rate of unemployment in Massachusetts is approximately 6.9 percent, compared to 4.8 percent unemployment in the rest of the country. When broken down for specific localities, the figures become even more depressing. For example: The rate of unemployment for the City of Quincy is 10.2 percent; for Brockton, 10.7 percent; for Fall River, 9.5 percent; for New Bedford, 9.8 percent; and for Lowell, 11.7 percent. As you can see, such figures are significantly higher than the national average and can not help but harm the economy and livelihood of thousands of workers in the Boston Metropolitan area.

With the impending closure of the Boston Naval Shipyard, the layoffs currently increasing with each passing day along the Route 128 industrial complex (due in large part to cutbacks in defense-related research and production), plus the recent reduction in new contracts for the General Dynamics Shipyard in Quincy, there is now the possibility that there will be more than 20,000 jobs lost in Massachusetts at a time when 190,000 Commonwealth residents are already receiving unemployment compensation. This poses an extremely difficult situation for those in government and the private sector who have been trying to stabilize employment while encouraging economic development in the Commonwealth.

To highlight these facts, I refer to a section of the report of the "Impact of Defense Cutbacks on American Communities" as prepared by the President's Economic Adjustment Committee and submitted to the Congress in July of this year:

"The Boston unemployment rate at the time of the April closure announcement was 5.7 percent, which was above the National average of 5.0 percent for the month. The latest (May, 1973) Boston SMSA unemployment rate is 6.0 percent, or one percent above the nationwide average. . . . The unemployment rate for the City of Boston itself registered 8.1 percent for April, and increased to 8.5 percent for May. Unemployment within the City is compounded by the difficulty of attracting low skill jobs back into the city. Even though only one in four shipyard employees reside in the City, the job loss impact of the shipyard closure to the City will be more significant, due to its incremental effect on the already high City unemployment rate."

The Boston area is in serious economic difficulty. The overall economic picture of the entire New England area cannot help but be affected.

The most tragic fact in all this is that the Boston area has the facilities and the manpower to renew and increase economic activity in the area. Unfortunately, most of these resources are ignored, to the detriment of the citizens who live and work in the area.

I now address myself to the Maritime Agreement mentioned in the introduction of this letter. As was previously stated, the Port of Boston was not included as one of the forty "most favored ports" open to Soviet trade and commerce. To me, this makes absolutely no sense at all.

First of all, it is evident that Boston is closer to the Soviet Union than all the inner seaway ports granted "most favored" status. Many of the ports included in the agreement (for example: ports in Wisconsin, Ohio, and Michigan) are at least an extra 4-5 sailing days from the Soviet Union. In addition, the closest "favored port" to New England is the Port of New York/New Jersey. Thus, New Englanders are forced to pay additional transportation costs just to get their goods transported to Boston, when these very same goods could be transported directly to the Port of Boston at a much lower shipping rate. The value of this would be to reduce the purchase price of the goods shipped. It would also provide an economic activity which would help to reduce the rate of un-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

employment, reduce the purchase price of many goods for the New England consumer, and help to increase the overall economic activity throughout the New England area.

Secondly, the Port of Boston offers some of the most modern facilities for the loading and unloading of cargo vessels available on the eastern seaboard. In recent years the innovative concept of the containerized handling of cargo goods has been developed and implemented with outstanding results achieved. Today, three highspeed container cranes with a combined ability to handle 90 containers an hour stand as tangible evidence of the commercial vitality of the Port of Boston. Just three years ago, the Port shipped or received 2,315 containers, while a total of 65,000 containers were handled during the 1972 calendar year. The Port of Boston has also made a substantial effort to maximize the potential of its other maritime facilities. Commonwealth Pier, Boston's major passenger ship facility, is appearing with increasing frequency on the logs of foreign passenger ships. In 1972, nearly 33,000 ship passengers used the pier—up dramatically from just over 4,000 passengers only five years ago. Also, facilities for the importing and storage of automobiles from foreign manufacturers have been expanded, with the net result of lower transportation costs for New England consumers.

A third major factor which strengthens the argument for adding Boston to the list of "most favored ports" is the fact that immediately adjacent to Boston Harbor, there are some of the most advanced shipbuilding and repair facilities to be found anywhere in the world. With proper arrangement, it would be possible to unload cargo and also schedule repairs, which, when done within the local area, would provide jobs and further opportunities for increased economic activity, as well as providing for cheaper repair costs, due to the proximity of the repair yard.

In conclusion, it is a well known fact that the Boston area is suffering from a reduction in economic activity. But it is also clear that many facilities vital to increased economic activity already exist—they only have to be properly utilized. The Port of Boston is a striking example of a facility which could be more fully utilized if given the opportunity to expand its levels of economic activity which would, I believe, further aid the acceleration of economic development within the entire Metropolitan Boston area, and no doubt have a positive spill-over effect on the economy of the entire New England area.

The Port of Boston deserves, and should be granted, its right to enter into new commercial activity now being undertaken with the Soviet Union. The Port of Boston should, at the very least, be allowed to compete for its fair share of commercial trade rather than be forced to suffer from the prohibitions and restrictions which it is now forced to cope with.

Now it may be said that Soviet pressures prohibited the Administration from granting a more favorable status to the Port of Boston. In fact, it is my understanding that U.S. Government officials have proclaimed rather vigorously that the United States stands ready to expand the list of most favored ports—but only when the Soviets are willing to reciprocate. Why not open the Port of Boston to Soviet vessels on a favored port basis regardless of any concessions on the part of the Soviet Union? If they do not wish to use the Port of Boston, so be it. But, at least give the Port of Boston a chance to attract new business—that is all I ask.

By discriminating against the Port of Boston by prohibiting the handling of Soviet cargo while allowing forty other U.S. ports to do so, the people of Boston and New England have been hurt. I urge that this matter be reconsidered as soon as possible and it is my hope that the Port of Boston can be given

its place next to the many other great ports of our nation.

I would be most happy to meet with you any time you may deem convenient to further discuss this matter, which is of serious concern to me and, indeed, the entire New England region.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. BURKE,
Member of Congress.

REPRESENTATIVE BURKE WANTS HUB ON "MOST FAVORED" LIST FOR SOVIET SHIPS

(By Martin F. Nolan)

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Rep. James A. Burke (D-Milton) asked President Nixon yesterday to end "the underprivileged status" of the Port of Boston and add Boston to the list of 40 "most favored ports" for trade with the Soviet Union.

Burke, in a letter to the President and to several cabinet members, asked that Boston "at least be given a chance to attract new business" from the increased trade between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Burke said that in the agreement between the two powers signed in October 1972, "the Port of Boston was not included as one of the 40 'most favored ports' opened to Soviet trade and commerce. To me, this makes absolutely no sense at all.

"First of all, it is evident that Boston is closer to the Soviet Union than all the inner seaway ports granted 'most favored' status. Many of the ports included in the agreement—for example, ports in Wisconsin, Ohio and Michigan—are at least an extra four to five sailings days from the Soviet Union."

The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. announced two weeks ago that it expected 120 Soviet vessels to use the inland waterway next year. The Port of Boston expects 12 visits from Soviet ships.

"It is my understanding that U.S. Government officials have proclaimed rather vigorously that the United States stands ready to expand the list of 'most favored' ports," Burke said. "But only when the Soviets are willing to reciprocate.

"Why not open the Port of Boston to Soviet vessels on a favored port basis regardless of any concessions on the part of the Soviet Union? If they do not wish to use the Port of Boston, so be it," said Burke.

Burke said Boston port facilities include "some of the most modern facilities for the loading and unloading of cargo vessels available on the Eastern seaboard, including the innovative concept of the containerized handling of cargo."

He added that "immediately adjacent to Boston Harbor, there are some of the most advanced ship building and repair facilities to be found anywhere in the world. With proper arrangement, it would be possible to unload cargo and also schedule repairs, which, when done within the local area, would provide jobs and further opportunities for increased economic activity."

Citing some Defense Dept. statistics on the cost of defense cutbacks to local economies, Burke said "the current rate of unemployment in Massachusetts is approximately 6.9 percent, compared to 4.8 percent unemployment in the rest of the country . . . With the impending closure of the Boston Naval Shipyard, the layoffs currently increasing" with each passing day along the Rte. 128 industrial complex, plus the recent reduction in new contracts for the General Dynamics shipyard in Quincy, there is now the possibility that there will be more than 20,000 jobs lost in Massachusetts at a time when 190,000 Commonwealth residents are already receiving unemployment compensation."

"This is a matter of grave concern to me and my constituents and to the many people who work and live in the Boston area," Burke said. He is seeking a meeting with Administration officials on the subject.

October 1, 1973

"The refusal to designate the Port of Boston as a 'favored port' will only contribute to a more dreary and bleak economic picture for New England in the future."

SURVEY OF RETAIL FOOD PRICES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, parity for the month of August was at 102 percent. That is the highest it has been for more than 20 years, but when our producers were starting to get a fair return for their labor and investment, there was an instant outcry that the price of food was too high.

Parity for September dropped to 95 percent, a 7-percent decline, but the over-the-counter cost of food to the consumer did not reflect a similar decrease.

Mr. Speaker, I have said this before, food is a bargain here in America.

With your permission, and as a reminder to my colleagues, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from Farm Profit magazine which tabulates the costs of food items in selected cities throughout the world.

As Baxter Freese, president of the Iowa Cattlemen's Association said:

There's something wrong when the world's best paid people can't afford the world's lowest and best priced food.

SURVEY OF RETAIL FOOD PRICES

For years, farmers have been telling consumers food is a bargain. And it has been.

While we Americans have been spending 16.7% of our disposable income for food, the Japanese were spending 27.4%, the Italians 29.3% and the British a whopping 31.3%. Subtract what we pay extra to have our food pre-packaged, pre-cooked and prettied up and the gap is even wider.

Problem is consumers happen to like bargains and they complain loudly whenever there is a penny-a-pound increase in price. So, maybe it's time to try a new psychology—and tell the consumers they need to start paying more for food.

When food shortages do crop up, maybe it's time we also point out to consumers that they had a hand in it. It was the pressure from them that forced Washington to impose a ceiling on food prices last June . . . the thing some economists blame for the livestock profit squeeze.

Food prices were at all-time highs. Packers were unable to bid up livestock prices much above what the processed meat ceiling dictated. That left livestock men with two alternatives—feed at a loss or cut back. Supply projections for meat, milk and eggs show they decided to cut back.

EATING HIGHER OFF THE HOG

Iowa State swine specialist E. J. Stevermer estimates it would have taken live hog prices of \$41 per cwt. or better this summer to encourage herd expansion . . . \$1 to \$3 above what they actually were.

He figures it this way: back when hogs were selling for \$20 and production costs were running \$16 per cwt., producers were getting out of the business rather than expanding.

This summer, pork cost \$36 per cwt. to produce. But now it would take at least a \$5 profit mark-up to encourage more pro-

duction, since cash grain farming is more feasible and attractive than it was then.

WHO'S BEEN EATING MY EFFICIENCY?

Only reason consumers have been able to get by with such small food bills is because farmers' increased efficiency. Output per man-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

hour on the farm is 3.1 times higher than what it was 20 years ago... nearly twice the increase of manufacturing industries.

In almost any other segment of the economy, such gains would have led to more comfortable profit margins. But on the farm,

it was necessary to survive. Production costs more than doubled during those 20 years, while produce prices rose only 12 percent.

Problem is there's a limit to efficiency. And this summer, there was a limit to the prices farmers could get.

SURVEY OF RETAIL FOOD PRICES IN SELECTED CITIES EARLY MAY 1973

[In U.S. dollars per pound, converted at June exchange rates]

	Sirloin steak	Chuck roast	Pork chops	Ham, cured, whole	Bacon, sliced, packaged	Eggs, large, dozen	Butter
Bonn	3.84	2.08	1.46	2.85	2.75	0.97	1.27
Brussels	2.78	1.69	1.57	2.87	1.08	.99	1.31
London	2.59	1.42	1.27	1.42	.75	.37	.57
Paris	2.29	1.12	1.54	3.48	3.09	.93	1.40
Rome	2.88	2.22	1.81	3.16	1.42	.76	1.09
Stockholm	4.03	1.90	2.10	2.59	1.91	1.13	2.10
Tokyo	12.86	6.26	2.49	3.09	2.74	.78	1.40
Washington, D.C.	1.79	1.29	1.55	1.05	.99	.69	.77

THINGS COULD BE WORSE

There's one consolation in this whole mess—you can be glad you're not the President. He's got 200 million consumers clamoring about high food costs plus an international trade deficit to make up. And the two just don't mix (unless we subsidize consumers—more than we already are).

Reason: the world market is telling us our food is worth more than we are paying. Weather and crop shortages around the world have no doubt boosted prices for feed grains and soybeans. But so has increased world demand.

As other people's incomes have risen, they've chosen to spend it on tastier protein sources—namely meat—and they have proved their willingness to pay.

Only way to block out the influence of world prices is to keep our products off the world market. This could be disastrous to our trade balance... we still need to import oil while feed grains and soybeans are among the few competitive products we have to sell.

Our trade balance itself might be an indication our food expenditures are out of line with the rest of the world. Cheap food means we have more money to spend on second cars and third televisions—one of the reasons for our trade deficit in the first place. That's led to devaluations of the dollar, further snowballing would demand for our food.

On top of that, the Administration can't knock the high prices our beans and grain are fetching. Forty percent of the \$3.3 billion agricultural exports contributed to our trade balance last year was the result of higher prices.

In short, we can't have cheap food and still have adequate supplies. And we can't pay less than the rest of the world wants to pay and still export enough to balance our international trade ledger.

That may be a little tough for consumers to chew at first. But consider this: In Uruguay, the government imposed a 4-month ban on beef consumption last year, just so there'd be some beef to export. Compared to that, steak at almost any price is cheap.

THOMAS L. C. VAIL

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House share in the loss of Tom Vail, chief counsel of the Senate Finance Committee. His untimely passing is a loss not only to Congress but the

people of this Nation. Those of us who had opportunity to know and work with him in connection with his post on the Finance Committee as well as his previous service on the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation had the greatest respect for his integrity and intelligence. His brilliance was unsurpassed, particularly in the complicated field of taxation.

Tom was a dedicated man. He brought clarity of understanding when technicalities seemed to cloud all possibility. He brought solution when it seemed there was none.

Many Americans never will have heard the name, Tom Vail. Yet, he was as much a part of the process that molded the great legislative programs of the last two decades as some of our most famous political names.

To all of us who knew him, Tom was a loyal and faithful public servant. There is no higher tribute in government. My deepest sympathies are extended to his loved ones.

THE RIGHT TO LIFE

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, at their national convention, recently held here in Washington, the Young Americans for Freedom passed a succinct resolution calling for a reversal of the Supreme Court's decision to permit most elective abortions without restriction. The YAF now numbers some 60,000 members nationally and 8,000 in my home State of New York. The youth of our land have spoken out to protect the rights of future youths who would otherwise never have the chance to enjoy the benefits of our great country.

The only way to protect these unborn lives is by constitutional amendment, and certainly there is sufficient support in the House to merit a full consideration of the issue. The Judiciary Committee, however, has so far refused to hold hearings on the several resolutions introduced. I urge all of my colleagues, regardless of their current views on abortion to sign Congressman HOGAN's discharge petition so

that after full debate the will of the House may be determined.

The YAF resolution follows:

THE RIGHT TO LIFE

In recent years, American attitudes toward human life seem to have undergone a subtle and frightening change. Abortion, euthanasia, and involuntary sterilization have a new respectability.

Any remedy short of equal protection for life from the moment of conception is philosophically, morally, and medically untenable. An innocent human being cannot be declared a non-person at will and killed if his existence is inconvenient or uncomfortable to others, or if others consider the individual unfit to live. Based on this criteria, the right to life can be and must be defined by legislative processes and exceptions limited only to the greatest cases of peril to the lives of others.

Young Americans for Freedom demands a reversal of the Supreme Court's invasion into the legislative process. There is no Constitutional "right to abort." The Court has brushed aside the crux of the issue, the question of and controversy over whether or not a fetus is from conception a human life. When millions of Americans believe that it is, a Court that mandates nationwide legalized abortion is seen as a betrayer, not a protector, of fundamental Constitutional rights.

NEW EASTERN DIVISION OF THE
WEST JERSEY HOSPITAL, VOORHEES TOWNSHIP, N.J.

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, on September 8, 1973, it was my privilege to deliver the dedication address at the new Eastern Division of the West Jersey Hospital, located in Voorhees Township, N.J. Unlike so many of today's planned buildings, the hospital is situated in a lovely, rural setting with spacious grounds. This hospital is more than just beds and bandages—it is a school, restaurant, drug store, laboratory, laundry, hotel, and library. It is an unusual assemblage of people from all over the world—people with varied interests, education, languages, and heritage. It is the third largest employer in Camden County, providing a wide variety of careers to over 1,700 area residents. It houses some of the most

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

October 1, 1973

sophisticated equipment devised by man and when totally completed, will accommodate 296 beds.

To touch a little on background—the West Jersey Hospital opened in Camden, N.J., about 87 years ago. Its contribution to medical science and assistance to the ill has always been one of Camden's shining lights. In 1966 the Southern Division of the hospital was opened at Berlin, N.J., and now we have the new Eastern Division with all its fine facilities added to a nonprofit institution in Voorhees Township, N.J. Not one penny of Federal funds has been used to erect the building nor buy the equipment that makes up this most outstanding hospital. In this day and age when everyone thinks Uncle Sam is a money tree, credit must be given to those people who have worked long and diligently in the field of private enterprise for the good for all mankind without asking for a handout. Much credit must be given to W. Robert Davis, chairman of the Board of Trustees; Barry D. Brown, president of the West Jersey Hospital, Jack O. Owen, president of the New Jersey Hospital Association, and Dr. William V. McDonnell, vice president of Medical Affairs of the West Jersey Hospital, to name but a few. Space permitting, I could go on and on listing names of persons who have done so much to make this great institution possible—the nursing staff, the ladies auxiliary of the West Jersey Hospital, and volunteer canvassers who helped raise the funds to build the institution. Vast numbers of people have performed in excellent fashion to bring this project to fruition.

I, JOHN E. HUNT, today in the House of Representatives, doff my hat to each and every individual who has made this great facility possible for a job well done and an effort which will long be remembered.

WATERGATE'S TV DEMISE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 26, Mr. Patrick Buchanan, Special Consultant to the President, gave the Watergate Committee a "refresher" lesson in campaign activities. From all indications, the committee was not only refreshed, but stunned by his wealth of knowledge regarding these activities.

Mincing no words, Mr. Buchanan laid it all on the table. Stunned and off balance, the committee recognized that what they were hearing they had known all along. The Republicans do not have a corner on campaign tricks, but were merely doing what had been long ago recognized by the Democrats as being accepted practice.

Apparently fearing that their credibility would be further harmed, the lights of the cameras were dimmed, and the Watergate Committee's hearings became daytime TV history. Buchanan may have provided the "coup de grace."

A REALISTIC ASSESSMENT

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal on Wednesday, September 26 published an editorial and an exchange of letters which placed the seeming controversy over expenditures at Presidential homes in Key Biscayne and San Clemente in proper perspective. They are worthy of consideration by the House, and I offer them in the hope that they will help create a better understanding of the circumstances surrounding this entire situation:

A NON-STORY

Today we are printing certain documents concerning the spending on President Nixon's homes. We note that the subject has more or less died out of the news, which is too bad. Once hints of scandal have been raised in the news, we of the press ought to stick with them until the full story is told, even if nothing juicy seems likely to result from further investigation.

Government spending at San Clemente and Key Biscayne did make headlines, especially since the total seemed to be going up and up as the press put on pressure for further details. But elsewhere on this page GSA Administrator Arthur Sampson makes a good case that part of the confusion was created by the press itself. We do not remember this part of his statement being reported in the stories on his remarks. Indeed, in reporting his press conference, The Washington Post said, "It was GSA's third attempt to provide an accounting of improvements, security expenditures and the installation of office facilities at Mr. Nixon's homes. The estimate has risen in steps from \$39,000 to \$1.3 million to \$3.7 million."

When the GSA's \$3.7 million is added to \$5.8 million in military spending and \$300,000 by the Secret Service, the total outlays are nearly \$10 million. But as this figure has been taken apart in efforts to find unjustified expenditures, the total that could reasonably be challenged has stopped going up and has been going down and down. Some of this has been reported, but somehow it has not attracted the same attention.

Rep. Edward R. Roybal and Rep. Jack Edwards toured San Clemente on behalf of the House Appropriations Committee, and concluded that most of the spending there had been justified for security purposes. News stories did report this, but they did not receive widespread notice, though to its credit The Washington Post did play the story prominently on page one. The stories said Rep. Roybal was particularly impressed by the landscaping for security purposes, as for example relocation of a palm tree to obstruct a window where the President might have been exposed to the aim of a distant marksman.

Rep. Roybal had been especially critical of the San Clemente spending at a previous committee hearing and could be counted on to single out its most questionable aspects. Actually, he thought the news reports of his comments went too far in exonerating the spending, and he later issued a press release saying that the expenditure of \$13,500 for a heating system and \$165,990 on landscaping and residential improvements were "clearly for personal comfort and esthetics." He said they "definitely enhanced the value of the President's property."

The great bulk of the \$165,990 consisted of landscaping not done directly for security

purposes. Mr. Sampson explains these contracts in the correspondence following his statement, and quite convincingly too. Surely it's difficult to doubt that the government should pay for restoring the grounds to their original condition after it has torn them up to install underground communications and security systems.

If you deduct these expenses from the Congressman's total, you are left with a sum quite different from the original \$10 million. There is the heating system, replaced because the Secret Service decided gas heat is inherently unsafe. Rep. Roybal also questions an overhead fire sprinkler system in the President's home, and believes a concrete fence should have been extended only partially around the President's property rather than entirely around it.

Now, there is no intention here to demean Rep. Roybal, who was conscientious enough to investigate and honest enough to alter some of his initial views. He may be right that Congress should limit presidential homes outside Washington to one per President, though others may feel a President ought to be able to go where he likes. More realistically, Rep. Roybal asks that Congress ought to approve presidential-security expenditures in advance rather than giving blanket approval.

But if Congress had been asked to spend \$13,500 to protect the President from the remote possibility of gas leaks, or to fence in the whole estate rather than part of it, can anyone imagine there would have been a murmur of opposition anywhere in either House? Possibly H. R. Gross, who once questioned the cost of the eternal flame on John F. Kennedy's grave, might have risen to the occasion. But we doubt even that.

In short, despite all those headlines the spending at San Clemente seems to have been a non-story. We recognize that not every question has been settled. The military spending has not been detailed, the President has not explained where he got the money to buy the homes or released the details of his tax returns and so on. We know, too, that lately it has been popular to take every explanation not as a settlement of the charges it addresses but a backhanded confirmation of the charges it does not address. But we don't subscribe to that philosophy; indeed, we suspect it is one of the best ways for non-stories to catch on.

So we think it wise to pause for a moment to chalk up the flurry over the GSA spending at San Clemente as something akin to the flurry over the false stories about 28 Black Panthers being killed by police. It might be wise, too, to think about how the press might undo non-stories when they arise.

THE BIG FLAP OVER THE HOUSE AT SAN CLEMENTE

(NOTE.—Following is a press conference statement by Arthur F. Sampson, administrator of the General Services Administration, on the confusion that surrounded government spending on President Nixon's homes at San Clemente and Key Biscayne; to which is added an exchange of correspondence between the editor of this page and Mr. Sampson concerning landscaping expenditures questioned by Rep. Edward R. Roybal (D., Calif.). An editorial on this subject appears today.)

Current public confusion over San Clemente and Key Biscayne expenses is due in part to the way that GSA expenditures have been reported. Over the past two months, a series of dollar figures have been announced in the press, each one higher than the last, each quoting government sources, and each compounding public misunderstanding. A review of the sequence of these events leads us to the conclusion that the government and the media are jointly responsible for this unfortunate development.

In late May, a reporter asked about the

specific costs of four items at San Clemente. We supplied the White House with the costs and they released them. One major newspaper erroneously stated that the cost of the four items—some \$39,000—was the total spent by GSA at San Clemente, and the error was picked up hundreds of times across the country. (The Associated Press, which made the original request, carried the story correctly.)

After this the press made many demands on the administration for further information.

In attempting to respond quickly, we compiled our major, one-time costs which totaled about \$460,000 for the San Clemente property. That figure did not include certain recurring costs, but because of misunderstandings within the government, the \$460,000 figure was released as a total for all GSA spending.

A thorough check of our records was then made and we released a report for the San Clemente residence and total Key Biscayne costs, showing the same totals as those we are reporting here. Today we are going one step beyond to release total figures for all the complexes.

The total GSA spending was \$3.7 million, including \$703,367 on the President's home and grounds at San Clemente and \$452,708 on the President's home and grounds at Key Biscayne. The balance was \$2,468,894 in capital and operating expenses for the associated government office complexes, and \$65,930 for the protection of the President and his family at four other locations.

In addition to GSA spending, the military spent large sums on communications equipment and associated items at the same locations. The total spending by GSA, the military and other agencies was nearly \$10 million.

In addition, we have started a complete audit for all expenditures on presidential protection and support during the Nixon administration. The audit is estimated to take up to seven months and will go behind our reports and examine records in detail to verify the accuracy and completeness of the accounting records we have used to date. We expect that this audit will result in less than a 5% difference—plus or minus—from the enclosed report.

Throughout the past few weeks, the press has reported differing figures for various items. Many items reported by the press were wrong and we have issued many statements about the erroneous reporting.

GSA was accused by the press, for example, of installing a "swimming pool heater" at San Clemente. That charge was repeated by the media across the country and is still printed today, even though it has been firmly denied by the administration. In fact, the heater was paid for personally by the President. Likewise, GSA was erroneously credited with installation of a septic tank for the President at San Clemente. In a similar way, without adequately checking the facts, the press has printed numerous stories with widely differing totals on the amounts spent at the various residences.

This has been confusing to the public and grossly unfair to the President and his family. By publishing this comprehensive report today, we hope that we can bring this confusion to an end.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL,
August 24, 1973.

Mr. ARTHUR F. SAMPSON
Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAMPSON: I have been studying your statement and the summary of expenditures for protection of the President at San Clemente and elsewhere. We are considering writing some more on the subject, including reprinting your remarks on how the confusion came about as the figures were released.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

However, I would like to have a bit more detail on a few of the contracts being questioned by Congressman Roybal and others, and wonder if you could provide answers to a few questions on the following items:

On page 13 of your summary, contracts C-2470 and C-2471, \$76,000 to repair and replace landscaping & sprinkler and \$7,515 to repair roadways, both damaged by construction work. What was the nature of the damage and how was it caused, and in connection with what other construction?

On page 19 of your summary, contract GS-09B-0-708, \$25,524 for maintenance of landscaping to insure growth. Why was such a large expenditure necessary, and to which landscaping was it applied?

Without tracing down each of the individual contracts, there are a number of expenditures on pages 17, 18 and 19 for replacement of landscaping. Could we have any sort of general description of why this was necessary? Similarly, on pages 20, 22 and 23 there are contracts to landscaping to remove fire and safety hazards. Could these be explained in a bit more detail?

Any assistance you could provide on these few contracts would be greatly appreciated, and I believe would further your purpose of bringing the confusion to an end.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. BARTLEY,
Editor of the Editorial Page.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
September 7, 1973.

Mr. ROBERT L. BARTLEY,
Editor of the Editorial Page,
The Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BARTLEY: This is in further reference to your letter of August 24 regarding expenditures made by the General Services Administration for the protection of the President of his San Clemente, California, residence.

Your first series of question concerns the repair and replacement of landscaping and sprinklers and the repair of roadways. The need for this work resulted in part from the initial installation of conduits for telephone cables, security cables, power lines, TV systems and miscellaneous alarm systems which required extensive excavation of the grounds. Also, other construction work including the blockwall, concrete manhole, and concrete footings required the movement of heavy equipment and vehicles across the grounds.

The excavation for the installation of underground lines and cables required the destruction of existing landscaping and severely damaged existing roadways, curbing, and drainage ditches originally designed for normal automobile use and pedestrian traffic. Therefore, extensive repairs were required throughout the grounds, including replacement of the sprinkler system where damaged. All other work considered the responsibility of the President was accomplished by his personal representatives.

The maintenance of the landscaping was continued for the period from September 1969 through April 1970. The government had removed and replaced extensive shrubs, flowers and lawn area and the continued maintenance was necessary to insure growth of the government-installed material. During this period it was also necessary to adjust trees, plants and shrubs to accommodate the surveillance requirements of the Secret Service. The contracts for maintenance were originally established for a one year period from October 1969 to October 1970 and were terminated in April as soon as it was felt that the owner should take over the maintenance. The expenditures you referred to on pages 17, 18 and 19 were those incurred during the above maintenance period.

The expenditures listed on pages 20, 22 and 23 were requested by the Secret Service and resulted in the elimination of a large area of

dry weeds along the northern perimeter of the property constituting a serious fire hazard. Dead and broken limbs from the large trees on the property were considered a hazard to the President, the Secret Service employees who patrol the property, and official visitors the President might have, and were removed. Trees were relocated in order to interrupt line-of-sight vision from the exterior of the property for security purposes.

I appreciate your interest in an accurate and complete understanding of these expenditures.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR F. SAMPSON,
Administrator.

HEALTH CARE FOR MAINE CHILDREN

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

MR. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a new and experimental program developed by the Maine Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics which is designed to provide comprehensive health care to children throughout the State of Maine, particularly to those who are not now receiving adequate medical attention. This is the first statewide pediatric program in the Nation involving private pediatricians.

I am, of course, delighted that Maine was chosen for this important health project. Ours is primarily a rural State with a shortage of physicians and dentists, and with an acute and serious shortage of pediatricians. Our children need better health care, and I am very hopeful that this ambitious project, funded by the American Academy of Pediatrics through the Office of Economic Opportunity, will provide just that.

The following article, Mr. Speaker, describes this project in detail, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

MAINE CHAPTER MAPS PROJECT

The first proposed statewide pediatric health project in the nation involving private pediatricians has received approval from the Academy and Washington to start delivery of comprehensive health care to thousands of Maine children.

The project, developed by the Maine Chapter, hopes to serve more than 13,000 children in a five county area (shaded areas on map) within its first year of operation.

As soon as the original clinics in the five county target area become self-supporting through contractual or other third party arrangements, new satellite clinics will be opened in other counties.

The Maine program will soon receive \$20,000 in start-up money—part of a total of \$150,000 it will receive from the Academy during the first year of operation.

Money for the project comes from a \$845,000 grant awarded to the Academy in 1972 by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The purpose of the grant, initiated and developed by the Academy's Department of Community Services, is to stimulate the delivery of pediatric health services through local AAP chapters to areas lacking sufficient access to sources of primary pediatric health care.

The Maine project is the fourth initiated

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

in the year since the grant was received. Three other such projects—in rural Texas and Missouri, and a ghetto area of Philadelphia—are already in operation.

This project differs from the others in that it will contract with at least five pediatricians in clinics throughout the state to provide health care instead of operating from one grant supported clinic.

The initial funding of \$150,000 for the first year will be reduced by one-third the second and third years and will be discontinued after the third year.

It is anticipated that a contract for Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment will be part of the program and will provide funds for all children under 21 years of age who are receiving Medicaid. A sliding fee scale will also provide income.

The Maine project has been endorsed by the Governor of Maine, the regional Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Maine Family Planning Association, Maine Division of Child Health, Maine Bureau of Rehabilitation, Pediatric Society of Maine, four Community Action Programs and three Comprehensive Health Planning agencies.

WHY MAINE?

Maine is primarily a rural state with a shortage of physicians and dentists and an acute shortage of pediatricians.

There are no pediatricians in two of the target counties and none in four of the clinic sites.

Lack of adequate transportation and local health resources have forced many Maine residents to resort to "crisis only" medical care.

The project hopes to change all that. It intends to extend comprehensive health care without duplicating or interfering with existing programs to those who can now only obtain crisis care.

THE PROJECT

More than 133,000 Maine children in the five county target area will be potentially eligible to receive services under the program. Services will be available to all children, regardless of their family income, although the target population will be those children who for many reasons are not presently receiving proper medical care.

The project is designed in the form of a "spider web" with an administrative and specialty consultant center in Portland and five satellite clinics located in diverse rural areas within the state.

The central administrative office has been provided, free of charge, in the capitol building complex by the Governor of Maine. It will be staffed with a core pediatrician who will serve as a medical director, an administrator, a health liaison person, accountant, secretary and auditor. The central office staff will travel periodically to the various sites to implement the program.

The five satellite clinics will be staffed one or two days a week by participating pediatricians and by one pediatric nurse associate and one outreach aide three days a week. Twenty-four hours emergency care will be available by telephone and referral.

The program will be administered by a nonprofit corporation—Expanded Child Health Care, Inc.

Five pediatricians who have submitted letters of commitment to participate in the program are: Maurice Ross, M.D., FAAP, chairman, Maine Chapter, who will be headquartered in Sanford and serve the children of York County; Randall Silver, M.D., FAAP, Machias, Washington County; Russell Morissette, M.D., FAAP, Norway-Paris, Oxford County; Edmund Ervine, M.D., FAAP, Unity, Waldo County; and Benjamin Shapero, M.D., Bangor, Penobscot County.

Outreach workers will recruit children from within the target areas. A referral system has already been established between

schools, public health nurses and existing social service agencies to identify medically underserved children.

Services provided at the clinics will include: complete medical history, physical exam, screening for visual or hearing defects and lead poisoning, testing for tuberculosis and other diseases, immunizations, the Denver Developmental Screening test, health education, transportation and home follow-up.

In addition to the services provided directly by the clinics, two-way referral linkages will be established with other service organizations in order to insure a comprehensive treatment plan. Major services provided by referral will be family planning, mental health, dental clinics, University of Maine Cooperative Extension Services, vocational rehabilitation, and services for exceptional children.

The clinics will also establish a strong affiliation with a local hospital capable of providing specialty referral services and inpatient care.

EVALUATION

The project will have a built-in evaluation component to determine the effectiveness of the program in delivering health care to children. This computerized program will allow the AAP Department of Community Services to monitor the program's progress once a month. Ross Laboratories, division of Abbott Laboratories, has contributed a grant of \$30,000 to assist in the development of a problem-oriented pediatric record keeping system.

FUTURE PROJECTS

The Academy hopes to initiate at least one chapter program each year in the next five years provided level grant funding remains available. At the end of five years nine programs could be operational, five self-supporting, and four in a state of developing financial independence.

If there is an area in your state you think could benefit from such a project, contact your chapter chairman to stimulate interest at the state level. The Department of Community Services will be happy to provide technical or professional assistance to any interested chapter to help it develop a proposal for such a project.

For further information please contact: Department of Community Services, AAP, 1801 Hinman, Evanston, Ill. 60204.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW DENIED HELP

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the history of the United States is the history of a people yearning for fairness: Fairness in individual opportunity, fairness in mutual defense, fairness in social responsibility and, above all, fairness in justice.

From its earliest days, our country has been settled by people who were driven to search for fairness in a new forum. The Pilgrims could not find fairness in England. The Huguenots could not find fairness in France. Jews could not find fairness in czarist Russia—much less in Soviet Russia; Mennonites could not find fairness in Germany; people from all over the world have fled their homelands in search of fairness and justice. They came to the New World to find a new forum.

New frontiers were not the only changes in forum for these immigrants;

October 1, 1973

they created an entire, new system of government that has been dedicated to protecting the freedom we call opportunity by providing varied forums in which to debate policy differences and enact laws, and in which to settle disputes. The forums vary in accordance with the matters they are designed to hear; the degree of fairness one may obtain is largely a matter of finding a compatible forum.

Last week, the Vice President appealed to this forum. He asked—not for help, but for a hearing. He asked—not for exoneration, but for investigation. He asked—not for acquittal, but for action.

He turned to the House of Representatives as the forum of all the people. And we, who are severally elected by each of 435 districts of the whole Nation, turned down this request from one of only two men who are elected by the entire Nation.

What have we done. We have denied the Vice President access to a forum that is competent to investigate. We have left him naked to be pilloried by pious piranhas in a Justice Department movement to exculpate itself from its sullyng role in Watergate.

We have a responsibility to give the Vice President access to the forum to which he is entitled by law. If we fail, we fail not just ourselves; we fail the very people by whom we were elected.

We fail them because fairness and justice are not occasional virtues. Rights are not occasional privileges. Either we have a right at all times, or we have it not at all. Everybody shares a right, or nobody enjoys it—but nobody.

The publicity that has been generated in this matter, and courtesy alone restrains me from saying "deliberately" generated, cannot help but to encourage indictment. That same publicity cannot help but to deprive the Vice President of a fair and impartial trial in any forum but in this House and in the U.S. Senate.

There are those, of course, who are driven to partisan salvation over this unhappy state of affairs, but gentlemen, colleagues, this is not the sad state of affairs of just the Republican Party. It is the sad state of affairs of our entire Nation.

And in the midst of this torment, we hear the shrill whining of those who condemn the system; but any "system" is people. This is not the time to degrade ourselves, but—if we fail to hear Mr. AGNEW, if we fail to consider his indictment, if we fail in this we will have indicted ourselves.

I do not know whether he is innocent or guilty. I do know that my constituents, the people whose interests and expectations I represent, demand that I, nay, that all of us rise to the challenge of our responsibility.

4-H GETS IT ALL TOGETHER

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 5.5 million young people

in the world today from all races, incomes, and backgrounds, from urban centers to countryside who are affiliated with this Nation's largest coeducational program and once again I am eager to commend all of those participants who look forward to National 4-H Week which begins on October 7 and extends through October 14.

"4-H Gets It All Together" is this year's theme and in countless ways 4-H has taken the initiative and by stretching from coast to coast where 4-H clubs exist in nearly every U.S. county and, additionally, in about 80 other nations of the world, 4-H has indeed gotten it all together.

The 4-H'ers, by seeking to improve themselves and the world around them, develop a broad understanding of the overall needs of our society and those things that are required to provide a good and productive life for all human beings. For example, 4-H'ers are involved in informal out-of-school programs and activities which range from repairing lawnmowers to managing money through yard maintenance, from karate to drill teams, from theatherics to consumer education and dog care to crafts and photography.

Members of 4-H are offered not only practical skills in a wide range of agriculture and home economics projects but also a broad and diversified program of activity that will enable them by extending their scope from the rural farm areas to the ghettos of the inner city to tackle the more pertinent problems of today such as conservation of soil, water and wildlife, pollution control, community beautification and clean-up and improvement of health generally. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that by emphasizing the learning-by-doing technique which, of course, 4-H implements fully and combining a multitude of subjects 4-H affords these youth the opportunity to grow both physically and emotionally. Fortunate, indeed, are these boys and girls who have the wonderful opportunity to participate in 4-H because through this program they learn beyond a doubt the importance of being involved in one way or another in America's future and in programs designed to make their communities a better place to live in today as well as tomorrow, and I feel confident Mr. Speaker that we can safely assume they will continue to justify the faith and the pride that we have in them.

In the Commonwealth of Kentucky alone, we have over 116,000 young people who are involved in 4-H programs and I am happy to report that all 120 counties in the State have participated this year in the 4-H Community Pride Contest which placed an emphasis on local clean-up and beautification projects. Understandably, I am justifiably proud to announce to this body that last month the 4-H Clubs of Spencer County which is in the Second Congressional District placed first in this statewide Community Pride competition.

It is a distinct privilege and pleasure for me to have this occasion to salute the 4-H Clubs of American as they con-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tinue to move forward in the months ahead to fulfilling their worthy ideals and goals and I want to offer them my support and good wishes.

WHO IS ANXIOUS TO KILL BUDGET REFORM OR—WILL THE REAL ADA PLEASE STAND UP?

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the well-known line from the television program, "To Tell the Truth," "Will the real _____ please stand up," is by far the most appropriate line to use with respect to a new, double-directed standard coming from the Americans for Democratic Action—ADA.

For years, the ADA has urged, advised, browbeaten, cajoled, and all but incited the Congress to reassert its constitutional prerogatives vis-a-vis the President in both domestic and foreign policy arenas. Conferences and seminars have been held, books and pamphlets written and published, countless speeches given by their spokesmen on this floor and behind thousands of other rostrums. All have urged the Congress to assert fully its role in budgetmaking and control and to stand up to the President. It seemed the more powerfully and Executive asserted himself in this subject area, the more the ADA stressed the need for congressional action—if that Executive was either a Republican or a moderate to conservative. The ADA called the Congress a rubberstamp, lethargic, incapable of meeting the demands of a modern society and economy; this has been particularly true during the past 4½ years.

There is a well-recognized need for budget reform, particularly in the processes of formulation of the Federal budget and of its consideration by the Congress. Under the present system, the Congress receives in mid-January of each year the President's budget message.

While members of the Committees on Appropriations may often have a fairly exact idea of what that message will contain, no one in the legislative branch knows for sure until that message is formally received. Then, the Congress has the choice of either acting upon every item therein in only 5½ months before the end of the then extant fiscal year or of passing continuing resolutions, which unfortunately often carry forward Federal expenditures which the Congress knows it intends to reform. Because the budget message originates within the executive, the Congress must bear the full burden of proof—of going forward—as to the merits of any substantive changes in funding levels or program thrusts. And when all the staffs of the congressional appropriations committees are combined, they do not have nearly the staff capability of the executive to analyze budget proposals and to profound changes therein.

The Constitution of the United States, article 1, section 8, specifically gives to the Congress the power of the purse:

The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

If we are to fulfill that constitutional responsibility and mandate, then budget reform must be given highest priority within the Congress.

Now, however, the ADA is taking a different tact. While still clamoring for a reassertion of congressional power, the ADA has taken off against proposals to give the Congress the tools with which to realize such a reassertion. In its legislative newsletter, "The Anatomy of a Committee Mark-Up: Budget Control Legislation," vol. 2, No. 15, September 1-15 1973, the ADA states:

The purpose of the original Joint Committee on Budget Control was to cut spending.

And then ADA has the audacity to conclude:

While this proposed procedure might not make much practical difference with a conservative administration in office, it would hobble a liberal administration's program development. It would substitute Congress for the Executive in the budget process. Under a workable budget system the Executive would supply fundamental national priority proposals to the Congress, which then could react to them. Judging by past performance, a congressional budget could be a disaster.

The proposed congressional Office of the Budget could easily become for Congress what the Office of Management and Budget has become for the Executive; its focus would be fiscal, with an emphasis on efficiency and dollar cost-consciousness. COB, constantly highlighting dollar costs, could inhibit the committees of Congress in moving necessary programs which require funding of a larger order. COB, in fact, could become a powerful . . . body.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to highlight the fact that the principal focus of the ADA's fears seems to be that, "its focus would be fiscal, with an emphasis on efficiency and dollar cost-consciousness." On that the ADA is correct. And, it is for those reasons that the budget reform proposals are gaining increasing acceptance. It is the way to hold down spending, and thereby to hold down both inflation and taxes. It is a way to improve the efficiency of the Federal dollar's use; to "get more value for the dollar." It is a way to illustrate to all members the dollar-impact of existing and proposed legislation.

It is for these reasons that I sponsored legislation to provide for such a congressional mechanism. It is unfortunate that ADA does not agree with these aims.

Mr. Speaker, this reflects an arrogance, an elitist view of Government, an ADA-knows-better-for-the-people-than-their-elected-representatives do philosophy which transcends any that I have ever seen put into print. ADA is saying that the social planners and big spenders, the tax-exempt foundations, the bureaucracy knows what is better for the people—and the monetary priorities to be attached to programs for them—better than their elected representatives in the Congress. Such a philosophy is anti-

theoretical to the very foundation stones of democratic government—democracy which one would have hoped the so-called Americans for Democratic Action would have believed in also.

It is clear what is happening in the debate over the legislation to provide the Congress with a budget making and control mechanism: Those special interests and social planners who have benefitted most from big spending are in danger of having their oxen gored. They are reacting by opposing the very reassertion of congressional prerogatives which they champion when an administration is in power with whom they philosophically and politically disagree.

Mr. Speaker, this article gives this body a much clearer picture as to who may be behind the slowdown of budget reform in 1973. *

Will the real ADA please stand up?

MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL—NO. 26

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Detroit, the leading American automobile manufacturing city, is also a leader in murders. According to Time magazine, this proliferation of homicides is due to the increasing number of handguns circulating among a third of Detroit's population.

Homicide Inspector John Domm is quoted as saying:

People who look for the police to solve this problem are looking in the wrong direction.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the people of Detroit, and the whole United States, should look to their legislators to solve the problem.

Immediate legislation is necessary to control accidental murders, and murders committed in anger against relatives, friends, and innocent bystanders. Only immediate legislation can stop the United States from leading the world in the number of murders committed each year.

At this time, I would like to include the article from the April 16, 1973, edition of Time magazine:

MURDER CITY

One day last week in Detroit, a lawyer in a Hall of Justice courtroom inexplicably drew a gun and pointed it at the judge and a witness. The judge was not carrying the .38 caliber pistol that he usually packs, but three policemen in the courtroom drew their guns and killed the lawyer. A few minutes later, in a luggage shop in downtown Detroit, the owner and his clerk were discovered neatly trussed and executed, apparently in a robbery. A little after that, a prominent black psychiatrist was found dead in the trunk of his car. And still later that evening, police in the suburb of Roseville came across the bodies of a pair of young lovers in a car, victims of a murder-suicide.

Since Jan. 1, there have been 187 homi-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cides in Detroit, 27% ahead of the rate last year in the city that normally revels in records. Last year Detroit (pop. 1.5 million) had 601 homicides, or one for every 2,500 people. By contrast, Chicago, with twice as many people, had 711 murders; while London (pop. 7.4 million) had only 113.

Why is Detroit such a center for bloodletting? Police Commissioner John Nichols believes that the widespread possession of handguns is a basic cause. He estimates that there are some 500,000 handguns around, or one for every three citizens of Detroit. Nichols is backed by the studies of Dr. Emanuel Tanay, a professor of psychiatry and law at Wayne State University, who says that "Detroit is almost like an experiment in testing the correlation between the presence of guns and homicide." Tanay notes that over a period of six years, the number of gun permits tripled and the rate of homicides by firearms increased eightfold; in the same period, homicide by any other means rose by only 50%.

Police say that the surge in ownership of guns—most of them unregistered—started after blacks burned and sacked large parts of the city's ghetto areas in the 1967 riots. "It seemed like everybody went out and bought a gun," one officer recalls. Now that so many guns are handy, the argument over the kitchen table at 2 a.m., which might once have ended in a punch in the nose, has a good chance of ending with a bullet in the gut. The police log offers these samples: an argument in the Red Dog Bar, a disagreement in Cherry's Poolroom, a quarrel over the whereabouts of the money from the welfare check, an argument over rent. Narcotics were involved in 10% to 12% of the homicides; most of the victims and the murders were black; one-third of the crimes remain unsolved. The majority of the murders continue to be the work of friends or relatives of the victims. Of 111 homicides in February, 72 occurred inside the home. And guns are used about 60% of the time.

The high homicide rate is a cultural problem as well as a gun problem. Detroit's need for unskilled labor has brought in vast numbers of rural Southern blacks and increasing numbers of rural whites. Says Homicide Inspector John Domm: "The kids grow up in a culture of aggression, the poor and the black learn to get ahead by being aggressive. People who look for the police to solve this problem are looking in the wrong direction." Meanwhile, Dr. Tanay warns that the chances of getting murdered in a gun-laden society are so great that it is unwise ever to argue with a stranger during, say, a traffic mishap.

AGNEW TELLS IT LIKE IT IS

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, although there may be many politicians in Washington who disagree with the Vice President on specific matters, I think we all have to agree that he cannot be accused of weak utterances.

His statement before the National Federation of Republican Women in Los Angeles on September 29 is a forceful and specific answer to the charges that have been made against him.

I insert the full transcript of his remarks on this occasion and suggest that those who read these words recall the basic American premise that all persons are innocent until proven guilty.

October 1, 1973

The transcript follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW

Following is a transcript of Vice President Agnew's extemporaneous remarks yesterday before the Los Angeles convention of the National Federation of Republican Women:

In the past several months I've been living in purgatory. I have found myself the recipient of undefined, unclear, unattributed accusations that have surfaced in the largest and most widely circulated organs of our communications media.

I want to say at this point clearly and unequivocally: I am innocent of the charges against me.

I have not used my office, nor abused my public trust as county executive, as governor, or as Vice President to enrich myself at the expense of my fellow Americans. In August of this year when I first became aware that I was being investigated for a serious crime, and I might mention to you that although rumors had been drifting out of Baltimore for some months before that, up until the time my attorney was handed that letter on Aug. 5 or 6 in Baltimore, I had no idea that I was the target of an investigation.

I want you to know that when I got that letter I learned an hour or two later that The Wall Street Journal was in possession of that letter before I was. And I want you to know that irrespective of the claims of certain individuals in the Department of Justice, it was not through my fault that this became a non-secret procedure, but through deliberately contrived actions of individuals in the prosecutorial system of the United States, and I regard that as outrageous and malicious.

RIDICULOUS REPLY

Even today at this point in this widely publicized investigation, no one would know that I am under any kind of investigation if the secrecy of grand jury investigations and the prosecutorial probes that precede them were kept inviolate. Certainly it is not and was not to my advantage to spread this kind of information across the pages of the news media. What a ridiculous counterreply to my statement is the statement that comes out of the prosecutor's office that I have been responsible for this publicity.

I say this to you: that conduct of high individuals in the Department of Justice, particularly the conduct of the chief of the criminal investigation division of that department, is unprofessional and malicious and outrageous, if I am to believe what has been printed in the news magazines and said on the television networks of this country and I have had no denial that this is the case.

It is my intention to use the courts of this country in an attempt to gain permission to examine under oath these people who are trying to destroy me politically through the abuse of the criminal justice system of the United States.

If the court gives my attorneys the right to take those depositions and if we find in fact that in Baltimore or in Washington individuals employed by the Department of Justice have abused their sacred trust and forsaken their professional standards, then I will ask the President of the United States to summarily discharge those individuals.

Now people will say to me: "Why? You don't make sense. Why should a Republican Department of Justice and Republican prosecutors attempt to get you?" Well I don't know all the answers, but I will say this, that individuals in the upper professional echelons of the Department of Justice have been severely stung by their ineptness in the prosecution of the Watergate case. They have been severely stung that the President and the Attorney General have found it necessary to appoint a special prosecutor and they are trying to recoup their reputation at my expense. I'm a big trophy.

And one of those individuals has made some very severe mistakes, serious mistakes. In the handling of his job he considers himself a career professional, in a class by himself, but a recent examination of his record will show not only that he failed to get any of the information out about the true dimensions of the Watergate matter but that he also through ineptness and blunder prevented the successful prosecution of high crime figures because of wiretapping error.

Those are the reasons why he needs me to reinstate his reputation as a tough and courageous and hardnosed prosecutor. Well, I'm not going to fall down and be his victim, I assure you.

Don't think for one minute when I say there's leaks in the Department of Justice that it's just my opinion. Civil libertarians across the country are enraged at what is happening. Attorney General Richardson himself after first denying those leaks, came back later, several days or a week later, and admitted members of the news media had informed him that the leaks were in fact coming from the Department of Justice in Washington. I say, if they're there let's do something about it.

I'm not going to get into the facts of the accusations against me coming out of Baltimore except in the most general sense to say that through the cocktail circuit and the rumor mills in Washington threats by certain individuals were communicated to me as recently as April of this year in which those people left no doubt that unless I used my high office to cut off the investigations against them that they intended to implicate me in their sordid misdeeds.

A POISONED WELL

I said no to them, that I would have no part of that. Certainly if anyone knows that I knew these individuals, or anyone connected with them, that I was not going to do that. And it was a result of that—a statement on my part that they could not look to me to abuse the constitutional powers that I have—that they began to seek and obtain from the prosecutors in Baltimore immunity and limited immunity.

Now, in case you don't know what immunity is, it means that someone who has already admitted his guilt to a criminal action can escape the full force of his punishment by turning in somebody higher up. And that's exactly what happened in this case.

I want to say just a word about why I went to the House of Representatives. It should be, I guess, obvious, that I don't believe I can have a fair hearing either before a grand jury or petit jury in Baltimore. The well has been most successfully poisoned.

And I find the only chance I would have to have a full hearing on the facts was to appeal to the House of Representatives. Thus far, they have decided not to grant me that hearing. But when I see principal news organs of this country criticize my going to the House of Representatives on the basis that I am attempting to hide behind a constitutional shield and suppress the facts, that amazes me, because what I want is not a suppression of the facts, but the fullest possible hearing of them, widely publicized, before the people of the American nation, so that everyone knows exactly what is going on in this nation. I'm not trying to hide anything.

NOT RESIGN

I want to make another thing so clear that it cannot be mistaken in the future. Because of these tactics which have been employed against me, because small and fearful men have been frightened into furnishing evidence against me—they have perjured themselves in many cases, it's my understanding—I will not resign if indicted.

Our Constitution says that every man is entitled to a fair trial and a presumption of innocence. I intend to rely on the spirit as well as the letter of those guarantees. I would

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

foresake the principals of the founding fathers if I abandoned this fight. And I do not intend to abandon it.

Because as I said in my earlier remarks, although I am very directly and personally involved in these accusations, also involved is the traditional framework of the American judicial system and the fairness of the American people and the inviolability of other Americans to perversions of this type in the future. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for hearing me out.

LUKE THE PHYSICIAN SPEAKS ON WHEN LIFE BEGINS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there has appeared in the September 7 issue of the magazine the *Banner* a most interesting article on the issue of abortion. The author, Dr. Stuart Bergsma, approaches the subject from both a scientific and religious point of view. The article follows:

LUKE THE PHYSICIAN SPEAKS ON WHEN LIFE BEGINS

(By Stuart Bergsma, M.D.)

The inhabitants of Rama-Bethlehem, where Rachel is entombed and where Jesus was born, did not know in advance of the heinous decision King Herod had made. He had ordered the massacre of their children up to two years of age. Had they known, the scene recorded by St. Matthew would perhaps have been no less tragic and poignant than the words of his gospel, but they might have fought back, or fled, or done something about it:

"A voice was heard: someone was loudly lamenting, weeping, mourning deeply: It was Rachel, in her tomb there, crying, heard through its walls, weeping for her children, and she would not be comforted, because they were not."

"Each one was not," these are the exact words of Matthew. Each one, one by one, was slaughtered.

Never, since Herod's fateful decision, has any legal decision been published which so devastatingly bristles with stark tragedy for any nation that might be referred to as "a Christian nation," America, of which we sing "God shed his grace on thee." There faces us the prospect of a million innocent persons being slain in-utero by non-therapeutic, elective abortion by request of only the expectant mother and one physician.

The disaster to the United States of America has become a grim reality since that fateful date January 22, 1973, when the Supreme Court published its judicial majority decision on abortion. It is a decision that rules as constitutional, elective non-therapeutic abortion, by which, one by one, each one is not.

Numerous articles of protest have appeared since that Black Monday, January 22, which is likely to become an annual day of mourning and atonement as the years go by, even though it is a day of rejoicing by many pro-abortionists.

Bethlehem's total casualty list was small in comparison with certain modern statistics of war atrocities. The infants slain in the Bethlehem area perhaps numbered a few hundred. Auschwitz, Buchenwald, Dachau and other World War II concentration camp exterminations will be surpassed in America, The Beautiful, as abortions performed can total 25 million by the end of the 1900's.

Among the articles disagreeing with the Supreme Court's decision are two on which I will comment briefly, before stating my own case referred to in my title.

Louis Cassels, the well-known religious columnist of United Press International, in his column of Saturday, March 3, 1973, states: "in spite of disavowing any intent of stepping into a moral-medical-theological controversy, the court did precisely that." (A moral decision has been made, as well as a medical and theological decision. I. S. B., thus have the courage to enter the same arenas).

Cassels mentions that the majority opinion "explicitly denied any intention of the court to resolve 'the difficult question of when life begins'." However, a decision is made by their taking "the position that an unborn baby does not become a human person with a right to life until it is 'viable,' or 'from six to seven months after conception.' Yet the majority opinion acknowledged that "there are millions of Americans—including not a few scientists—who believe that life begins at conception—and that the State therefore has a compelling interest in protecting that life." Two of the Supreme Court justices disagreed with the majority report which expressed the opinion of seven justices.

My second reference is *Death Before Birth* by Edwin H. Palmer, in *The Banner* of March 23, 1973. His is a masterful, succinct, one part article on the Supreme Court's decision, not mincing any words as to that tragic decision. He outlines the meaning and breadth of coverage and scope and intent of the first, second and the third trimesters, or three month periods in pregnancy, as pertaining to abortion. He stresses:

"The only recourse to action is now an amendment to the U.S. Constitution." I agree wholeheartedly with Dr. Palmer.

It is extremely important that every American—certainly those who believe there is a God—should realize that there is a moral issue at stake. An almost neopagan, atheistic assumption is prevalent that God and morality have nothing to do with this heinous trespass into a sanctuary where even "angels should fear to tread;" and that the ancient, authoritative Scriptures, including the Judeo-Christian, have nothing to say about the unborn child. Some refuse in any way to relate non-therapeutic abortion to the most ancient and universal code for man, the Ten Commandments, especially to the sixth commandment: "Thou shalt not kill." (Also note Psalm 139: 12-18).

Luke, the physician, writes about two pregnant women (Luke 1:5 to 2:52). There are some who maintain that the Bible is silent as to when the developing embryo is precious in the eyes of God. I see a very definite reference, answering this question, for me at least, in Luke 1:26-56. Here is the scene: The angel Gabriel has revealed to Mary, a virgin of Nazareth, the amazing fact that she has found favor with God, and that through the intervention of the Holy Spirit she shall conceive and bring forth a son, Jesus, Son of the Highest. She is also told that her cousin, Elizabeth, aged and barren wife of the priest Zacharias, has conceived in her old age. Elizabeth is now six months pregnant. (Her son would later be known as John the Baptist).

We read that Mary arose in those days and went "with haste" from Nazareth to south of Jerusalem, a considerable journey for a young, pregnant girl, to her cousin Elizabeth. She greeted Elizabeth, and Elizabeth spoke to her with a loud voice, "Blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb! What have I done to have 'the mother of my Lord' come to me?" And Mary stayed with her about three months.

Note: Mary's miraculous conception occurred when her cousin Elizabeth was six months pregnant. Mary set forth "in haste." When Elizabeth greeted her, Mary's pregnancy could not have been other than in the earliest weeks. Yet Elizabeth refers to this

living, developing fetus in earliest stage of pregnancy as "my Lord." She refers to it as a person. Except for the miraculous manner of conception, Jesus' development in the womb was no different from all other men. He became man; in His humanity. He was "like unto His brothers." Because of what some might construe as "an unwanted pregnancy," Mary composes the Magnificat, the most wonderful pregnancy song of all ages: "My soul doth magnify the Lord." That Lord, in His human nature, was developing in her womb at that time. He was there, as a person (not just a blob of cells), at that very moment. Through Mary's words the Bible again refers to the contents of her womb as being a person, for she says: "My spirit hath rejoiced in God my Savior." "Savior" is a name ascribed to Jesus throughout His life, and here ascribed to Him in the womb.

Other biblical references to human life, life's sanctity, and its personhood before birth. In Psalm 139, verses 13 to 16, David addresses God his Maker and speaks about his own personhood while he was yet unborn: "Thou it was didst fashion my inward parts; Thou didst knit me together in my mother's womb;

Thou knowest me through and through;
My body is no mystery to Thee,
How I was secretly kneaded into shape,
And patterned in the depths of the earth.
Thou didst see my limbs unformed in the
womb,
And in Thy book they are all recorded;
Day by day they were fashioned,
Not one of them was late in growing."
(New English Bible)

David speaks of that state when he was in his mother's womb, in the first person singular as noted above: "I," "my," "me." No "blob of cells" was he; no indifferentiated "mass of tissues" of little account and easily expendable. From the moment of conception the Bible recognizes that man is a living organism, a person in the eyes of God.

God's blueprint which is followed in the life of every man coming into the world. Human life is present from the moment the fertilized egg-cell is formed. There is an exact 50/50 sharing of two original cells, each casting off half of its contents to pass out of existence as individual cells in order that they may become one marvelous single cell having 48 chromosomes. This new primal cell, or "zygote," embodies in its chromosome sections "genes" which determine the *hundreds* of contributions of both the male and the female. These include the physical and mental attributes and features (even color of eyes, color of hair, big or small ears, etc.). This one cell is the living embodiment of "the person" in formation.

In this cell is also the marvelous computer mechanism which has the molecular blue prints and building specifications for the whole "person's" construction job for nine months. It is something far more marvelous than would be necessary for a complex structure like the Empire State Building.

Then, by cell division, this living organism enters into a two-cell stage in a matter of hours; and the two become four, and the four become eight, and this continues month after month exactly according to the code laid down by the "Computer."

Some cells are early differentiated as the sexual cells of this new person for future generations. These reproductive cells, true to the coded information, are soon tucked away safely into a new organ in formation, the ovaries or the testes. There for some twelve years they remain quiescent, until puberty and adolescence bring into action the teenage phase of maturing, and the human cycle is getting ready to be repeated. Never does the living, throbbing life process stop, from the beginning one cell until the person is born into the world.

The heart begins to beat at the end of the

third week in utero. The body muscles contract and expand and make spontaneous movements by the tenth week of pregnancy. The mother detects these movements by that first "kick" about the twentieth week. In approximately 280 days, or 40 weeks, a baby is ready to be born. From embryos expelled accidentally, even at five weeks, head and feet and eyes and ears are recognizable with ordinary magnifying glass. At six weeks many body parts are clearly seen by naked eye.

Some personal opinions relating to 1973 and a somber future. David said in Psalm 139:14: "I will praise thee, O Lord, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvelous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well." That is why the life of any person in-utero must not be meddled with, must be left inviolate. Abortions which occur "of themselves" (miscarriages), may well be left "in God's hands," as "an act of God." Abortion should only be an act of man for a very good and proper reason, among which would be to save the life of the mother. The father of the person in the uterus has a vested interest. That child is 50 percent his production. He should not be denied his constitutional right nor be discriminated against on solely the sexual basis of not being a female. For one physician alone to bear the awesome responsibility of deciding whether an abortion should be done, without calling in a second physician, is almost "playing God." Most states had adequate abortion laws, with restraining clauses, operating efficiently before the Supreme Court decision of January 22, 1973.

Finally, I must caution against the unworthy, almost flippant comparisons made between the marvelous person developing in the womb, and his destruction, on the one hand, and the destruction of a chicken's egg or an acorn. These are simply the dragging of a dead herring along the trail to detract and mislead and sidetracking "to absurdity."

"A chicken's egg may be capable of producing a chicken, yet we eat it," some say. A more just comparison is rather that of a broody hen sitting on a nest of hatching eggs. Midway in the hatching cycle she is lifted off the half-formed chicks in the shell, and the eggs ruthlessly smashed. With fury she attacks you. If anyone does such a deed repeatedly, I, as a psychiatrist would be raising questions as to the perpetrator's mental status. Such a comparison has nothing to do with justifying abortion.

The acorn has been used as comparison. Acorns have the potential of becoming a large forest of oak trees. Burning the acorns is not the same as burning the forest they could become. Granted. The comparison is deliberately faulty and misleading. The true comparisons would be: You have planted a thousand acorns. They have sprouted, are now living beings, have grown to the size of small trees just breaking into leaf for the first time. You now ruthlessly bulldoze them all out of existence.

There is a natural abhorrence and painful anxiety at the thought of life being "nipped in the bud state." It is akin to breaking off the flower buds from an azalea bush, or the early blossoms from a fruit tree. I would be indignant if someone did such an "abortion" on my pear tree.

We began with Bethlehem and Year 2, the Year of our Lord when a mass "murder of the innocents" occurred. We have leaped across the centuries to 1973 A.D. and have maintained an inference that the two dates have similarities. Was this justified? I would answer: "Yes." The same arch-enemy has not rested from his work throughout the years mentioned. He is at work today. Let us support all efforts to bring about an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America when such amendment is formulated. Help to restore respect and concern for "the temple of God, which temple ye are" and have always been. You were never

a "blob of cells." Help to build up solid Christian, God-fearing family life. Help to build up the Christian moral fiber in the sexual realm of the youth of America.

SUCCESS OF JIM FARLEY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, last month a new tribute was paid to Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. Rockland County in New York State held the first annual James A. Farley Golf Classic in honor of their favorite son. The announcement of this, together with a short review of the events which highlighted Jim Farley's career, appeared in the Rockland County News-Leader-Independent. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert this article into the RECORD, and know my colleagues will find it most interesting:

THE SUCCESS OF JIM FARLEY

(By Art Hopper)

No other native-born Rockland Countyite in all history ever attained success on the national level as did Grassy Point born James A. Farley one-time known as Three-Job Jim when he simultaneously was Postmaster General, National Democratic Chairman, and Democratic Chairman of New York State.

Today Genial Jim is the dean of American politicians, revered and respected by Americans of all political beliefs.

Probably no American success legend since Abe Lincoln's childhood in a log cabin is so embedded in American folklore as the rise of Stony Point's town clerk, Big Jim, to the pinnacle of American political power, according to the nationwide news media.

On Sept. 17, Rockland's favorite son will be honored when Haverstraw Lodge, Elks BPO, of which he is a member, will stage the first annual James A. Farley Golf Classic at Dellwood Country Club, New City. The \$40 entry fee will include breakfast, green fees, buffet, cocktail hour and banquet. It is planned to have Big Jim in attendance.

James A. Farley hasn't lived in Rockland County since Dec. 31, 1928, but he still considers North Rockland "home", and subscribes to the local newspapers so as to keep up with hometown news.

He was born in Grassy Point on May 30, 1888, the son of James and Ellen (Goldrick) Farley. His father was a brick manufacturer and was killed accidentally when a horse kicked him and he died overnight.

His father was born in Verplanck, Westchester County, and his mother was born in Haverstraw. Both sets of grandparents came from Ireland—on his mother's side from County Cavan and on his father's side from County Meath, in the 1840s.

Big Jim attended Grassy Point Grade School, the eighth grade at Stony Point School, and graduated in 1905 from Stony Point High School. He then attended Packard Commercial School in New York City. Although he never went to college he holds 25 honorary degrees from colleges throughout the U.S. and is the author of two books—"Behind the Ballots" and "Jim Farley's Story."

After his father died his mother ran a small grocery store and saloon in his home town, and at 14 he tended bar before and after school. His mother asked him not to

smoke or drink, and he never has done either one.

As a youth he played first base for Sunday semi-pro baseball teams in Grassy Point and Haverstraw. Our father, who played against him at third base for Pearl River always used to say, "Big Jim was a darn good ball player."

Before going practically full-time into politics, Big Jim worked as a bookkeeper for Merlin Kelholtz Paper Company in New York City, was with the U.S. Gypsum Company of New York for 20 years, and then founded James A. Farley & Co., dealers in mason building materials.

In 1940 he was elected chairman of The Coca-Cola Export Corp., and made Coca-Cola a household word around the world. He now is honorary chairman of the board but still puts in a day's work at the office at 85 years of age. He has held many directorates nationwide, too numerous to list.

His political career started when he was elected town clerk of Stony Point, 1911-19, and then supervisor of Rockland County, 1920-23. He was appointed Port Warden in New York City by Governor Alfred E. Smith, 1918-19. Next Big Jim was elected member of the New York State Assembly from Rockland for 1923 sessions. He was appointed member of the New York State Athletic Commission by Governor Smith, 1924. He served as chairman 1925-Feb. 1933.

Mr. Farley was appointed Postmaster General of the U.S. in President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Cabinet, 1933, reappointed in 1937, resigned in August 31, 1940. Named member of Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government by President Eisenhower, 1953. Became member of New York State, Ranking Board through Governor Harriman, 1955-60. Appointed member of State Harness Racing Commission by Governor Rockefeller, 1959, and is still serving. Named honorary Postmaster of the New York World's Fair by President Johnson, 1964. Was a member of Electoral College, 1932, 1936, 1964 and 1968.

Other political activities include being chairman of the Rockland County Democratic Committee 1919-29. He was a delegate to every National Democratic Convention from 1924 through 1968. Became secretary of the N.Y.S. Democratic Committee in 1928. Served as chairman of the State Democratic committee, 1930-44. Was the chairman of the National Democratic Committee, 1932-40. He helped to elect President Roosevelt twice, then parted when he disagreed on a third term. Was himself a Presidential possibility. Has been vice president of the National Democratic Club of New York since 1930.

He is a member or honorary member of 19 social, political and fraternal organizations. Among them are Haverstraw Council, Knights of Columbus; Cheyenne Tribe, Order of Red Men, Stony Point, which recently honored him with a 50-year pin; Haverstraw Lodge, Elks BPO, and once president of N.Y.S. Elks Association; New York Athletic Club; Member of New York State Historical Association in Cooperstown; American Academy of Political and Social Science; Ancient Order of Hibernians, and others.

In addition to being awarded 25 varied honorary college degrees, Big Jim has been the recipient of 15 citations.

On April 28, 1920, he married Elizabeth A. Finnegan of Haverstraw. They became the parents of two daughters, now Mrs. Elizabeth M. Montgomery and Mrs. Ann E. Hickey, and a son, James A. Jr. Smiling Jim is exceptionally proud of his grandchildren. Mrs. Farley died Jan. 14, 1955.

He suffered a heart attack on April 21, 1972, was hospitalized for five weeks, and spent another five weeks recuperating at his apartment in the Waldorf-Astoria. His weight dropped from 205 to 180 pounds. To-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

day he is as active as ever. His theory is that hard work and devotion to one's job never hurt anybody.

One of his biggest assets as a politician has been his ability to remember faces and names, of being able always to personalize a greeting.

Jim Farley is truly one of the great human beings of our times. He possesses a magnetic personality and a flair for personal contact which captivates those who come under its influence.

He is one of those rare souls who by their very presence in a room seem to fill it with optimism, pride of country and deep abiding conviction that Americanism is not only the best philosophy of government and society, but the strongest.

Big Jim Farley is a legend in his own time—and Rockland County is proud of its favorite son.

WILL WE NOT CHANGE OUR WAY "UNTIL IT BECOMES UNDENIABLE EVEN TO THE MOST OBTUSE?"

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Kenneth J. Smith is leader of the Philadelphia Ethical Society and founder and former officer of the Drug Abuse Council of Philadelphia. He writes in the May/June 1973 issue of the Humanist about the two approaches to heroin addiction—the punitive approach prevalent in the United States and the approach used in Great Britain:

Only Canada, West Germany and America treat heroin addiction as a serious crime and all have accelerating problems. On the other hand, in Britain, Scandinavia, and other countries that treat addiction as a disease to be dealt with by professional experts, there is no burgeoning problem. . . . Meanwhile, the punitive approach has allowed our problem to get completely out of hand, so that, even now, practically all federal money is spent on chasing international suppliers and local pushers—all to no avail. Relatively little money is available to help bring about the rehabilitation of our addicts, and only about 10 per cent get any attention at all. For example, in Philadelphia, what meager resources exist have waiting lines of from three to six months.

A substantial number of addicts in the United States move to Great Britain to work out their problem within the law. Let us ask ourselves as Kenneth Smith asks, "Does the British alternative offer the promise of being a substantial improvement, a more humane method of dealing with one of the saddest and most intransigent problems faced by our country?"

The article in its entirety follows:

AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO HEROIN

(By Kenneth J. Smith)

It wasn't so long ago that heroin addicts were viewed as depraved creatures living in the ghetto (where they belonged) or bohemian musicians who needed the stuff to hit that beautiful note. Vietnam and the emergence of the drug-youth culture quickly changed all that. As addicts returned from the war, and as "hip" pockets of the large

cities developed, the more conservative elements of our society became aware of a link between heroin addiction and muggings, burglaries, and robberies. At first, the liberal segments seemed to ignore this connection, but today we have such paragons of liberalism as the *Village Voice* searching for some viable alternative to the heroin problem. So one over-riding fact has emerged—we all have to address ourselves to this problem because we are all affected by it.

Most experts see heroin as the single most important cause of theft and crimes of violence. And because of this obvious connection between narcotics and crime, there is a popular belief that heroin makes criminals of people and turns them to violence. On the contrary, heroin actually creates a temporary euphoria followed by lethargy and a desire to sleep. It is not the taking of narcotics, then, that leads to crime; it is the absence of the narcotic and the insatiable craving for it that impels and compels addicts to do literally anything to get a fix. The price of illegal heroin being so very high, few can maintain the habit without eventual involvement in crime.

Our present American system of dealing with heroin addiction is irrational and absurd because it makes a disease into a crime and punishes the victim. Virtually every sociologist and criminologist in the country views addiction as a disease and, hence, to be treated by medical and psychological means. In spite of this expert opinion, for over 50 years now, addiction has been a police matter—one result being that the number of addicts has multiplied in astronomical fashion.

Only Canada, West Germany, and America treat heroin addiction as a serious crime and all have accelerating problems. On the other hand, in Britain, Scandinavia, and other countries that treat addiction as a disease to be dealt with by professional experts, there is no burgeoning problem, no underworld of drugs and crime, little drug-connected violence or crime, and, of course, virtually no narcotics traffic.

When Scotland Yard announces no connection between narcotics and crime in Great Britain, it is a significant breakthrough. This is in direct contrast to the United States and an important justification for the British system; for we have all heard the much-publicized stories about the British system being a profound failure—the implication being that our punitive criminal approach is therefore justified. Naturally our entrenched bureaucrats in the addiction field have been eager to report that addicts have somewhat increased in England since the original program began and, on this basis, have sought to discredit the medical approach.

But what are the facts behind the numerical increase? In the first place, a significant number of addicts have moved to Britain where they can deal with their problem without breaking the law. In the second place, the old British system of trusting doctors to prescribe maintenance doses for their addict patients broke down; not necessarily because the *system* was wrong, but because a few doctors apparently were greedy and irresponsible and prescribed unlimited amounts. In turn, their patients sometimes sold the excess supply or gave it away, thus furthering addiction. Simply stated, no system can be better than the people administering it.

At any rate, when Britain found that a portion of doctors could no longer be trusted, it simply took the right to prescribe heroin away from the general practitioner. Addiction is now treated only by drug clinics scattered around Great Britain. Today about 2500 registered addicts receive maintenance doses—and Britain has *fewer* addicts than

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

it did back in 1968. Half of all addicts are productive and now work at jobs, and virtually none are engaged in crime. If we compare these British figures with our own estimated 600 thousand addicts and the accompanying crime and misery, calling their system a "failure" seems ludicrous.

The British combine their medical approach with an unrelenting educational program about the evils of addiction, and also have made the illegal selling of narcotics the highest fixed penalty in British law—14 years imprisonment.

When an addict shows up at a British clinic he must prove he is an addict before he is registered. Proof involves urine tests, intensive physical examination of injection scars, and exhaustive interviews and cross-checking of the story. After a week or so, he is registered and given a renewable prescription good for 13 weeks. The prescription is also forwarded to a drugstore where the addict can pick up his drug just once a day. In the meantime, if and when the addict wants to try to shake his habit, every medical and psychological service is made available to him. (Methadone, when acceptable to the addict, is increasingly being used.)

It is pathetic that former Attorney-General John Mitchell called the British system "the surrender approach" and a complete failure. Meanwhile, the punitive approach has allowed our problem to get completely out of hand, so that, even now, practically all federal money is spent on chasing international suppliers and local pushers—all to no avail. Relatively little money is available to help bring about the rehabilitation of our addicts, and only about 10 per cent get any attention at all. For example, in Philadelphia, what meager resources exist have waiting lists of from three to six months. Such community therapy centers as Gaudenzia House care for about 75 addicts and perhaps rehabilitate 20 a year—and this in Philadelphia with a reputed 25 thousand addicts!

Indeed, the current situation is desperate, and our remedies don't seem to do the job. Gaudenzia House, Synanon, Daytop Village—all these therapeutic centers reject over 50 per cent of all applicants for lack of motivation, and at each center the dropouts number some 50 per cent. Methadone, another addictive drug, works for some, but many addicts will not use it and the present program is being criticized for sloppy administration and inadequate supervision. Religious programs sometimes work, but how many addicts are going to respond to such a fundamentalist approach as Teen Challenge offers?

One aspect of the problem seems to be motivation, and almost any program based upon motivation can have some success. Unfortunately, many addicts are apathetic, lethargic, without hope, and we might question how realistic it is to expect these people to remould their personalities, substituting enthusiasm, hope, and commitment. Surely these are ideals to aim for, but, in the meantime, what are we to do with the hundreds of thousands of addicts driven by misery into a life of crime to support their drug habits?

Desperate problems sometimes require desperate remedies. There should be no illusion that medically controlled legalization of the use of heroin would be an adequate or satisfactory solution. Perhaps there can be none until we face up to the gigantic problem of restructuring our society so that the causes of addiction are dealt with. However, we cannot wait for Utopia, and surely it is foolish to condemn an alternative method because it is not perfect and foolproof. The only honest question is this: Does the British alternative offer the promise of being a substantial improvement, a more humane method of dealing with one of the saddest and most intransigent problems faced by our country? At the minimum, we should sup-

port an experimental pilot program as a test of the new approach to heroin addiction.

Enlightenment comes slowly; first the experts, then the media, then the public building support. The late American sociologist, Harry Elmer Barnes, had long been an advocate of this position. So too has a leading sociologist-writer in this field, Dr. Alfred Lindesmith of Indiana University. Recently the Ford Foundation came out for a controlled experiment in heroin maintenance, as has the Crime Committee of the American Bar Association. In 1972, Yale Medical School drew up a plan for a pilot program in New York City under the auspices of the Vera Crime Institute. In November of 1972, the Consumer's Union issued an exhaustive study of the drug problem and recommended the medical approach. Still, enough support has not developed for anyone to be optimistic about any experiments in the near future. The idea is out in the open, however, and away from the ivory tower. Hopefully, public education and enlightenment will follow.

It may be that America has not suffered enough yet. Maybe we will change our losing plan only as the unrelieved failure of the present approach becomes undeniable even to the most obtuse. Perhaps some of us can shorten this dreadful period of waiting—at the very least, we must try.

SUPPORT GROWS FOR VICE PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION BY HOUSE

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1973

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is readily becoming evident that the American people are in support of the Vice President's request for a full investigation of the charges made against him. It is also obvious that the only proper forum for such an investigation is the House itself.

As evidence of the growing feeling that the Vice President's request is both correct and should be followed, I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of October 1, 1973, entitled, "Tacky Arguments" and a column by the distinguished columnist, William S. White, which appeared in the Washington Post on September 29, 1973.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 1, 1973]

TACKY ARGUMENTS

We have seldom seen a tackier set of arguments than those being offered by apologists for the House leadership's decision not to investigate Spiro Agnew. We are told that an investigation would slow disposition of the case by somehow helping Mr. Agnew in court, that since Mr. Agnew has requested the investigation he must be up to something bad, and that anyway the House is incompetent to discharge its constitutional duties.

The fact is that with or without a House investigation Mr. Agnew is quite capable of going to the Supreme Court on the plausible grounds that he must be impeached before he can be indicted. On Friday he went right ahead and filed suit to stop the grand jury investigation; did the House leaders seriously believe he would not do so if they turned down his request? Do they now believe he will hesitate in any appeal he would have made if they had started their investigation?

Only two questions bear on how the House could affect the length of time until this

issue is settled: Whether the House will be prepared to move if the Supreme Court says the House is the body with jurisdiction, and whether after seeing the evidence the House would want to short-circuit the appeals by moving on its own for impeachment. Obviously, both argue not for refusing the investigation but for getting it started.

As for Mr. Agnew's motives in asking for the investigation, if he is going to argue in court that only the House has jurisdiction he must ask the House to take jurisdiction. Whether or not the House acts on the request is nearly irrelevant. Those who put the worst interpretation on Mr. Agnew's request argue, in effect, it's a dirty trick because he knows full well the House is too cowardly to take him up.

The House is not only cowardly, the apologists for the House argue, it is also incompetent. From truck drivers and hash-house waitresses you can assemble a grand jury fit to hear the charges, but in the membership of the House of Representatives it is impossible to find 12 good men and true who could be trusted to act with propriety.

And if the House works hard at proving itself cowardly and incompetent, the apologist line concludes, the Supreme Court will be less likely to rule that the Constitution gives it any responsibility. What this says about the House may be reasonably accurate, but we very much doubt what it says about the Supreme Court. The Justices are not entirely immune from political considerations, but we find it entirely preposterous to believe that their decision will turn on whether or not the House has appointed a select committee to start taking a look at the evidence.

The House is, of course, free to shirk its responsibilities if it wants, but the act should be seen for what it is. The decision was not made on constitutional or legal grounds, but on political grounds. The Democratic leadership in the House does not want to end the uncertainty that threatens to cripple the Republican administration. And if we find that the same uncertainty cripples the Republic, Mr. Albert and the rest will pass the buck once more, blaming everyone but themselves for letting the damage come to pass.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1973]

(By William S. White)

CARL ALBERT'S DECISION AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

All sorts of legalistic alibis can be made for the refusal of the Democratic leaders to have the House of Representatives take charge here and now of the case of Vice President Agnew.

Nevertheless, no number of soothing rationalizations can alter the profound truth that here the highly decent Speaker Carl Albert has made a decision that runs against the deepest of national interest.

What the House has decided to do is to let not simply Spiro Agnew himself but also the people of the United States "hang there twisting slowly in the wind." This was the marvelous recommendation made by a discredited Nixon White House aide for dealing with acting FBI director L. Patrick Gray.

For the central and undeniable facts are these:

Item. Agnew's right to an investigation by the House itself, in place of a federal grand jury already guilty of persistent smear-leaks against Agnew, already partially admitted by the Department of Justice itself, is incontestable under the Constitution.

Item. The duty, not merely the privilege, of the House so to act is additionally plain since there is the gravest of doubt, again a fully admitted doubt, that any vice president can be indicted by any grand jury for anything so long as he remains in office.

October 1, 1973

For the House therefore to say that it really cannot intervene "because the matter is in the courts" is a staggering cop-out of double-talk. After all, the fact that the matter is indeed "in the courts" is Agnew's whole point. He is appealing to the House to acquit him or to impeach—that is, to indict—him because in his view the courts could not lawfully do the one and, given its whole attitude, the Department of Justice is hell-bent to do the other.

Thus the whole effect of the cop-out of the House is to leave this wretched, this divisive, this traumatic business hanging over this nation for many, many months if not for years. Court appeal will follow appeal will fol-

low appeal . . . The House on the other hand could clear the whole thing up in a maximum of six weeks if it had the mind to do so.

Moreover, indictment or no indictment Agnew is simply not going to resign. He is in a high-noon, a shoot-out-at-OK-corral mood. So what good can "leaving it to the grand jury" do anyhow, even assuming that the grand jury isn't sooner or later stopped cold by the higher courts? Why, the case will come right back to the House—where it ought to be right now.

Carl Albert is an able and fair man whom I have known and respected (and still do) for many years. One can only suppose that here he let himself be over-persuaded by overly-partisan Democratic associates. Old Speaker

Sam Rayburn, on those very rare occasions when he believed elementary justice and the indispensable national welfare were involved, asked neither Democratic colleagues nor the House itself what to do. He told them. And they did it.

One hopes that Albert will return to the Rayburn tradition before this sad crisis has run its course. The question is not whether Spiro Agnew is a bad man or a good man. One question, however, is whether the Department of Justice is showing how "tough" and "independent" it can be, perhaps in order to sanctify the extremely poor job it did in the Watergate scandal.

Be he guilty or not, there is a strong "get-Agnew" aroma around Washington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 2, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Give us this day our daily bread.—Matthew 6: 11.

In the revival of a centuries-old tradition in which man has paused each autumn to give thanks for his harvest, we lift our hearts unto Thee, our Father God, in gratitude for the fruit of the soil, for the reaping of grain, and for the daily bread which nourishes our bodies and our spirits. Help us to realize anew our dependence upon the soil, the sun, and the rain, upon the skill of the farmer and, above all, upon Thy bountiful grace. "Back of the loaf is the snowy flour, back of the flour the mill, and back of the mill is the field, the wheat, the sun, the shower, and the Father's will."

May we turn our voices of thanksgiving into the virtues of thanksgiving. With understanding and compassion, help us to share the results of our labor with those who are in need. Through our giving and our sharing on this international day of bread, may new hope come to the distressed, new faith to those who doubt, new light to those who sit in darkness, and new life to those who are depressed. By Thy spirit, may we make our contribution of human sympathy to human need, transcending the boundaries of color, creed, and country.

In the spirit of Him who said, "Give and it shall be given unto you," we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 719. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and

Urban Development with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages, to extend authorizations under laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits, and for other purposes.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2535) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection of the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COL. JOHN H. SHERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2633) for the relief of Col. John H. Sherman.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF THE LATE RICHARD BURTON, SFC, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3533) for the relief of the estate of the late Richard Burton, SFC, U.S. Army, retired.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2508) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ROBERT J. BEAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3544) for the relief of Robert J. Beas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MURRAY SWARTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6411) for the relief of Murray Swartz.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ALVIN V. BURT, JR., EILEEN WALLACE KENNEDY POPE, AND DAVID DOUGLAS KENNEDY, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6624) for the relief of Alvin V. Burt, Jr., and the estate of Douglas E. Kennedy, deceased.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION TO REFER BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF ESTELLE M. FASS TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the resolution (H.R. 362) to refer the bill (H.R. 7209)