

dent under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be Lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Robert E. Huyser, [xxx-xx-xxxx] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

The following officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be Lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Felix M. Rogers, [xxx-xx-xxxx] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

Army nominations beginning Malcolm P. Henry, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Karen P. Valra, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 1, 1973.

Army nominations beginning Trevor E. Williams, to be colonel, and ending Fernando Zapata, Jr., to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 1, 1973.

Army nominations beginning Anthony T. Alt, to be colonel, and ending Nicholas G. Georgakis, to be lieutenant colonel, which

nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 4, 1973.

IN THE NAVY

Navy nominations beginning John William Ackerman, to be chief warrant officer, W-3, and ending Joseph P. Venable, to be lieutenant (Jg.), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 27, 1973.

Navy nominations beginning Henry Hisashi Abe, to be captain, and ending Sue Ella Young, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 1, 1973.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

1974 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 7

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the information of Members, their staffs, and others, excerpts from the "Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 7, as of September 28," prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. The report itself has been sent to all Members.

This report shows that the impact of congressional actions completed to September 28 would be to increase budgeted 1974 outlays by about \$2.8 billion. This, together with certain revenue actions, would have the effect of raising the estimated deficit for fiscal 1974 by more than \$3 billion.

In addition, a number of significant actions are as yet incomplete which may materially affect the final impact of congressional action or inaction in this session. The report points up the major areas of pending action in both legislative and appropriation bills.

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

EXCERPTS FROM 1974 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 7, AS OF SEPTEMBER 28, 1973

INTRODUCTION AND 1974 SCOREKEEPING HIGHLIGHTS

Budget outlays (expenditures)

The impact of congressional action through September 28 on the President's fiscal year 1974 budget outlay requests, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	House	Senate	Enacted
1974 budget outlay (expenditure) estimate.....	268,671	268,671	268,671
Congressional changes to date (committee action included):			
Appropriation bills:			
Completed action.....	+663	+990	+869
Pending action.....	+399	-54	
Legislative bills:			
Completed action.....	+1,215	+2,118	+1,934
Pending action.....	+1,288	+3,390	

	House	Senate	Enacted
Total changes:			
Completed action.....	+1,878	+3,108	+2,803
Pending action.....	+1,687	+3,336	
Total.....	+3,565	+6,444	+2,803

1974 budget outlays as adjusted by congressional changes to date..... 272,236 275,115 271,474

See table 1.

While this report reflects enacted congressional increases in budgeted outlays of about \$2.8 billion, many significant actions are as yet incomplete which may materially affect the final impact of congressional action or inaction on budgeted 1974 outlays.

Completed actions: A summary of major individual actions composing the \$2.8 billion total outlay impact of completed congressional action to date on 1974 budgeted outlays follows:

Appropriation bills:	Estimated 1974 outlay impact (in millions)
Regular 1974 bills:	
Agriculture	+250
Interior	+75
Public Works	+20
Transportation	-30
District of Columbia	-3
1973 supplemental bills (1974 outlay impact)	+557
Subtotal, appropriation bills.....	+869

Legislative bills—backdoor and mandatory:

Food stamp amendments (P.L. 93-86)	+724
Repeal of "bread tax" (P.L. 93-86)	+400
Federal employee pay raise, Oct. 1, 1973 (S. Res. 171)	+358
Welfare—medicaid amendments P.L. 93-86)	+122
Unemployment benefits extension (P.L. 93-53)	+116
Veterans national cemeteries (P.L. 93-43)	+110
Social Security—liberalized income exemption (P.L. 93-66)	+100
Winema forest expansion (P.L. 93-102)	+70
Veterans dependents' health care (P.L. 93-82)	+65
Airport development (P.L. 93-44)	+15
REA—removed from budget (P.L. 93-32)	-146
Subtotal, legislative bills.....	+1,934

Total, 1974 outlay impact of completed congressional action

+2,803

Pending action: The major incomplete legislative actions affecting budget outlays which have passed or are pending in one or both House of Congress are shown in detail on table 1 and are summarized below:

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

[In millions of dollars]

	House	Senate
Labor—HEW	+490	
State—Justice	-40	-20
Treasury—Postal Service	-35	-68

Legislative bills—backdoor and mandatory:

Twenty legislative measures authorizing backdoor or mandatory outlays have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress.

House action on 11 such measures would increase fiscal 1974 budget outlays by about \$1.3 billion. Senate action on 14 such measures would increase budgeted 1974 outlays at least \$3.4 billion, including about \$2 billion for social security increases. The undetermined outlay effect of increased contract authority is excluded.

The scored backdoor or mandatory impact of these pending legislative bills includes the following major amounts in excess of the budgeted outlays:

[In millions of dollars]

	House	Senate
Civil Service minimum retirement (including social security increase)	+172	+2,250
Mass transit operating subsidies	+400	+400
School lunch	+129	+300
Federal employee health insurance	+234	
Veterans pensions	+208	+172
Veterans drug treatment		+144

REVENUE LEGISLATION

The June 1 budget revisions estimate revenue for fiscal 1974 at \$266 billion. This is an increase of \$10 billion over the original January estimate of \$256 billion. Completed legislative action to date, has the effect of reducing 1974 revenue estimates by \$492 million, as follows:

Railroad Retirement: decrease of \$612 million due to failure to provide additional trust fund receipts requested.

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

DEFICIT POSITION

The 1974 budget deficit, as revised June 1, is estimated at \$2.7 billion—a decrease of \$10 billion from the original January estimate

of \$12.7 billion. Although there has been indication that further revision in the deficit projection is possible due to revenue adjustments, this is the latest official estimate. It reflects a federal funds deficit of \$18.8 billion and a trust fund surplus of \$16.1 billion.

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

	Billion
Budget estimate (revised June 1)-----	\$2.7
Based on House changes to date-----	7.0
Based on Senate changes to date-----	9.7
Based on changes enacted to date-----	6.0

BUDGET AUTHORITY (APPROPRIATIONS AND OTHER OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY)

The impact of congressional action through September 28 on the President's \$290.4 billion budget authority request for fiscal year 1974, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

	[In millions of dollars]		
	House	Senate	Enacted
Congressional changes to date in requested 1974 budget authority (committee action included):			
Appropriation bills:			
Completed action-----	+89	+926	+484
Pending action-----	+1,109	-178	

	House	Senate	Enacted
Legislative bills:			
Completed action-----	+1,977	+2,190	+1,966
Pending action-----	+1,313	+3,693	
Shifts between fiscal years 1973 and 1974 (net) due to timing of action on budget requests-----	+3,890	+3,890	+3,890
Total changes:			
Completed action-----	+5,956	+7,006	+6,340
Pending action-----	+2,422	+3,515	
Total-----	+8,378	+10,521	+6,340
Total changes, excluding shifts between fiscal years due to timing-----	+4,488	+6,631	+2,450

TABLE NO. 1.—ESTIMATED EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 93D CONGRESS ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF SEPT. 28, 1973)

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Fiscal year 1974:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the 1974 budget):						
1973 bills:						
1973 Labor-HEW appropriations (continuing resolution, Public Law 93-9)-----				(1)	(1)	(1)
Urgent supplemental, 1973 (Public Law 93-25)-----	+36,000			+36,000		+36,000
2d supplemental, 1973 (vetoed bill, H.R. 7447)-----	(+27,000)			(+202,000)		(+150,000)
2d supplemental, 1973 (Public Law 93-50)-----	+150,000			+150,000		+150,000
Inaction on proposed rescissions-----	+370,600			+370,600		+370,600
1974 regular bills:						
Legislative branch (H.R. 6691)-----	-16,900	-36,592	(9)	-16,000	-11,400	(9)
Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection (H.R. 8619)-----	-133,813	+357,375	+108,116	+135,000	+300,000	+250,000
District of Columbia (Public Law 93-91)-----	-5,281	-15,281	-15,281	-2,550	-2,550	-2,550
Transportation and related agencies (Public Law 93-98)-----	-139,501	-51,381	-112,286	-40,000	-6,000	-30,000
Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, Veterans (H.R. 8825)-----	+453,501	+500,920	+439,047		+45,000	(9)
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare (H.R. 8877)-----	+1,264,352			+490,000		
Interior and related agencies (H.R. 8917)-----	-4,877	+118,406	+72,770	+30,000	+105,000	+75,000
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary (H.R. 8916)-----	-82,134	-63,423	(9)	-40,000	-20,000	(9)
Public Works and Atomic Energy (Public Law 93-97)-----	-81,074	+15,513	-8,066	-16,400	+37,000	+20,000
Treasury, Postal Service, and general government (H.R. 9590)-----	-56,622	-77,999	(9)	-35,000	-68,000	(9)
Subtotal, appropriation bills-----	+1,197,651	+747,538	+484,300	+1,061,650	+935,650	+869,050
Legislative bills (changes from the 1974 budget):						
"Backdoor" spending authorizations (not requiring further appropriation action):						
Federal Financing Bank (contract authority) (H.R. 5874, S. 925)-----	+25,000	+25,000		N.A.	N.A.	
Flood insurance (borrowing authority) (H.R. 8449)-----	(10)			N.A.		
Airport development (contract authority) (Public Law 93-44)-----				+15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Federal-aid Highway Act of 1973 (contract authority) (Public Law 93-87)-----						
(increase over requests)	+1,307,220	+1,307,220	+1,307,220	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Traffic safety (contract authority) (Public Law 93-87)-----	+915,000	+245,000	+281,000	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Urban mass transit operating subsidy (contract authority) (S. 386, H.R. 6452)-----	+400,000	+400,000		+400,000	+400,000	
Freight car loan guarantee (borrowing authority) (S. 1149)-----		+2,000,000			N.A.	
Subtotal, "backdoor"-----	+2,647,220	+3,977,220	+1,588,220	+415,000	+415,000	+15,000
Mandatory spending authorizations (requiring payments over which there is little or no control through the appropriation process):						
Federal employee health insurance contributions (H.R. 9256)-----	+233,600	+357,900	+357,900	+233,600	+357,900	+357,900
Federal employees pay raise, Oct. 1, 1973 (S. Res. 171)-----		+95,000			+95,000	
Uniform relocation assistance (S. 261)-----	(11)	+16,000		(11)	+16,000	
Eucalyptus tree fire hazard (S. 1697)-----						
Farm bill (Public Law 93-86):						
Food stamp amendments-----	+724,000	+724,000	+724,000	+724,000	+724,000	+724,000
Repeal of "bread tax" (offsetting receipts)-----				+400,000	+400,000	+400,000
School lunch amendments (H.R. 9639)-----	+129,500	+300,000	(9)	+129,500	+300,000	(9)
Feed grain program (H.R. 6791)-----	+89,000			+89,000		
Peanut support (H.R. 6646)-----	+8,600			+8,600		
Winema Forest expansion (Public Law 93-102)-----	+60,000	+70,000	+70,000	+60,000	+70,000	+70,000
Welfare—medicaid amendments (Public Law 93-66)-----		+122,000	+122,000		+122,000	+122,000
Public safety officers death gratuity (S. 15)-----		+6,000			+6,000	
Public safety officers group life insurance (S. 33)-----		+20,000			+20,000	
Victims of crime—payments (S. 300)-----		+7,000			+7,000	
Deputy marshals pay raise (H.R. 5094)-----	+2,070			+2,070		
Early retirement—customs inspectors (H.R. 6078)-----	+3,900			+3,900		
Veterans drug and alcohol treatment (S. 284)-----		+144,136			+144,136	
Veterans dependents' health care (Public Law 93-82)-----	+64,915	+103,800	+64,915	+64,915	+103,800	+64,915
Veterans national cemeteries (Public Law 93-43)-----	+96,720	+110,000	+110,000	+96,720	+110,000	+110,000
Veterans pension increase (H.R. 9474)-----	+208,400	+171,900	(9)	+208,400	+171,900	(9)
Civil Service—Minimum retirement (S. 1866, H.R. 9107)-----	+172,000	+170,000		+172,000	+2,250,000	
Civil Service—Survivor annuity modification (S. 628)-----		+8,500			+8,500	
Civil Service—National Guard technician retirement (S. 871)-----		+7,900			+7,900	
Civil Service—Early retirement, hazardous occupations (H.R. 9281)-----	+41,100			+41,100		
Civil Service—Retirement cost-of-living liberalization (H.R. 3799)-----	+200			+200		
Civil Service—Survivor benefits (S. 2174)-----		+4,600			+4,600	
Social security—Exempt wages (trust fund) (Public Law 93-66)-----		+120,000	+120,000		+100,000	+100,000
Unemployment benefits—Extension (trust fund) (Public Law 93-53)-----					+115,700	+115,700
Railroad retirement (revenue) (trust fund) (Public Law 93-69)-----	-612,000	-612,000	-612,000	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Subtotal, mandatory-----	+1,222,005	+1,946,736	+956,815	+2,234,005	+5,134,436	+2,064,515
Adjustments and other changes (legislative provisions having impact on budget totals):						
Rural electrification loans—Remove from budget (Public Law 93-32)-----	-579,000		-579,000	-146,000		-146,000
Forest roads and trails—repeal of permanent appropriation (S. 1775)-----		-40,900			-40,900	
Subtotal, other-----	-579,000	-40,900	-579,000	-146,000	-40,900	-146,000

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Shifts between fiscal years 1973 and 1974 (Impact on budget totals due to timing of action on budget requests):						
Airport development (contract authority)—shift to 1973 (Public Law 93-44)	-560,000	-560,000	-560,000			
Federal-aid highways (contract authority)—shift from 1973 (Public Law 93-87)	+1,450,000	+1,450,000	+1,450,000			
Urban mass transportation (contract authority)—shift from 1973 (Public Law 93-87)	+3,000,000	+3,000,000	+3,000,000			
Subtotal, shifts	+3,890,000	+3,890,000	+3,890,000			
Subtotal, legislative bills	+7,180,225	+9,773,056	+5,856,035	+2,503,005	+5,508,536	+1,933,515
Total, fiscal year 1974 (including shifts)	+8,377,876	+10,520,594	+6,340,335	+3,564,655	+6,444,186	+2,802,565

¹ The continuing resolution extended funding for items in the vetoed 1973 Labor-HEW appropriation bill to June 30, 1973, in lieu of processing another regular 1973 appropriation bill in this session. The revised 1973 budget estimates showed appropriations for these items at the level requested last session, and also proposed amendments to the then-pending requests. The level of the budget authority under the continuing resolution, the same as provided last session, is estimated to be about \$1 billion higher than shown in the budget, and no action is contemplated on the proposed amendments to reduce budget authority by \$366 million with potential outlay effect of \$470 million in 1973 and \$391 million in 1974. The scorekeeping above shows the impact of inaction on the proposed amendments in budget authority.

² Replaces vetoed bill, H.R. 7447; FY 1973 appropriations only.

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

⁴ Subject to or in conference.

⁵ Excludes increase of \$300 million in budget authority and outlays providing funding for mandatory food stamp amendments, reflected below against the Farm Bill for scorekeeping purposes.

⁶ Committee action.

⁷ Does not reflect possible outlay effect, estimated at \$70 million, of Senate floor amendment which provided that funds in bill for housing programs would not become available unless HUD funds presently impounded are released and used for purposes appropriated.

⁸ Pending signature.

⁹ Does not reflect outlay impact, estimated at \$164 million, of denial of transfer authority requested for GSA.

¹⁰ Indefinite.

¹¹ Enacted figure used for comparability.

¹² Assumes pay increase of 4.77 percent, as indicated in H. Doc. 93-140.

¹³ Rejected.

N.A.—Cost estimate not available or undetermined at this time.

FEDERAL STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the New York Times recently published an excellent summary and analysis of the present Federal financial aid programs available to students continuing their education.

This article contains valuable information for all students needing financial aid to continue their education. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Programs Helping College Students" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Sept. 4, 1973]

PROGRAMS HELPING COLLEGE STUDENTS

(Following are the five major programs administered through the United States Office of Education for aiding postsecondary school students and the major state-operated programs in the metropolitan area. In addition to these programs there are other specialized forms of Federal assistance, private loans and a wide variety of scholarships offered by foundations, agencies and the educational institutions themselves.)

BASIC EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

Eligibility: Open to full-time freshmen at colleges, universities and vocational and technical schools who did not attend a postsecondary education institution prior to July 1, 1973.

How to apply: Applications are available from post-secondary institutions, high schools, post offices, state employment offices, county agricultural extension agencies and Box G, Iowa City, Iowa, 52240.

When to apply: As soon as possible for the academic year now beginning.

Criteria: Family income and assets deter-

mine who gets a grant, academic achievement having no bearing. Applicant must complete a detailed financial statement that is subject to comparison with the Federal income tax return that parents have filed with the Internal Revenue Service. In general, a student from a family of four with an income of \$11,000 or more would not qualify for a grant. However, factors that can offset a higher income and enable a student to get a grant are a large family, brothers and sisters in college, both parents working and usually large medical expenses.

Size of grant: Ranging from \$50 to \$452—the top grant going to a student from a family that according to its income and assets cannot afford to contribute anything toward the student's education.

Terms of repayment: This is a grant and there is no repayment involved.

Comments: No eligible student whose certifiable need meets the established criteria will be turned down by this program. Also, the grant will be awarded regardless of any other Federal grants or loans the student may receive. If a sufficient level of funding is authorized by Congress, the program is to be expanded to include all needy undergraduates, full-time and part-time. The top grant would be \$1,400.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

Eligibility. Anyone enrolled as an undergraduate or graduate student in any of 8,200 participating colleges, universities and nursing, vocational, technical, trade, business or home study schools.

How to apply: Applications may be obtained from participating educational institutions, banks, savings and loans, credit unions and the United States Office of Education.

When to apply: At any time.

Criteria: All students are eligible, regardless of how high the family income. Only those with established need, however, can qualify to have the Federal Government pay the interest on the loan; others must pay their own interest. Those seeking interest-subsidized loans must fill out a needs analysis divulging income and assets. Such factors as a large family, brothers and sisters in college, both parents working and unusually large medical expenses are taken into considera-

tion. The financial aid office of the educational institution processes the application, applying a mandated formula, and recommends to the potential lender the amount of the interest-subsidized loan (including a possible zero dollar recommendation) for which the student qualifies. Prior to March 1, a student from a family with an adjusted income of less than \$15,000 could qualify for an interest-subsidized loan, but under new regulations many students who formerly qualified are finding themselves ineligible.

Size of loan: In general, loans may be for up to \$2,500 a year—not to exceed \$7,500 during an entire undergraduate career and \$10,000 during the course of undergraduate and graduate education. The annual amounts and cumulative totals vary, though, in some states, including Connecticut and New York.

Terms of repayment: No payment on principal is required until nine to 12 months after the student leaves school or until after service in the military, Peace Corps or VISTA. Once repayment begins, it is to be completed over a period of not more than 10 years and not less than five years, or sooner if the loan can be paid off at a rate of \$360 a year. In the event of default, the Federal or State guarantee agency will compensate the private lender and attempt to recover the money from the student.

Comments: While this program appears to be open to all applicants it has not worked out that way. All of the money being loaned belongs to private lenders who participate voluntarily and retain the ultimate decision about who gets a loan. The new needs analysis formula has had the effect of disqualifying many of the students who would have gotten interest-subsidized loans under the old rules. The lending institutions could go ahead and give loans through the program that are not interest-subsidized, but are reluctant to do so. Not only is this a time of tight money, but apparently the lenders do not want to get too much of their money tied up in loans on which payment on the principal is delayed until after the student leaves school.

Moreover, while a lender can bill the Federal Government in one lump sum for the interest on all the subsidized loans, students must be billed individually for interest on unsubsidized loans—making such loans unattractive to the lender because of the great-

er servicing costs. The March 1 regulations were ostensibly to make it easier for the middle-class to get the guaranteed loans, but the change has had the opposite effect. Congress has had hearings on the problems that have developed and there is a widespread opinion among authorities on the program that the law needs further changes if it is actually meant to be of use to students from a wide range of income groups.

SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

Eligibility: For undergraduates in colleges and universities and students in other approved post-secondary schools. Half-time as well as full-time students.

How to apply: Through the financial aid office of the institution in which enrolled.

When to apply: As soon as possible for this year and upon acceptance for next year.

Criteria: For students of "exceptional need," who without the grant would be unable to continue their education. Final determination of need is up to the College's financial aid office. This grant is often given in combination with National Direct Student Loan and College Work-Study aid to form a single assistance package.

Size of grant: Not less than \$200 or more than \$1,500 a year. Normally, renewed for up to four years—or five years when course of study requires extra time. The total that may be awarded is \$4,000 for a four-year course of study and \$5,000 for a five-year course.

Terms of repayment: This is a grant and there is no repayment involved.

Comments: In the past, 72.7 per cent of these grants have gone to students whose family income is below \$6,000; students from families with incomes in excess of \$9,000 have received 4.2 per cent of the grants.

COLLEGE WORK-STUDY

Eligibility: For undergraduates and graduate students in colleges, universities and approved post-secondary schools. Half-time as well as full-time students.

How to apply: Through the financial aid office of the institution in which enrolled.

When to apply: As soon as possible for this year and upon acceptance for next year.

Criteria: The offer of a job is based on need, as determined by the college's financial aid office. The Federal money is used to pay the wages. The job may be for as many as 40 hours a week at a nonprofit on-campus (cafeteria, library, laboratory) or off-campus (hospital, school, government agency) site. Usually awarded as a package in combination with Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grant and National Direct Student Loan.

Amount of pay: From \$1.60 to \$3.60 an hour. Average annual compensation being \$600.

Terms of repayment: These are wages for hours worked and there is no repayment.

Comments: In the past, 56.7 per cent of the work-study jobs have gone to students whose family income is less than \$6,000; students from families with incomes in excess of \$9,000 have received 17.3 per cent of the jobs.

NATIONAL DIRECT STUDENT LOANS

Eligibility: For undergraduates and graduate students in colleges and universities and approved post-secondary schools. Half-time as well as full-time.

How to apply: Through the financial aid office of the institution in which enrolled.

When to apply: As soon as possible for this year and upon acceptance for next year.

Criteria: The loan is based entirely on need, as determined by the college's financial aid office. Usually awarded as a package in combination with College Work-Study and Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grant.

Size of loan: Up to a total of \$2,500 while enrolled in a vocational school or during the first two years of a degree program. Up to a total of \$5,000 while studying toward a bach-

elor's degree and up to \$10,000 during the entire undergraduate and graduate career.

Terms of repayment: Begins after leaving school or service in military, Peace Corps or VISTA. Interest of 3 per cent on unpaid balance of loan is charged when repayment period begins. Maximum length of repayment period is 10 years. Loan is canceled and no repayment necessary for teachers of the handicapped and teachers in inner-city in combination with College Work-Study and Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grant.

Size of loan: Up to a total of \$2,500 while enrolled in a vocational school or during the first two years of a degree program. Up to a total of \$5,000 while studying toward a bachelor's degree and up to \$10,000 during the entire undergraduate and graduate career.

Terms of repayment: Begins after leaving school or service in military, Peace Corps or VISTA. Interest of 3 per cent on unpaid balance of loan is charged when repayment period begins. Maximum length of repayment periods is 10 years. Loan is canceled and no repayment necessary for teachers of the handicapped and teachers in inner-city schools and servicemen who spend one year in a combat zone.

Comments: This is the original of the Federal assistance programs for students, which began as the National Defense Student Loans in the late nineteen-fifties in the wake of the panic over the launching of the Soviet Union's first satellite. It was awarded on the basis of academic achievement, largely to students in the sciences and education. Academic achievement no longer figures in the loan and major field of study makes little difference. Students from families with incomes in excess of \$12,000 get 10.6 per cent of the loans.

TRIBUTE TO SAM DAVIS OF TENNESSEE—"BOY HERO OF THE CONFEDERACY"

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was honored and pleased last Sunday to join others in honoring the memory of Sam Davis, of Smyrna and Rutherford County, Tenn., a brave, loyal, and courageous young man who gave his life rather than betray his cause or his friends.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the courage and valor of all Americans, I place my remarks on this occasion in the RECORD:

TRIBUTE TO SAM DAVIS—BOY HERO OF THE CONFEDERACY

Thank you, Sarah King—Mrs. Hughey King—Mrs. Enoch, Mayor Ridley, ladies and gentlemen and friends.

Certainly I am pleased and delighted to join with all of you here today in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of Sam Davis on this—the 131st anniversary of his birthday.

This is an important occasion.

This is a significant occasion.

May I say that this occasion has already had a profound impact upon me because I have had the opportunity of again reviewing the wonderful story of the quiet heroism of Sam Davis, often called the "boy hero of the Confederacy".

Today as we recall the incredible bravery and courage of this young man, we should

indeed reaffirm our faith in our country and examine the depths of our own courage and commitment to the ideals of patriotism which Sam Davis represented.

As we gather here at this time, first—I want to commend and congratulate Mrs. Sarah King for her dedication and devotion to preserving, promoting and perpetuating our heritage and traditions.

As we all know, Sarah King is Regent of the Sam Davis Memorial Association—and she is also Curator-General of the Daughters of the American Revolution—a great and patriotic national organization. I predict further honors for Sarah yet to be attained.

Sarah, along with her co-workers, is most active in this important work of retaining, continuing and preserving our traditions and history.

I want to commend also the other officers and members of the Sam Davis Association—it takes dedicated people to sustain an effective organization like this Association—and certainly all of you who are devoted to the ideals and principles that motivated Sam Davis are to be commended and congratulated.

A great American writer, John Greenleaf Whittier, once wrote:

"When faith is lost and honor dies, the man is dead."

Certainly Sam Davis kept the faith and exalted honor—and although he was executed more than a century ago, he lives on in history today.

At the entrance of the National Archives Building in Washington, there is an inscription which reads: "What Is Past Is Prologue"

In other words, history runs in cycles.

We frequently see history repeating itself.

It is very interesting to know and to realize that the legendary courage and loyalty of Sam Davis continues to inspire the same qualities of nobility and patriotism in men caught up in the horror of war more than a century later.

Captain Bill Lawrence—Tennessee's highest ranking prisoner of war—wrote a poetic tribute to Sam Davis while in a prisoner of war camp in Vietnam. He concluded his poem with these words:

"And many a time during my life as trials I have faced,

I have thought of my hero Sam Davis and my back was braced."

What was it about this young Tennessean—Sam Davis—that has been such an inspiration for more than a century to his countrymen?

Let us recapture the scene of the martyrdom of Sam Davis as he stood before thousands and thousands of Union soldiers on Seminary Hill on the outskirts of Pulaski, Tennessee, on a crisp November Day in 1863—November 27, 1863.

He had been sentenced to be hanged as a spy by a court-martial because he had in his possession certain important information concerning the Union Army.

Dressed in Confederate Gray, he was a lonely figure—a 21-year-old boy standing by a rough scaffold erected to end his life, surrounded by a sea of blue uniforms.

The noose hung above his head, a rough wooden coffin at his feet.

History records that without bitterness he forgave his captors.

He had written a farewell letter to his parents which, along with a few personal effects, he gave to a Union chaplain for delivery.

The letter said, in part,

"Mother, do not grieve for me—I do not fear to die."

He then announced that he was ready.

At that point the commander of the unit that had captured young Sam came riding furiously to the spot where Sam was seated.

"Davis"—he said—"you are not the man who should be hung, and if you will tell me

who General Bragg's chief of scouts is, your life will be spared."

The simple, direct reply was in the form of a question:

"Do you suppose, were I your friend, that I would betray you?" Sam asked the Union officer.

The officer had no answer—he persisted in his efforts to get the young man to betray his friends and the Confederacy.

"Sir"—Davis said—"Sir, if you think that I am that kind of man, you have missed your mark. I would rather die a thousand deaths than betray a friend or be false to duty."

Within two minutes the trap was sprung and Sam Davis left those immortal words as his epitaph:

"I would rather die a thousand deaths than betray a friend or be false to duty."

History records that tears streaked the faces of many of the Union soldiers who witnessed the execution—especially those close enough to the scaffold to hear young Davis refuse to compromise his cause or betray his friends.

As a matter of fact, the attitude of the Union soldiers toward Sam Davis following his execution attests to his martyrdom.

When Mr. John C. Kennedy of Rutherford County went to Pulaski to return the body of Sam Davis here to his home, he received the most courteous treatment and cooperation from Federal troops.

When he discussed the matter with the Provost Marshal of the Federal troops at Pulaski, this officer commented:

"Tell the parents of Sam Davis for me that he died the bravest of the brave, an honor to them, and with the respect of every man in this command."

When Mr. Kennedy asked the officer if he might have any interference in removing the body from the cemetery, the officer replied:

"No, sir—if you do, I will give you a company—yes, a regiment, if necessary."

At the cemetery several Federal soldiers stood at attention with caps in hand as the body was removed and taken away.

On the way back Federal troops lifted and literally carried the wagon containing the body down to the river crossing at Columbia and up the steep incline on the other side.

After Mr. Kennedy thanked them, the Union soldiers quietly raised their caps and watched the wagon out of sight.

Perhaps the greatness in Sam Davis was the fact that he quietly accepted his death as inevitable following his courtmartial and was quietly outraged by the suggestion that he sell his principles to preserve his life.

Some dramatic moments and events in history are caught up and swept forward with the tide to live forever.

Such an event was the execution of Sam Davis and the calm courage and deep loyalty he displayed.

I regret to say, my friends, that many things are going on in our Government today that do not reflect the high principle and integrity that Sam Davis demonstrated.

This young man stood for—fought for—and died for the highest of principles.

He refused to compromise—he refused to temporize—he refused to betray his Southland—or his friends.

In conclusion, permit me a personal note and reference with respect to the time frame of the Civil War.

My great-grandfather, on my mother's side, Perry Webb, was killed in the Battle of Perryville, Kentucky in 1863—he fought on the side of the South. This was indeed the period and time of great division—the nation was divided—families were divided—but today we are one "united" States.

It was Andrew Jackson who, in his famous toast in Washington, said: "Our Federal Union—it must be preserved."

Let me say of all assembled here that we are Tennesseans—we are Southerners—and we are also all Americans.

I am reminded of the advice of General Robert E. Lee to fellow Southerners following his surrender at Appomattox. General Lee said: "Abandon your animosities and make your sons Americans."

Today we all are Americans.

As Americans we appreciate the true spirit of a patriot. Even the Union troops who saw Sam Davis hanged praised his courage, loyalty and patriotism.

His life and death are an inspiration to the young men and women of today—Sam Davis simply refused to budge one inch from his principles, no matter what the cost.

As we stand on this hallowed ground—near the grave of this hero, we can draw strength from his courage and his high principles—we can renew our appreciation for the patriotism that Sam Davis demonstrated for his beloved Southland.

He gave all he had to give—he made the supreme sacrifice.

I am reminded of the eloquence of John Masfield, the English poet who wrote:

"Man with the burning soul
Has but an hour of breath
To build a ship of truth
On which his soul may sail—
Sail to the golden shore."

In his brief span of life, certainly Sam Davis built his ship of truth.

At this beautiful and historic homeplace where we honor the memory of the "Boy Hero of the Confederacy", it occurs to me that perhaps we may not have paid adequate and sufficient tribute to the mother and father of Sam Davis—Charles and Jane Davis.

The parents of Sam Davis reared a noble and magnificent son, who met his hour of truth with courage and confidence—and yet his loss was, I am sure, sheer agony for them.

And so, I suggest in reflection that we not only revere the memory of Sam Davis, but that we also honor the memory of his parents.

They gave their most priceless possession to the cause of the Southland—their noble son—Sam Davis—the "Boy Hero of the Confederacy."

WHEN IS THE MAJORITY NOT THE MAJORITY?

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread public concern over President Nixon's wholesale use of the Presidential veto, especially in the area of social legislation. I believe that an editorial published in the October 4, 1973, edition of the Stars and Stripes—the National Tribune reflects this concern very well. When one considers the Stars and Stripes tendency to editorially support the decisions of the present administration, this editorial becomes remarkable and suggests a truly widespread questioning of Mr. Nixon's use of his veto powers.

The article follows:

WHEN IS THE MAJORITY NOT THE MAJORITY?

We have experienced in this Congress a series of what many call, "ruling by veto."

Recently a bill, S. 504, the Emergency Medical Service bill with an amendment to save the Public Health Hospital System, passed the Senate. In the regular form, it then went to the House and passed.

S. 504 passed both Houses by more than a majority.

It then went to the President and if signed would have become law.

However, the Administration did not want to keep the Public Health Hospitals open and the President vetoed the bill, against the majority of the Congress.

Because S. 504 originated in the Senate, it must first go back to the Senate for a vote if they wish to override the President's veto. The Senate met the requirements and overrode the President's veto by over two-thirds.

S. 504 then went to the House for a vote to override the President's veto. However, some of the House Members switched their original vote on the bill and voted not to override the President's veto. The vote, however, was five votes short of the necessary two-thirds to override the veto. The PHS and S. 504 was dead.

There are 435 U.S. Representatives and 100 U.S. Senators elected to represent the people of the United States.

There is the President, also elected to represent the people of the United States.

The majority of these elected officials voted to save the PHS—yet S. 504 was killed because the President said "No" and one-third plus five of the House of Representatives also said "No".

One of the first lessons we learn in a Democracy is that the majority rules.

Is the above an example of "the majority rules?" There are arguments pro and con on this type of example.

Without getting further into this phase of our Democratic process nor condemning it, it does cause one to give serious thought to what seems like a trend.

During this session of Congress we have witnessed a Congress voting for a bill and the President vetoing it. We have had it spelled out clear that regardless of how the 535 elected officials vote, the President can obtain his will by just one-third plus one in either House. This is our process.

When a President is at odds with the Congress, the "majority rules" can be badly abused.

We hope this seemingly trend has a very short life and that the better methods of consultation and compromise are used more often.

FATHER FRANCIS HENRY BURNS OF UTICA, MICH., MARKS 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORDINATION

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, for the past quarter century, the Reverend Francis Henry Burns, pastor of St. Lawrence Catholic Church in Utica, Mich., has been laboring in the Lord's vineyard, helping to reap a bumper crop of souls in his service to God and his fellowman.

Father Burns will mark the 25th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood at special ceremonies this weekend. I have the privilege of being a member of St. Lawrence's parish, and it is therefore a personal honor for me to be able to join with the other members of the parish and the ever-widening circle of Father Burns' friends and admirers, in paying tribute to this man of God on this occasion of his silver jubilee.

One of the 10 children of Frank H. and Frances Martin Burns, he was born in Detroit on April 20, 1921, and, in the closeness of his own family he learned the Christian concepts that he was to carry with him later into the priesthood—the concepts of faith, hope, and

love. Francis Burns was destined for the priesthood, and three of his sisters were destined to serve the Lord in a special way as well, and now serve in the religious order of the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

He attended St. Rose Parochial School, Sacred Heart Seminary in Detroit, and St. Mary of the West Seminary in Cincinnati, Ohio, and on May 22, 1948, was ordained to the priesthood by the late Edward Cardinal Mooney.

Then followed a series of assignments in the Archdiocese of Detroit—assistant pastor of Our Lady Queen of Peace in Harpers Woods; St. Martin's, Visitation, Holy Name and Christ the King in Detroit; and Holy Innocents in Roseville. After a year as Chaplain at the Medical Center Hospital Complex in Detroit, Father Burns was named as pastor of St. Luke's in Detroit in 1967, and 2 years ago he became pastor of my own parish, St. Lawrence's in Utica.

Down through the years, Father Burns has become highly regarded as a counselor to those in trouble, as a priest dedicated to doing the Lord's work, and as a warm and generous friend to those in need.

On Sunday, October 14, the members of his personal family and his parish family, along with the host of friends he has made during his quarter century of service in the Archdiocese of Detroit, will join in a special mass and ceremonies in tribute to Father Burns. It will be my privilege to participate in that happy event, and to join in wishing many more productive years of living his belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

EXCESSIVE EXPENDITURES AT OAKLAND ARMY BASE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD a letter I recently received from Mr. Clayton R. Pao, president, Local 1157, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO.

Mr. Pao writes about the excessive expenditure at Oakland Army Base for recreational purposes and luxury furnishings. Most disturbing is the fact that Oakland Army Base has been undergoing a major reduction-in-force, supposedly for fiscal reasons. The evidence Mr. Pao presents makes me question the Army's rationale for initiating this personnel cutback.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of Mr. Pao's letter in the RECORD at this time:

AUGUST 28, 1973.

HON. JEROME WALDIE,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: As a union president and a taxpayer, I have the right to voice my objection on how the Army spends my tax dollars:

As you know, the Oakland Army Base is

undergoing a cutback in personnel and monetary allocations at the present time. Therefore, any expenditure of public funds on military installations affected by such for recreational purposes is questionable and, at the most, foolhardy.

The Army Base has either spent or plans to spend for the following:

Handball Court.....	\$47,500
Tennis Court.....	20,000
Air Conditioning for General's Suite	24,000
Gas Tanks (Reserve).....	50,000

Total Cost..... 141,500

That's a lot of money for a base whose total military population is barely over 300!

\$67,500 for recreational purposes would equate to almost \$225 per person, and the majority of the personnel who participate in these particular sports are "OFFICERS." Furthermore, there are many tennis and handball courts in the neighborhood communities that could be utilized by military personnel.

\$24,000 for the General's office is ridiculous! There are only eight persons employed there or \$3,000 each for personal luxury/comfort.

\$50,000 for reserve gas tanks for the sole purpose of "hoarding fuel" is much too high a price for the taxpayers to bear.

I would appreciate your intervention in curbing or stopping these wanton expenditures of OUR FUNDS.

Sincerely yours,

CLAYTON R. PAO,
President.

COLUMBUS DAY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, of all the successful legislative efforts in which other Members of this body and I have participated, none gives me greater personal satisfaction than that of achieving recognition of Columbus Day as a national holiday.

All Americans can now join our loyal Italo-American citizens and our Latin neighbors to the south of us in their traditional honoring of the man who first stepped forth on the shores of this hemisphere. Now the peoples comprising the entire New World join hands to celebrate the birthday of Christopher Columbus. This unity of purpose is well-placed for no other man in history has made a greater or a more lasting contribution to the development and expanded growth of this new continent.

The observance of Columbus Day has many benefits for all of us. It brings us closer to our Italo-American friends. It improves our friendship with the people of Central and South America. Becoming aware again of the dauntless courage of Columbus, of his determination and his dedication to a single aim, of his brilliant seamanship, and of his outstanding leadership lifts our spirits and revives our appreciation for all the things this magnificent explorer means to us.

In recent years many of us have gained a new and expanded appreciation of greatness of the voyage of Columbus because we have seen equally valiant explorers take off from our earth to cir-

cumnavigate the globe thousands of miles in space. We have seen our own astronauts explore the moon and return safely after living almost 2 months in the Sky Lab. This took the self-same courage which Columbus mustered as he set forth on a journey to unknown lands over uncharted seas in three frail little ships.

America needs more and more of bravery and determination which Columbus and our spacemen demonstrated. We need it to chart the yet unsolved routes toward improved human relations, to navigate the precarious routes to world peace, to explore successfully all the avenues to privation and human suffering and find lands of good and fulsome living.

The more we understand the make-up of Christopher Columbus, the easier it becomes for us to emulate his traits. To achieve this understanding it is essential that we give our fullest support to the splendid Italo-American organizations which have long assumed the leadership in providing proper observance of this day. My own close ties with the leaders of these organizations have convinced me of their patriotism and their dedication to public service of the highest type, for in truth they follow in the footsteps of Columbus and the scores of other Italians to whom America is so much indebted.

Mr. Speaker, I consider Columbus Day to offer me a good opportunity to express my appreciation for so many fine Italian friends both here and in Italy. To them I again extend my thanks and my congratulations on the beneficial services they are rendering to all of us.

MIAMI—TOUCHSTONE OF LIBERTY

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 26, the House passed the Immigration and Nationality Act amendments. Portions of this bill modify the present definition of refugee by expanding it to include conditional entry for political refugees from any country in the world. The current law restricts refugees to those who have fled communisms or certain defined areas in the Middle East.

Furthermore, this preferential system only extends to Eastern Hemisphere nations. With the exception of Cubans who flee their homeland, an alien cannot qualify as a refugee if he is a native of a Western Hemisphere country.

Miami, on the southern tip of Florida, has been the touchstone of liberty during the last few months for persons fleeing the brutal regime of Duvalier in Haiti. There have been no freedom flights for these refugees. They have come to Miami at the risk of their lives in small boats.

Yet, if they finally reach Miami safely, the U.S. Government is less than cordial to them. For some reason, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has determined that these Haitians do not

meet the guidelines for political refugees. I reject this reasoning. The persecution of peoples under Communist regimes is no different in quality than persecution by non-Communist, dictatorial governments.

During the last week of September, 62 Haitians arrived in Miami after being rescued from a sinking boat. The INS began deportation proceedings, and the Haitians are now appealing. I believe that in light of the proposed legislation, and the indication of the clear intent of the House, INS should suspend its proceedings.

On October 2, WTVJ in Miami aired what I believe is an excellent editorial. I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to it and, therefore, insert it in the RECORD:

A CASE OF RIGHT OR LEFT

Thirty-five men and 27 women adrift on a sinking sailboat were rescued last week out in the Atlantic and brought to Miami.

They were refugees, 62 in all, trying desperately to reach our shores. . . . trying to reach what they hoped was freedom.

Had they been from a number of other countries their path to asylum here would have been smooth.

Cuban exiles are given free entry.

Chile, during the three-year reign of Salvador Allende, saw many of its citizens flee and be granted asylum here.

Refugees from Eastern European nations have been let in . . . as have many Soviet citizens.

All these people had to do was to convince authorities that their return would result in physical persecution based on race, religion or political beliefs.

But the 62 people rescued last week were not from any of those countries. They weren't from a Communist-dominated nation.

They were from Haiti.

We seem to have developed an unofficial distinction between those escaping a dictatorship of the left as opposed to those escaping a dictatorship of the right.

The Haitians yesterday were ordered to be deported back to their homeland.

They are in the same boat as 300 of their countrymen who have landed here in recent months . . . requesting asylum and having it denied.

Those cases are under appeal.

What is strange to us is the double standard.

Haiti is a dictatorship. True, young Duvalier has eased up a bit, but that small nation is still a brutal society. The refugees have a case.

Since Papa Doc's death two-and-a-half years ago, the U.S. has been warming up to the new regime. That should have nothing to do with this, but we wonder if it does?

It is wrong to categorize tyranny . . . to say that the point of a gun has an ideology.

The U.S. Government says the Haitians don't meet exile guidelines . . . that they can't prove the threat of physical persecution.

The modern history of Haiti says this is wrong.

NATIONAL GOODWILL DEED DAY

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a constituent of mine suggesting a Goodwill Deed Day. Since I feel her idea deserves much merit, I

would like to have it printed in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

DEAR PAUL: Today I enclose to you a very good idea, and definitely want you to work at it and see if you can pass this law in our U.S.A. To help our old people call it Goodwill Deed Day. The example and idea is stated here in this letter.

Example: All people with room in their minds, hearts, and homes should go to see the shut ins in Homes, county, other places and in the hospital and arrange to take out 1 or 2 old people who are able and take them home to their homes 1 and 2 days a week and give them a treat of home atmosphere. To make the old people happy and if such people get along with the old people and if they have room in their private homes, each should board the old folks as some of those old people are still useful to themselves and perhaps even help with little chores to the household, its not right to keep such people shut up and wait for death to claim them, they need a chance to be useful to themselves. Our people are becoming selfish and hypocrites in our country when their own children can help to care for their own. And this idea will also cut down expenses of housing them in institutions and becoming a pattern of mechanical machinery. Then you have succeeded in passing such a law. Press the idea in all U.S. newspapers so the good people with a heart can start to get ball rolling to come to their aid and help because when a person is poor that's the time the help is most appreciated so my advice to you all is try and I assure it will work out o.k.

MERIAM BRUNO.

YES, PATRICIA, THERE WILL ALWAYS BE CHRIST IN CHRISTMAS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, more than a thousand concerned people in our district alone have written to me deploring the recent Federal court of appeals decision banning the nativity scene from the Nation's annual Christmas pageant in Washington, D.C.

The great majority of these people have never been to this celebration in the Nation's Capital. Yet, they have deep feelings of concern over the direction that our country is headed because of confused court decisions.

The court of appeals in Washington reversed a lower court decision which found that the manger display with the Christ child was quite acceptable under our church-state concept of law. What the higher court overlooked, was the remainder of that first amendment clause which forbids Government from "prohibiting the free exercise" of religion. But this is what has been done.

One of the most moving letters I have received is from an 11-year-old, sixth grade student named Patricia. She writes:

Please try to convince Congress to leave Christ in Christmas.

How do you explain to an 11-year-old child that the men who decide the constitutionality of our laws have been bent on a course of eroding religious expres-

sion in America for years. Our people seek religion now more than ever before in the history of the Republic.

This most recent example of judicial outlawing of religion must be interpreted as an extension of the Supreme Court's ban on prayer by our little children in schools. Perhaps this latest court affront to the American people will serve to increase public indignation to a point where Congress will be forced to enact the constitutional amendment legalizing prayer in schools and public buildings.

And as for Patricia, and all the other children and adults who feel as she does, we must remember, the story of Christ has endured the assaults of godless governments for 2,000 years. And that no action by any human court or politicians can alter or change an eternal truth.

Yes, Patricia, there will always be Christ in Christmas.

I insert the related newsclippings:

COURT LIMITS USE OF PAGEANT CRECHE

(By Timothy S. Robinson)

The federal government must limit its participation in future Christmas Pageant of Peace programs on the Ellipse unless a manger scene is removed from the exhibit, the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled yesterday.

The result of yesterday's unanimous opinion, as spelled out in its 51-page text, is to leave three basic options open to future Christmas events on the Ellipse:

The manger scene can be removed altogether.

The manger scene can stay, and the government can grant the pageant's sponsors the use of the park land as it would any other group. In that case, the government would be required to withdraw from sponsorship and to post plaques saying the pageant was no longer a government-sponsored event.

The manger can stay, and the government can write new, tightly drawn regulations concerning its limited participation in the event. For example, its participation could be limited to minor financial aid and technical sponsorship, but could not include any government help in planning or organizing the event.

Pageant of Peace officials could not be reached yesterday for comment on the court decision, which was delivered by a three-man member panel of Circuit Judges Edward A. Tamm, Harold Leventhal and Roger Robb.

They ruled that the government's participation in planning and organizing the event as long as the manger scene remained was in violation of court tests concerning the separation of church and state.

While stressing that the pageant is mainly a tourist event and agreeing that the nativity scene is not a major portion of it, the court held, "The government involvement with religion should be kept to a necessary minimum, and there should be avoided not only the actual interference but also the potential for and appearance of interference with religion."

In 1970, the last year listed in the Court of Appeals record, government officials held two of the five positions on the executive committee of the 19-year-old, week-long pageant.

The ruling came in a suit brought four years ago by an Episcopal minister, an atheist, the president of the American Ethical Union, a rabbi and a Roman Catholic priest. They sought to ban the manger scene, part of a display that includes the national Christmas tree, on the grounds that it represented an unconstitutional religious activity by the government.

The U.S. District Court, in holding that the government's participation in the event

was acceptable, had compared the use of the manger scene on the Ellipse to the use of the scene in department store windows. Such displays, in essentially nonreligious settings, diminish the religious impact of the scene, the court had said.

"I find this reasoning unpersuasive," wrote Judge Leventhal in his concurring opinion yesterday. "It's unstated premise is that the creche as seen in commercial settings has no substantive religious impact."

"What seems equally, if not more, likely is that the commercial establishments that display the nativity scene, a clearly religious symbol, do so in order to evoke its emotional message, as a motivation for purchase of contemporary equivalence of frankincense and myrrh."

VIEWS ON A NATIVITY SCENE

The principle that the church should be separate from the state was central to the founding of this nation, and so it should remain. But it has always seemed to us that if a principle is any good at all, it should be able to withstand a certain amount of well-intentioned, common-sensical treatment without suffering danger of being whittled away.

That's pretty much the way we felt four years ago when three churchmen and an atheist brought suit against the inclusion of a Nativity scene among the other Christ-massy sights and sounds at the annual "Pageant of Peace" on the Ellipse.

The plaintiffs lost in the lower courts, but the U.S. Court of Appeals has just sustained them, in effect agreeing that the government's role in putting on the pageant—among other things its officials serve on various pageant committees—represents "excessive government entanglement with religion," and as such is a clear violation of the First Amendment.

Well, yes, but gee whiz. It's not as if children are being asked to make professions of faith at public schools or feel odd if they don't (although grace is still being said at some schools here before lunch) and it's not as if the Supreme Court, itself, doesn't routinely call on God to save it, or the Congress has given up having its own chaplains start each day's session with a prayer (albeit few sinners are there to hear it). And it's not as if we haven't had prayers at the White House with breakfast and prayers at the Pentagon. How entangled in religion does government have to get before it becomes too much?

We remember when, several years ago, through a combination of circumstances we found ourselves at the Ellipse quite early on Christmas morning. Except for one park policeman, no one else was there. It was cold, and quiet, and under a pale blue sky the earth had been lightly touched with snow. Nobody made us look at the Nativity scene—as a matter of fact, like many modern-day creches, this one had no particular artistic merit—but we did warm ourselves at the yule log pit, and the whole lonely landscape gave us a poignant feeling for Christmas such as we had not had in years. With or without the Nativity scene, one could have as easily unscrambled an egg as remove religion from that time and place.

And whatever one's faith, or lacking any at all, the story of the birth of Christ is an utterly charming one, as deeply human as, say, the story of the early life and young manhood of Mahomet, the founder of Islam.

Next thing we know, the National Gallery, possessor of what is perhaps the finest collection of Italian Renaissance paintings in the Western Hemisphere, will be asked to turn Raphael's Alba Madonna to the wall, along with companion works of equal religious fervor.

Ah, well. As an alternative to scrapping the Nativity scene, the Appeals Court has suggested the scene could stay, provided that the government severs its own connection with the pageant, treating it like any other group applying for a permit to use a public park, or at least limits government participation to a minor show of friendliness.

Perhaps the President will still be allowed to push the button that lights the tree. Whatever rush of feeling this act engenders in those who chance to behold it, we trust they can handle it without assistance from the courts.

TRADE BILL

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of publicity of late has been given to the upcoming trade bill, which from what I understand about its present form it would make trade with the Communists easier.

I would urge my colleagues to pay particular attention to the enclosed article when considering this bunk about détente.

The article follows:

FINANCING OUR OWN SLAUGHTER STUDY CLAIMS AMERICAN MATERIEL SUPPORTS ENEMY FORCES

Something like 100,000 Americans have been killed in battle in recent years by enemy forces equipped and moved by American technology.

That is the shocking message conveyed by researcher Antony Sutton of the Hoover Institution in a just-published study of East-West trade and its impact on the Cold War struggle with the Communists. Sutton's volume, entitled *National Suicide* (Arlington House, \$8.95), is a popular rendering of the immense research embodied in his three-volume survey, *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*. And it drives home the policy implications of such trade with frightful clarity.

Sutton shows that the Communist powers of the world have little advanced technology of their own, and in particular have been lagging in developing any sort of transportation industry. He documents at copious length the fashion in which American and other Western sources have supplied the factories and machines producing Soviet steel, trucks, marine diesel engines, tools for arms plants, ball bearings for missiles, tanks, and other military vehicles, accelerometers for missile guidance, chemicals for the manufacture of explosives and propellants, prototypes for machine guns and other weapons, etc.

The author documents all of these transactions in great detail and shows that the Communist offensives in both Korea and Vietnam would have been impossible without the use of Soviet and other Iron Curtain technology which had been in turn provided by the West.

Without these supplies, the Communists could not have sustained their aggressions in Korea and Vietnam, and the approximately 100,000 Americans who died in those two conflicts might be alive today. All this equipment was of course provided to the Communists on the grounds that it constituted "peaceful trade"—precisely the macabre ar-

gument we are hearing in favor of such trade today.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO PUBLIC FINANCING OF FEDERAL ELECTIONS

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, I had the privilege of testifying before the Committee on House Administration, Subcommittee on Elections, on a proposal that I introduced which has been referred to the Ways and Means Committee.

The thrust of my proposal is to obtain a broader range of participation by interested citizens not only in Federal elections, but in State and local elections as well. I insert my testimony in the RECORD for all to read:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE RALPH S. REGULA

I consider it a privilege to be here today to submit my testimony on a modest proposal, an alternative to public financing of Federal elections.

A lot has been said about proposals that recognize a need for reform and answer that need by injecting the Treasury of the Federal Government into the breach.

I have no quarrel with laudable proposals that recognize that moderate federal support for contributions from the private sector can provide an important and healthy avenue for citizens to participate in the electoral process.

Indeed, a candidate's right to funds ought to be measured by his ability to obtain grass root support—and that includes support from small contributors—not only at the Federal level but at the grass root election level as well.

Revenue sharing is the direction that legislation is taking the Congress. As a result, the role of the State and local governments is becoming increasingly important.

I think, therefore, that it is very important as we move responsibility for government to the local arena, that we be concerned about stimulating campaign contributions to worthy candidates at the State and local levels as well as at the Federal level.

As a practical matter, local government offices have been and will increasingly become incubators of potential candidates for Federal office. In this Congress forty-seven percent of the Senate and forty-four percent of the House at some time served in either State or local government offices.

I recently polled the constituents of my district, and one of the ten questions I asked was, "Should Federal tax dollars be used to finance election campaigns?"

The response I received was overwhelming in the negative. 71.4 percent responded in the negative.

I therefore reject proposals to federally subsidize our honored free elections procedures. I believe we can achieve the necessary reform as well as greater citizen participation by providing for a greater tax credit or deduction, at the election of the contributor, for his contribution to individual candidates.

I have, therefore, drafted and introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, H.R. 9983, that I believe offers a reasonable alternative to both those that say our present system of elections favors "those that have or

can get it" and those that advocate a Federal subsidy of potential politicians. Perhaps more importantly, my bill provides incentive for increased local participation in the election process.

My bill contains many of the recommendations of the President of the United States and some of the best provisions of the various bills introduced in this and the other body to date.

I would provide a permanent Commission on Elections that is wholly independent, charged with implementing the Federal Elections Campaign Act of 1971, and studying and recommending such changes to that Act as may be necessary.

I have attempted to make it more attractive for the small contributor to contribute to Federal elections and, unlike other proposals, to State and local elections.

By the same token, I have limited the amounts that can be contributed to any one candidate, and have strengthened what I believe to be the intent of the 1971 Federal Elections Campaign Act; that is, accountability, by providing that only one Committee may be authorized to make expenditures on behalf of and receive contributions for any one candidate.

The Commission is given administrative and investigatory powers and is charged to report its recommendations to the Congress and the President by December 1, 1974.

The bill makes it unlawful for any person other than a candidate, an official national party committee, or any official Congressional or Senate campaign committee, to make directly or indirectly contributions or expenditures on behalf of any candidate, including the authorized committee of that candidate, in any calendar year any amount in excess of \$2,500 in case of a Presidential or Vice Presidential election, and \$1,000 in the case of congressional elections.

What I mean by the official national committee of a candidate or his authorized committee is that committee that is certified by the Federal Elections Commission under the 1971 Act, as amended, and I limit the number of such committees to one and only one.

Every candidate for Federal office is required to appoint a single committee to handle his campaign financing. I prohibit inter-committee transfers of money.

In addition, I have provided procedures whereby a candidate for State and local office, may, for the purposes of complying with the Internal Revenue code, designate a single political committee which would then be bound by the Campaign Act provisions.

To encourage many people to contribute to the candidates of their choice, the allowable tax credit would be increased from \$12.50 to \$250, and the tax deduction from \$50 to \$500. However, the aggregate contributions by a taxpayer to any committee or candidate could not exceed either \$25 for tax credit treatment or \$50 for deduction treatment in any one year.

This would mean that a person would have to contribute to more than one candidate or committee, in fact, ten, to take full advantage of the tax credit or deduction.

The objective of this proposal would be to get a broad range of participation by the interested citizen in not only Federal elections but State and local elections by saying in effect, you can get the tax credit, but you have to spread it around over many candidates rather than to any one candidate if you are to maximize the availability of the tax credit mechanism.

What effect my proposal would have, I have been told that at the time the Revenue Act of 1971 was under consideration, existing tax

I asked the Department of the Treasury credit and deductions were estimated to cost the Treasury \$100 million in a Presidential

election year; that total campaign contributions were estimated at \$300 million with 12 million taxpayers participating; that in a Congressional campaign year the estimates would be halved; and that in an off year, they would be only one quarter as large.

The Treasury does not yet have reliable data on the actual utilization of the existing tax credit and deduction provisions, but has stated that a small sample of returns indicates substantially fewer taxpayers claimed deductions or credits than anticipated. At 1972 levels of contributions, the Treasury estimates that the revenue loss from my proposal would be \$140 million as compared to \$100 million under the 1971 Act. An increase of only \$40 million.

I think this offers a reasonable alternative to Federal financing of campaigns. It has the added advantage of directly involving people in the political process.

I believe this bill would lessen the possibility of gross misuse of money in election campaigns. It broadens the base of campaign financing while assuring that no one has undue influence on a candidate as a result of a large contribution.

Thank you for the privilege of appearing here.

COLUMBUS DAY—DAY OF DISCOVERY

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, today is the traditional Columbus Day, marking the day 481 years ago that the first Italian American discovered the New World. Americans of Italian descent have been contributing to the fullness and richness of American life ever since.

I am proud of my Italian heritage. Our fathers and forefathers came to this country with the desire to make a new life for themselves and their families. They dreamed of the opportunity to better their lot through their own hard work. They had heard of the promise that America holds out to peoples all over the world: that here can be found a nation dedicated to the principles of freedom, equality, justice, regardless of past history or national origin. But these immigrants also came with the determination to give back measure equal to that received—to contribute to their adopted country in whatever way they could.

And contribute they have, to every facet of American life. The sciences, the arts, business, labor and government are several times richer for the Italian Americans who have devoted their lives to these endeavors. This is especially true in government. We Italian Americans realize that all is not perfect in this great country, but this does not give us license to just complain. Rather, many of us consider that it is our duty as responsible citizens to try to remedy what problems still remain by working within our democratic political system. We are both proud and honored to be able to participate.

You know, the United States is really unique in all the world. There is no such thing as a typical or average American. The melting pot is a misnomer. Rather than completely assimilating its immigrants, it embraces them and their customs and makes them its own. From pop music to Carmen, from pizza to scallopine, the influence of Italian culture can be felt in the daily lives of all Americans. Italian Americans have also maintained a traditional view of the importance of the family in an age which too often sees people going their separate ways.

Columbus Day is now a national holiday, so in a larger sense it should give us pause to reflect on the great contribution made by all ethnic groups that have come and played their part in making America what it is today. It is a chance not only to remember the discovery of this hemisphere, but to discover America anew and seek means to make it even better. We Americans of Italian descent are proud of our heritage, proud of our country, and proud to be a vital part of the greatest Nation on Earth—the United States of America.

TRADE REFORM ACT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we draw closer to House debate on the Trade Reform Act and the controversial features which would involve the conditions for trade with the Soviet Union, I believe it is important for all Members to recognize the full consequences of that special feature of the bill.

Therefore, I insert in the RECORD a letter I have just received from the president of the Lithuanian American Council, Dr. Kazys Bobelis. May I advise the Members that the Lithuanian American Council is a nationwide organization supported by all legitimate Lithuanian-American groups. It is dedicated to the restoration of freedom to Lithuania and to the maintenance of the strength and freedom of America.

The letter follows:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., October 1, 1973.

HON. EDWARD DERWINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DERWINSKI: In the near future the United States Congress will have to vote on the Administration's proposal to extend a most favored-nation status to the Soviet Union in trade relations between the two countries.

Senator Henry M. Jackson has already introduced in the Senate of the United States, Amendment #79 to the Trade Reform Act of 1973 (H.R. 6767) which seeks to bar fresh trade concessions to the Soviets unless they ease up on their emigration policy.

While wholeheartedly supporting Sen. Jackson's Amendment, we wish to point out that the citizen's right to emigrate is only one of the fundamental human rights which

are all brutally suppressed by the Soviet government.

What results can the European Security Conference achieve in seeking free exchange of ideas and people between East and West, if the United States as a world champion of freedom should surrender these principles in bi-lateral agreements with the Soviet Union? On the other hand, how happy can the American people be when buying Soviet imports and knowing that at least part of the goods had been produced by slave labor under inhuman conditions?

In this connection we wish to call attention to the words of the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, spoken before a congressional committee on November 30, 1953, pertaining to negotiations with the Soviets: "We do not look on the conference table as a place where we surrender our principles, but rather as a place for making our principles prevail. That is our resolve—a resolve which I am confident is backed by the Congress and by the American people."

Therefore, we respectfully urge you to act quickly and decisively against the granting of the most favored-nation status to the Soviet Union under the present conditions.

Yours very truly,

Dr. KAZYS BOBELIS,
National President.

FAILURE OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S ENERGY POLICY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today's news of a rapidly widening war in the Middle East has forced us to reassess our national interests in the area. As part of this reassessment, one fact stands clear: A great nation cannot afford to be held hostage by the narrow and unpredictable interests of the oil States.

Yesterday—with a flourish—the President announced an increase of \$115 million in this year's budget for energy research and development. A close examination of this additional money reveals, however, that most of this increase is an illusion. It is not the product of any new initiative by the administration. The vast bulk of these new funds—up to \$95 million—is the result of increased appropriations by Congress.

It is incredible to me that the administration could be so lax in this vital area of energy research and development. During yesterday's press conference none of the administration's spokesmen, which included the Director of the President's Energy Policy Office, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Executive Secretary of the Energy Research and Development Council, could answer the question of how much of our oil is now coming from the Middle East. Further, none of these distinguished officials could offer the foggiest idea of what our dependence is likely to be by the year 1980.

For the interest of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD ex-

cerpts of yesterday's news conference, which reveal a shocking ignorance on the part of our top energy planners as to the real characteristics of our national energy shortage. Below is an exchange between a member of the press and Dr. William T. McCormick, Jr., Executive Secretary of the Energy Research and Development Advisory Council. The advisory council, according to the White House Press Secretary:

Comprises eminent scientists and engineers representing the Nation's leading experts in various areas of energy research and development and is intended to provide the Director of the Energy Policy Office with independent advice and counsel on the overall direction of the Federal energy R&D effort . . .

The excerpts follow:

Question. Can you project for our own record the total amount of oil currently imported from the Arab States and what that projection is for 1980?

Dr. McCORMICK. I am sorry, I just don't have those figures on the tip of my tongue. We can supply them for you.

Question. Can someone tell us what share, first of oil and secondly of energy use as a whole, comes from Middle Eastern oil?

Dr. McCORMICK. I believe that question was just asked.

Question. Not quite in the same way.

Dr. STEVER. (Director, National Science Foundation). No, I do not know exactly.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that we cannot look to the administration for leadership in this critical area. If we are to insure our energy future—and guarantee the future well-being of millions of Americans—we must act today to establish a Manhattan project for energy research and development. Furthermore, as the events in the Middle East prove more clearly each day, such a massive national effort—as I propose in my Energy Development and Supply Trust Fund—is vital to guarantee our future national security.

NATIONAL ENQUIRER READER SHOWS 96 PERCENT OPPOSE MANDATORY SEATBELTS

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the National Enquirer recently conducted a poll on the subject of a possible law requiring the wearing of seatbelts. The results were overwhelmingly against such a law. In my view, this is significant, coming at a time when the 1974 model cars are appearing in the showrooms with the new interlock system, which is only slightly less contortive than getting into one of the old Pullman upper berths. Congressman WYMAN has introduced a bill to nullify this interlock system as a requirement on automobiles. I am proud to be numbered among the 50 cosponsors of this measure. Therefore, I find this poll especially timely. The news item follows:

ENQUIRER READER POLL: 96 PERCENT OPPOSE A LAW REQUIRING MOTORISTS TO WEAR SEATBELTS

An overwhelming majority of Enquirer readers are against the passage of a law which would require motorists to wear seat belts, according to the first results of a recent Enquirer opinion poll.

Figures show that of a total of 1,666 mail-in votes received, 1,604 readers, or 96.3 percent, voted "no" and only 62, or 3.7 percent, voted for passing such a law.

The Enquirer does not take sides in its Reader Opinion Polls. Instead, we present opposing views from authorities to help readers decide for themselves.

The question "Should motorists be required by law to wear seat belts?" was debated in the Oct. 7 issue of The Enquirer by Rep. Lou Frey Jr. (R.-Fla.) and Rep. John R. Rarick (D.-La.).

Opposing such a law, Rep. Rarick said, ". . . No government has the right, legal or moral, to force an American to do anything designed solely for his own good."

Rep. Frey favored a law, and said:

"The combination lap/shoulder belts would save some 20,000 lives each year . . . and Americans will just have to get used to using them."

USDA LIVESTOCK QUARANTINE FACILITY ON FLEMING KEY, FLA.

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at its annual convention, the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture passed several resolutions, one of which should be of particular interest to my colleagues since it relates to the agriculture appropriations bill previously considered by the Congress.

Because this appropriations bill contained a mandate directing the Department of Agriculture to consider the need for additional livestock quarantine facilities and report its findings to the Office of Management and Budget, the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture has adopted resolution No. AH-9, urging that immediate funds become available through a supplemental budget to construct the USDA Livestock Quarantine Facility on Fleming Key, Fla.

This subject merits the attention of my colleagues and I am, therefore, herewith including the full text of this resolution:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE, COMMITTEE ON ANIMAL HEALTH—RESOLUTION NO. AH-9

In order to make available a livestock quarantine facility in this country to permit importation of cattle from continental Europe, the Congress has appropriated \$300,000 for planning the construction of such a livestock facility to be operated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture on land provided by the U.S. Navy located on Fleming Key, Florida. The Appropriations Bill for the U.S. Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1974 did not include the \$6.7 million for construction of this quarantine facility.

The Appropriations Bill did include the following mandate to the USDA, to wit:

"The Conferees direct the Department (USDA) to immediately evaluate the overall need for additional quarantine facilities and if urgently needed now, various alternatives available to alleviate this situation should be reported to the Office of Management and Budget for inclusion in an supplemental budget request to the Congress for consideration by the Congress."

RESOLVED, the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, in convention in Portland, Maine, September 27, 1973:

Does re-affirm its support and endorsement of the construction of this facility and urges that the United States Department of Agriculture give the highest priority to this program and that the USDA make an immediate request for the funds through a supplemental budget to construct this facility during the next fiscal year.

HOME RULE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the many arguments presented in the past when discussing home rule for the District of Columbia seem to indicate that such a move would be unprecedented. On the contrary, home rule has been an important issue for almost every major city at one time or another.

In defining jurisdictions and powers for smaller areas of government, the incorporation of cities is one form of home rule. Many cities have had long and hard battles to incorporate themselves as separate entities. On September 7, 1973, the citizens of Rancho Palos Verdes, located in the county of Los Angeles, voted to incorporate their city. This election culminated a 5-year battle that involved disputes between local agencies that could only be resolved by the California Supreme Court. The determination of the people of this city to pursue their goal is similar to the perseverance that the residents of the District have shown in their long journey toward home rule.

In a recent and growing trend, 30 percent of the States have either considered, or granted home rule to the counties and cities in their jurisdiction. Arkansas, Missouri, and Illinois have all granted home rule for their cities and, in addition, set a minimum limit on the size of the cities' population, in order to qualify them for home rule.

Looking at these States' minimum qualifications, it can be concluded that, on the simple basis of population, the city of Washington, D.C. is more than qualified for home rule. In Arkansas, the minimum population is 18,000; in Missouri, 5,000; and in Illinois, 25,000. With a current population of over 800,000 people, the District of Columbia should have qualified for home rule long ago.

States, naturally, guard their powers jealously and, like any jurisdictional au-

thority, are reluctant to relinquish their powers to another body. Can we in the Congress be so behind the times? Can we be so unaware of the pressing forces which pushed almost one-third of the State legislatures throughout the country to relinquish their power in favor of home rule? Judging from the trends in other States, apparently, the same forces of self determination have finally prevailed in the District of Columbia.

EDMONSON NEWS

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on September 27 the Edmonson News entered its 47th year of continuous publication. This long period of service to the citizens of Edmonson County represents a great deal of more than just factual reporting of local and national news, important though they may be. From its establishment in 1927 by the late Perry Meloan, the Edmonson News has proved itself worthy of the highest recognition in the field of newspaper publication.

Jack Meloan, the son of Perry Meloan, beginning in 1955 operated this newspaper successfully and at his death his widow, Mrs. Louise Meloan and her son, Bill Canty, took over operation of this newspaper. The Edmonson News is now edited and published by Bill Canty.

The place of the press in the formation of opinion and in the operation of modern government is clearly understood by Bill Canty and evidenced by his provocative and refreshing editorials.

The backbone of the American press is the weekly newspaper and in the quality of such publications lies the greatness of the free press of the Western World. The citizens of Edmonson County and the town of Brownsville are indeed fortunate to be served by the Edmonson News. Both the staffers and editor recognize the needs and interest of the farming community their paper serves and with this in mind all phases of agriculture are faithfully reported. Items of personal interest, local events, and outstanding achievement are as carefully reported as national and world news. And when funds need to be raised for a community project or the bare facts of an ugly situation exposed, the Edmonson News has never hesitated to raise its voice editorially to bring the truth to its readers. In fact, the editorial policies of the News is one of the distinguishing features of this weekly paper and brings much merit and acclaim to its editor.

In the industrial and agricultural growth of Edmonson County, the Edmonson News has not just recorded accomplishments but has performed magnificently the true function of a local newspaper, that is to inform, encourage, stimulate, arouse, and stir to action all

concerned with the development and expansion of the community.

It is my confirmed opinion that any community is made stronger by virtue of having a good newspaper in its midst and I am confident that the influence which this newspaper has wielded in the past 47 years will continue to have its impact upon public life, not only in Edmonson County but throughout adjoining sections of Kentucky.

TRIBUTE TO ANNA HYATT HUNTINGTON

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, the contributions made by America's artists to the realm of sculpturing are well known and acclaimed the world over. I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Anna Hyatt Huntington, a long time resident of Redding, Conn., and perhaps the finest of American sculptors, who died at her home on October 4.

Mrs. Huntington's works can be seen in more than 200 museums and exhibits throughout the United States and abroad. While Mrs. Huntington's accomplishments are many, those for which she has won international acclaim include the equestrian statue of Joan of Arc, Diana of the Chase, Cid Campeador and the Torchbearer.

Born in 1876 in Cambridge, Mass., Mrs. Huntington early in her youth showed a fondness for animals which was to lay the foundation for her future accomplishments. During her schooling Mrs. Huntington came under the tutelage of Gutzon Borglum, known for his work on Mount Rushmore. At age 24, Mrs. Huntington was displaying work at the Boston Arts Club and the Metropolitan Museum in New York.

Some of Mrs. Huntington's finest works were done in Europe and it was in this setting that she began in 1909 her greatest work, the statue of Joan of Arc, which fulfilled an early dream of her youth. The statue won for her international acclaim, including honorable mention at the Paris Salon, the highest international standard for measuring artistic achievement. Replicas of this statue are located in New York, San Diego, San Francisco, and Orleans, France. She was also made a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor in France. The statue of Cid Campeador won for Mrs. Huntington, the Grand Cross of Alfonso XII of Spain, presented personally by the King of Spain. She is the only sculptor to have been so awarded.

While the magnitude of the greatness of Anna Hyatt Huntington can be seen in her accomplishments, she has never hesitated to contribute to the enrichment of the American public. Such is evidenced by her founding of the Brook-

green Gardens, an outdoor museum in South Carolina which represents American sculpture from the 19th century. She also donated her estate, Stanerigg, to the State of Connecticut for use as a public park.

It is to this great person that I call upon my colleague to pay tribute today.

"AMERICAN DREAM" IS AS VALID AS EVER

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, October 14 is the birthdate anniversary of the late Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, Commander in Chief of the allied forces in World War II, university president, and a man loved by Americans and, yes, by all peoples throughout the world.

It was a distinct honor to have had Dwight D. Eisenhower as a constituent as a resident of Gettysburg. Because his professional life characterized him as a "man on the move," he considered his residence in retirement at Gettysburg, the first real home he ever had. I visited him there on various occasions, and it was very apparent that he was extremely happy in his new environment. His good wife Mamie continues to live in that residence where, according to her own statement, she never has a boring day.

It is reported that Ike once said:

Only Americans can hurt Americans.

Looking at conditions that exist today, one cannot help but ponder the penetrating wisdom of that observation.

In the October 7, 1973, issue of the Sunday Patriot-News, an editorial appeared under the title of "'American Dream' Is As Valid As Ever." Its contents touch on the theme of Ike's comment that only Americans can hurt Americans. Because this editorial is timely, and because it has a meaningful relationship to Ike's comment, I feel it is highly appropriate as a tribute to Ike's birthday to submit it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I recommend its reading:

"AMERICAN DREAM" IS AS VALID AS EVER

We call it "The American Dream." And, like our fathers and our grandfathers, we know what it is though we hesitate to define it.

"The American Dream" has to do with freedom, honesty, personal dignity, a chance to prove oneself and even a second chance if need be; privacy, mutual trust and other ideals that are very important.

A year ago when Judge John C. Dowling naturalized some new Americans—people who had come a long way to at last embrace that dream—he observed: "We all want something out of life. Sometimes we do not know exactly what it is, but I think what it all boils down to is that we don't want to be wasted. We want a chance to prove ourselves, and in this country, as in no other, you get that opportunity."

A large part of "The American Dream" is that it is a way of life that only we, with

God's bounty, can bestow upon ourselves and, conversely, that only we can despoil and ruin. If there is an enemy to "The American Dream," it would not be outsiders, but Americans failing to live up to their principles.

"If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide," said Abraham Lincoln. Or as Dwight Eisenhower put it succinctly, "Only Americans can hurt Americans."

Here in this beautiful autumn of 1973, America is in distress. As Honest Abe and Ike might have feared, Americans are hurting themselves.

"The American Dream" is as valid as it ever was. The principles of this free society remain a beacon of liberty to the rest of the world, and a quiet source of inspiration and incentive to the American people. If we were a crass and barbarous people, there would have never been an "American Dream" to begin with. If selfishness and indulgence, greed and arrogance were our natural style, this nation wouldn't have a conscience left to be distressed.

What is happening is that a chronology of tragic proportions unfolds before our eyes. Nothing, not even the dreadful experience of the Civil War, has had such a potential for upsetting "The American Dream."

There was the Vietnam War, the most unpopular and ambiguous foreign entanglement this nation ever foolishly slipped into. There is the yet unresolved struggle for racial equality, still explosively mixed with the incredible decline of American cities. There were the assassinations, a burst of insanity in this country unmatched by even the goriest of Shakespearean dramas. And coupled with these events there has been an unpleasant awakening to the problems of the environment, of an inflated economy and a commodity shortage of such essentials as food and fuel.

These have been the most prosperous days in this Republic's history, but the most un-restful, too. "The American Dream" began to shred as we became contemptible of ourselves. "What is truly frightening in the age we live in is the increasing sense that something has gone wrong with our humanity itself," observed poet Archibald MacLeish.

And now comes a national disillusionment with those who hold high office, from the Presidency and Vice Presidency on down. The situation is unparalleled. The fact is there is massive scorn for the actions and statements of those who speak for the American people, the press not excluded. In any other country, a government with more than a dozen investigations and court cases on its back would have fallen months ago. In this Republic, the government could stagger on for three long years. Fact already is stranger than fiction in the "Trauma of Watergate," as Sen. Hugh Scott tabs it.

How are we to regain our self-confidence and trust, our basic optimism that "The American Dream" is viable?

It would be easy, but disastrous, to cover up the cover-up. "The best and only answer to a smear or to an honest misunderstanding of the facts is to tell the truth," President Nixon himself once asserted.

It would be easy, but disastrous, to pretend that all politics are evil, that non-involvement is the smart thing and that even bad politics should be tight-lippedly endured. "Politics is not a dirty word," said President Nixon on one occasion. "It should, in fact, be the part-time job of every American. Without citizen participation in politics, self-government inevitably degenerates into anarchy or dictatorship."

It would be easy, but disastrous, to just give up and cave in to the threatening pub-

lic mood of cynicism. "To a crisis answer, we need only to look within ourselves," Richard M. Nixon on an earlier occasion instructed.

An enduring part of "The American Dream" is that it contains the stuff of renewal, and resurgence. Americans bounce back—in football, in business, in space exploration, in art, in personal relationships, in politics. Youthful desire, pioneering enterprise, can-do over can't, action and not American Dream."

Winning the peace was to be the goal of this generation, as Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon told us. We now have, if capitulation—these are at the heart of "The not total peace, at least some pause in war."

HOSTILITIES IN MIDDLE EAST

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the seventh day of tragic hostilities in the Middle East. I know that I am speaking not only for my own constituents but for most Americans when I condemn the Arab attacks on Israel as brutal and outrageous.

By commencing the war on the most solemn and holiest day for Jews, Syria, and Egypt not only sought to desecrate that day but express their contempt for the Jewish religion as well. All of us, I am sure, are deeply disturbed by this military aggression for other reasons. What it shows is the intentional refusal of the Arab States to recognize the legitimacy of Israel's existence and their refusal to sit down face to face with the Israelis and negotiate terms of peaceful human coexistence.

So long as the Russians continue to supply the Arab States with advanced weaponry, the Arabs will continue to seek a military victory over Israel and a destruction of the Jewish State by force—regardless of the outcome of this war. It seems to me that the Arab States must face up to reality. Israel is there to stay. Yet, instead of trying to coexist peacefully, the Arab leaders have sought to divert the attention of their people from their own domestic failures by engaging in "holy wars" against the State of Israel.

At this time it is imperative for the United States to insure that Israel has sufficient arms and materiel to resist the present Arab aggression. It must also use whatever influence it has to stop the Soviet Union from fueling this war.

Once a cease-fire is reached, it is crucial that the United States earnestly and seriously devote every effort to bringing about a permanent peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

A lasting peace in the Middle East will not be achieved if world opinion condones Arab aggression. The last 6 years should have taught us that "benign neglect" will not bring the Arabs to meaningful peace talks.

Winning a national maturity, built upon citizen maturity, now is every bit as vital, or even more important.

To think that "The American Dream" could be sold out so cheaply, that it is now worthless, would be stupidly turning our back, not only on our proud past, but on a future that needs "The American Dream."

FIRE PREVENTION WEEK

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, October 7-13 is National Fire Prevention Week, and I feel that it is very important and fitting that we have set aside a week to pay tribute to our firemen who are dedicated and devoted public servants and to alert the American people to the dangers of fire.

I have sponsored and cosponsored a number of bills that would be of help to firefighters, and that would also reduce the death and destruction caused by fires. It is estimated that the dollar cost in fire damage is more than \$11 billion yearly.

One bill that I have sponsored is H.R. 9608, and if passed it would make it a Federal crime to kill or assault a fireman engaged in the performance of his duties. It is my opinion that this measure should not even be necessary. Our firefighters should always have had personal protection from felonious assaults, but that is not the case and I hope that Congress will expediently grant the firefighters this most needed and deserved protection.

Another bill that I have introduced would provide \$50,000 in benefits to the widow and dependent children of public safety officers, including firemen killed in the line of duty.

I am cosponsoring a bill that would establish a U.S. Fire Administration and a National Fire Academy in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This bill would also assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of death, personal injury, and property damage from fire, and it would also increase the effectiveness and coordination of fire prevention and control agencies at all levels of government.

The job of a firefighter is considered to be one of the most dangerous, and when you see the rate of injuries each year you can understand why. It is estimated that 40 out of every 100 firefighters are injured in the line of duty yearly.

I will continue to work to see that legislation to benefit firemen and to reduce fires is enacted into law, and I encourage all of my colleagues to work toward that end. It is only fitting that we pass legislation to help prevent fires and to help those men who work to save our lives and property at enormous risks to themselves.

SOUTH DAKOTA'S FOREIGN EMISSARIES

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, this past spring a group of South Dakotans visited the Soviet Union and several countries in Europe. The individuals of this group represented the mainstream of South Dakota's economic activity—agriculture, and they visited primarily with those folks who are engaged in agriculture.

Visits of this sort by the ordinary American citizen with his counterpart in other countries will do more to promote world peace and understanding than all the official diplomats that could be appointed or treaties that could be ratified could ever do. Especially if those doing the visiting are the good ordinary folks of South Dakota, who I think are pretty special.

One of the members of the group was Mr. Harry Blair, of Sturgis, S. Dak. He has written an account of the trip which was published in the September issue of the Stockgrower magazine.

I commend his article to the Members of Congress and other interested readers of the Record and suggest that the last two paragraphs are worthy of special note:

AGRICULTURE WE SAW IN EUROPE

(By Harry Blair)

The People to People Goodwill movement was started under Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower some 15 years ago. The Government had nothing to do with the tour as we paid our own way.

This delegation was all agricultural people and we met mostly agricultural people.

A delegation of 37 people were selected to make a tour to Europe on a good will People to People mission from South Dakota. The group left for New York on May 26, the first lap of the journey; part of us boarded the plane at Pierre and the rest at Sioux Falls. The countries visited were Belgium, Holland, Denmark, the Soviet Union of Russia, Hungary, and East and West Germany, a 22 day tour and returning home on June 17.

The purpose of the trip was to give agricultural leaders in the state of South Dakota an opportunity to carry a message of good will to the occupational places in western and eastern Europe.

We did see and inspect, in person, typical agricultural operations, to learn and compare methods and visit with people on their farms and in their homes.

Arriving in New York airport and going through customs and security precautions, into a change of several hours of time, we boarded a Sabena world airlines plane for Brussels, Belgium, arriving there about 10:00 a.m. Sunday. We got to our rooms and rested a few hours and in the afternoon we were taken by a bus into the country, and also for a brief tour of the city. We had a special guide who met us in Brussels and remained with us until our return to Brussels on our way home. He was very good, so added to our informative trip.

Rent in Brussels for a six room house was around a hundred and twenty dollars per month. The lowest salary was set at three hundred dollars per month and higher, and gasoline was a dollar per gallon.

Many of the buildings in Brussels date back to the thirteenth century with many old churches and cathedrals, with beautiful stained glass windows. Before the tour in the country we met in an agricultural research center for a briefing and information, followed by a question and answer period with the leaders, so it was necessary to have an interpreter. Farms were very small in acreage, averaging twenty five acres. Leading crops were fruits, sugar beets, potatoes, and dairying. We visited one farm that had three to four hundred year old buildings that once bred and raised Belgian horses. It was interesting to see their method of raising cattle and hogs as well as other livestock. They do artificial breeding much as we do here. We were invited into the house which had beautiful old furniture. In the evening we were served a fine supper on long tables with representatives for the agricultural center as our guests.

The next day we went by train to Amsterdam, Holland with its narrow streets and houses that were narrow with high steep roofs. We went through the famous art museum, and took a boat ride on the canal with many house boats on either side. Some are occupied by hippies with much litter and filth. The canal water looks filthy, as much sewage is put into it. There is a housing shortage.

We went to an experimental farm and saw some of the land that they had reclaimed from the sea and it was one of the most interesting things we saw on the trip. In the last 20 years, they have reclaimed 500,000 acres. The way that they do this is, they build a dike around what they want to reclaim, then pump the water out, then sow some grasses and let stand for about 7 years before they start farming it. The farms are very small, from 50 to 100 acres. A farmer may lease or buy it if he is qualified as the farmers are sort of picked as to being qualified. They raise enormous crops on this land.

There is an arm of the North Sea that runs down into Holland and they have made a dike across this arm and they pumped all of the water out and now it is filled by a river and this is their source of fresh water.

Their main crops are potatoes, sugar beets, barley, and corn for silage. There is also much dairying and feeding of some cattle for beef.

We were permitted to go inside the house and the lady was very gracious. The men looked over the farm while the ladies were in the house. We were all served refreshments of dairy pastry and tea or coffee.

We went by plane then to Copenhagen, Denmark, and it was raining. A full day was spent in the typical Danish farming operations, after a briefing with the American Embassy, where the man in charge was formerly from South Dakota State College, so we did not need an interpreter. The average farm is 50 acres and very productive. Land prices are up to \$1,000.00 per acre. Their main crops are barley, potatoes, sugar beets, soy beans, and there is also much dairying and hog raising as they send much cheese and canned ham to us. They have also joined the common market. Some of the food prices quoted were: round steak, \$2.25 per pound; eggs, \$1.05 per dozen; milk, half gallon at 58 cents and butter, \$1.25 per pound. We also visited a diamond factory. A few of the ladies bought diamonds. We went into a large old church of Lutheran denomination and a plaque hanging there with Eisenhower's slogan on it, "Peace by Understanding". Denmark exports two thirds of their production, and taxes are up to 50 percent of their net income plus property taxes.

Our evening meal was served in four courses and we were really wined and dined, with members of the Embassy as our guests.

We went through the famous Tivoli Gardens but as the air was filled with mist and smog the lights did not show up as they should.

From Copenhagen we flew to Moscow. When we got to the airport in Moscow, we claimed our luggage, filled out forms, declared our money and valuables, and opened some of our luggage for inspection. One couple was delayed going through customs because they had a couple of books on religion. We had considerable advantage over the average tourist, as we all wore badges and our leaders went ahead and talked to the custom officers. They didn't look inside of my suitcase, just glanced in my hand bag, so it was more of a spot check.

That evening we walked to the Red Square, inside the Kremlin. Red means beauty to them. The streets were so wide that many subways were used to cross them. We stayed inside the Square until 12 o'clock to see the changing of the guards at the tomb of Lenin, which was heavily guarded.

Our guide was a woman while in Russia and was very friendly, but many felt she tried to brainwash us with untruths about Russia. She did say that "Friendship is what is going to win Peace." They say tourist trade has increased 25 percent in the last year. There are few churches in Russia. Education is free and compulsory. A bus took us for a tour of Moscow. We went down to the main subway which is probably the largest and finest in the world; they have 100 miles of track and electric trains to take care of the traffic of over one million people a day. Many beautiful buildings are decorated in gold. The building where President Nixon stayed, inside the Kremlin, on his recent visit to Moscow was pointed out to us. Inside a large museum we visited, we had to put cloth slippers over our shoes to enter. It was similar to our Smithsonian in Washington, D.C., but not as large. It was heavily guarded.

We were then taken to the agricultural exposition with many prize animals and machinery on display, something like a fair in the U.S. That evening we had a banquet and were entertained at a theater with the Red Military Band and Orchestra with dancers and performers.

Next morning we had a guided tour inside the Kremlin interior and the Lenin Mausoleum just outside the Kremlin walls. Kremlin means fortress, and it is an enclosure of 70 acres with a high brick and stone wall, much of which is still standing. In viewing the Lenin Mausoleum we passed by an everlasting flame with fresh flowers on the monument.

It was here that everyone was under heavy guard. It seemed if you moved a finger a soldier was looking. No one could carry a camera, no hats, no talking, and we walked in twos through the mausoleum where a body of the likeness of Lenin was viewed.

From Moscow we flew to Krasnodar, another town in Russia not far from the Black Sea. This part of Russia is semitropical and crops are farther advanced than here, as they had new potatoes, fruit and berries of all kinds, and ripe watermelons. As we drove out in the country we saw much poverty, small gardens, huts for houses, and men, women, and children all working in the fields. Scythes were used to cut hay and forks were used to make small stacks without raking.

At an experiment farm which is called a State farm, we went into an auditorium for a briefing with the manager and an interpreter. They said they were glad to welcome us and glad of the friendship between the U.S. and Soviet Russia. Population of the State farm of 33,000 acres is 8,000 people; with 9,000 acres farmland and 8,000 irrigated acres, with 4,000 cattle, 1,000 goats; they raise 15,000 pigs per year, 4,000 ducks, 2,000

sheep, 400 horses; and they have tractors and many other machines and trucks.

This State farm is run by a manager and is subdivided into nine departments, specializing in the production of rice, poultry, potatoes, sugar beets, dairying, hogs, sheep, goats, and horses, with about 2800 workers. On the State farms workers are paid about \$120.00 per month and labor in industry about \$150.00 per month. On the State farms each family is allowed 2 acres to use for themselves. The women even wore dresses when working in the fields. We were taken where children of working women are cared for; the children met us with bouquets of flowers for each of us and then they put on a fine program for us inside the building. Many pictures of the youngsters were taken.

They also gave each of us an orange as we left. Each of us had gum, candy, pencils or other things to give to the children.

They don't believe they should accept a gift without giving something so we were given bouquets of fresh flowers.

We then flew to Kharkov and had a tour of the city, then went out into the country and visited a state farm operation and experiment farm. Their principal crop on this farm was potatoes, sugar beets, oats, corn, along with dairying, hogs, and some beef cattle, most of the cattle in the countries we visited were dual purpose cattle and looked very good for that purpose. We visited a large dairy where women were milking Simmental cows. There were 200 cows in a large open shed. They were using milking machines, but didn't have any milking parlors. They just moved the milking machines along and emptied the milk into cans.

The bus we rode in had an American Flag on the dash. We had lunch in an open place in the timber on long tables. Some of the men from the farm were our guests and there seemed to be much fellowship between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Some of the farm managers were with us for the evening dinner and we danced and had a fine time. From Kharkov we flew back to Moscow for customs before we left the country.

Our guide who had been with us from Brussels remarked he was glad to get out of Russia and assured us it would be different in Budapest, Hungary.

As for the group, no one had encountered any hardship in Russia, but felt many discrepancies had been put out in the information.

One of the headlines in the paper was a big wheat crop without a sweat "and we were told that the wheat that had been imported from the U. S. had been included in their crop."

One of the farmers in our group told at one of the briefings, of the enormous crops we had produced last year, like 6 billion bushels of corn, 1,700,000,000 bushels of wheat and so many bushels of soy beans and the millions of tons of wheat and feed grains we had sent to Russia and the Russian leader of this farm just shrugged his shoulders and looked rather sour but seemed in a good humor before we left.

The Russian people are very inefficient, especially in their farm and ranch operations and we could see very little incentive for a man to develop his capability.

We then flew to Hungary. The people in Hungary were poor and downtrodden with past wars but were very friendly. We visited the U. S. Embassy in Budapest and were given a very informative briefing by two members of our Embassy before we went out to see two collective farms that day and on the way out we could see young and old working in the fields with scythes, hoes, and horses or cattle hitched to cultivators or wagons hauling produce.

Their main crops are corn, potatoes, sugar beets and dairying. Corn has recently become one of their main crops as they got seed corn from U. S. and our methods of raising corn so they have greatly increased their corn yields.

They also grow onions, poppies and grapes. The poppies they grow for seed and for making morphine. The poppies were in full bloom when we were there and the white blossoms were very beautiful.

Their crops looked very good even on dry farming and they have some larger farms and getting larger machinery and they seem to follow more toward the U. S. than Russia in technology also in their every day life and more freedoms in making their own decisions in the operations of their farms.

We saw very little fencing in Hungary or Russia and most of the cattle we saw were being herded.

From Hungary we flew to East Germany, and were taken by bus from the airport to the hotel. Enroute we had to go through a check point in the wall between East and West Germany. An officer entered the bus and checked our passports before we could enter West Germany.

The next day we went through the wall again and toured both East and West Germany which hold bitter feelings toward each other. The wall is a high cement wall with broken glass in cement on it and the other wall or cement with large round pipes and barbed wire on it with a road in between, was called "No Man's Land". Both walls were under heavy guard. Our guide told us sometimes it takes several hours to get through the wall due to tight security.

We only spent one night in Germany, and this being our last night out we were treated to a special supper and evening at the Resi Club. June 16, we boarded the plane headed for New York where we spent the night and the next day we flew towards our homes in South Dakota, some leaving the group in Sioux Falls and others at Pierre.

In the countries we visited most things were higher than here and anyone thinking the government can do all things for all people should go over and visit Russia and Hungary and some of the other countries.

After returning, a few of us in discussing conditions over there, pretty well agreed they are about 15 years ahead of us in discussing conditions over there, pretty well agreed they are about 15 years ahead of us in going backward, but at the rate we are going will catch up with them in 15 years or sooner.

TRIBUTE TO KENNETH ROOKER

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 13, a testimonial dinner will be held in Pismo Beach, Calif., for Kenneth Rooker, a man who has devoted decades of his life to the service of his neighbors.

Ken Rooker is a native Californian who came to Pismo Beach in the early 1940's. He began his business career as the owner of a service station, and later added a tire shop to this successful enterprise. But Ken Rooker's heart has always been in public service.

Ken is a founder and past president

of Beach City's Little League baseball organization and a former chairman of the Shell Beach Fire District. In his latter role, he succeeded in having the California Insurance Underwriters establish a fire rating for the district for the first time.

Ken has also been most active in fraternal and business organizations. He is a past governor of the Pismo Beach Loyal Order of Moose, a director and past president of the Pismo Beach Chamber of Commerce, and a former president of the Lion's Club. For his great dedication to the Lions he was named "Outstanding Man of the Year, 1973," the first such award ever made by the club.

In 1970, Ken Rooker was named by the city council of Pismo Beach to fill a vacancy on the council. For 3 years, Ken has served with distinction and devotion. Now, he is stepping down from the council to a much deserved retirement. I join with the people of Pismo Beach in saluting Ken Rooker's lifetime of public service, and thank him for the countless contributions that he has made to the community over the years.

TRIBUTE TO CASIMIR PULASKI

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to note that October 11 is the 194th anniversary of the death of a nobleman and army officer driven into exile, who joined the American Revolutionary Army as an officer in 1777, Count Casimir Pulaski.

It is known that Pulaski was born of Polish aristocracy, and grew to manhood under harsh political circumstances. He was a great patriot with an impassioned love of freedom. He was a great humanitarian and an avowed champion of human rights.

As a true believer in the democratic cause of the colonies, he came to this land to give his life for the principle in the interest of all mankind. He came to this land from far across the seas where the people were seeking for themselves what he had sought for his own people years before.

After Pulaski's arrival to these shores, he served as a volunteer on Gen. George Washington's personal staff, but within a matter of only a few months, he proved himself so competent and such an asset to Washington that Congress awarded him the rank of brigadier general and gave him the task of organizing the American cavalry.

Under Pulaski's able leadership, this mounted unit of the colonial forces first known as "Pulaski's Legion" soon won fame for its valor and military competence. It was certainly unfortunate that this young military hero lost his life on October 11, 1779, while leading a charge by his unit in the Battle of Savannah.

Mr. Speaker, while this Nation does not have a united effort in celebrating the anniversary of the death of Casimir Pulaski, the 12 million of Americans of Polish descent traditionally mark Pulaski day by parades and other observances not only as a tribute to Pulaski, but also as a day marking the many contributions to our Nation by the people of Poland who followed him to the United States.

The Polish character, personality, culture—the Polish spirit as exemplified by General Pulaski—has survived. That in itself, Mr. Speaker, is an inspiration for us to follow.

Great was the priceless contribution of Casimir Pulaski almost 200 years ago and that contribution has been carried down through the years and is reflected by the contributions of the Polish-Americans being made to our country today.

MIDDLEMEN TAKE 55 PERCENT OF FOOD DOLLAR

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, food prices to the producer are finally climbing to near respectable levels, but the fact remains that the middlemen are still getting more than 55 percent of our food dollar.

This fact was brought out in a recent column by Sylvia Porter, which, with your permission, and for the enlightenment of my colleagues who may have missed reading it, I insert at this point in the RECORD:

MIDDLEMEN TAKE 55 PERCENT OF FOOD DOLLAR

The farmer has been the spectacular winner in this year's food price spiral. Returns to farmers for the meats, milk, fruits, vegetables and other products they sold during this year's second quarter (latest for which firm official figures are available) were up an astounding 30 percent from a year earlier. For the first time in more than two decades, farm prices have risen above 100 percent of parity—a fundamental measure of farm prosperity. The August increases in raw farm product prices were staggering.

Yet, dramatic as the farmers' gains have been, the equally dramatic fact remains that middlemen are still getting more than 55 percent of our food dollar. During the second quarter the cost of the U.S. marketbasket of foods bought by the average U.S. household rose to an annual rate of \$1,497.05. Of this, \$665.19 went to the middlemen who process, transport, store, package and sell the food.

The Department of Agriculture has just released its yearly rundown on our national food marketing bill. The table shows who got what "in the middle" of that \$77 billion bill in 1972 and a summary of how the shares are changing.

	[In percent]	
	1972	1960
Middlemen:		
Food processors.....	43.1	34.7
Wholesalers, assemblers.....	12.4	13.3
Retailers	24.6	29.0
Eating-feeding places.....	19.9	23.0

What are some of the implications of these changes?

Clearly, reflected here is the rapid growth of supermarket services, ranging from delicatessen departments to all-night shopping, from check-cashing to baby-sitting—services for which we pay.

Also behind the percentages are soaring construction costs for food stores, rising taxes and the substantial profits of many of the restaurant chains in recent years.

Unmistakable is the upsurge in eating out, not just at restaurants but at snack bars and company cafeterias. Most traditional restaurants haven't been making big profits in recent years—quite the contrary—but many of the fast food, single menu chains have prospered.

As for the decline in the share of our food marketing bill absorbed by processors, surely this must reflect the spreading of automation and mechanical cost-cutting techniques in this huge industry. Labor costs for processors amount to 44 percent of total food processing costs—but closer to 50 percent for wholesalers and retailers and more than half for eating places.

Below are additional key points:

Labor: Labor costs are taking 48.4 percent or \$37.4 billion of the food marketing bill today as against 44.2 percent or \$19.7 billion in 1960. Productivity has lagged behind labor cost increases in the food industry.

Business taxes: The share taken by business taxes has jumped from 2.9 percent in 1960 to 4.3 percent in 1972.

Capital costs: In this category of rent, depreciation and interest, costs rose nearly 12 percent in 1972.

Advertising: This category takes the same share today as in 1960—2.9 percent—but spending has risen from \$1.3 billion to \$2.2 billion and advertising now consumes two cents out of every food dollar you spend.

Packaging: This category also has held approximately the same share—12.2 percent against 12.1 percent in 1960. But the dollars going to packaging materials have jumped from \$5.4 billion to \$9.4 billion.

THE 198TH BIRTHDAY FOR U.S. NAVY

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, October 13, 1973, will mark the 198th birthday of the U.S. Navy. Every American can be truly proud of the U.S. Navy's magnificent heritage.

Throughout our history, naval forces have been the military backbone of this Nation's freedom and survival. Events of recent years, and at this very time, bear out the concept that mastery of the seas is absolutely essential to our national interests.

But hardware, sailors, and machinery are only part of the partnership of excellence between Navy ships and Navy crews. That is why it is so appropriate that this year's Navy Day theme pays tribute to the entire Navy family.

Admiral Zumwalt's message to the fleet elaborates on this important aspect of naval strength and morale. It is reproduced below:

NAVY BIRTHDAY, 1973

1. It is with great pleasure that I extend warmest greetings to all hands on the occasion of the 198th anniversary of the United States Navy. As we commemorate this event, it is clear from the enthusiastic worldwide response to Navy Birthday 1973 that a sense of bright promise about our future prevails in today's Navy. This year we especially honor the contributions and deeds of the Navy family—active duty personnel, reservists, civilian employees, dependents and retirees—whose combined efforts have forged a proud tradition of commitment and service to our Nation from 1775 to the present.

2. Through nearly two centuries of peace and war, our Navy has continued to affirm the truth of President John Adams' words that "naval power is the natural defense of the United States." From sail to steam to nuclear power; from cutlass and cannon to guided missiles; from the open seas to outer space, the unflinching skill, selfless sacrifice and wholehearted devotion of the Navy family have remained ever constant, and have made our Navy the greatest navy in the world.

3. I am confident that our unique heritage and the spirit of Navy Birthday 1973 will continue to guide our growth in the year ahead as we rededicate ourselves, with pride and professionalism, to the tasks that lie before us. Congratulations and best wishes.

E. R. ZUMWALT, Jr.,
Admiral, U.S. Navy.

PENSION REFORM

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently submitted a statement to the House Ways and Means Committee on the subject of pension reform. I strongly believe that pension reform can serve the interests not only of those directly participating in pension plans but possibly all of our taxpayers. I ask that my statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ANCHER NELSEN

I appreciate the opportunity to make known to the Committee on Ways and Means my position on pension reform. Your Committee is to be commended for the effort being made to move ahead quickly so that a pension bill can be considered on the floor of the House before the end of this session. All of us in the Congress are aware of both the overwhelming importance and the complexity of this matter, so your efforts will not go unappreciated.

The Committee will be faced with a volume of statements and data on this subject that will probably not be exceeded by the consideration of any other issue during this Congress. I do not wish to add to your burden unnecessarily so I will forgo a lengthy recitation of the horror stories of the pension field. Some of these failures were caused by sheer criminality, some by mismanagement and some could only be termed acts of the Almighty. All of them have one thing in common which none of us can overlook and that is their terrible cost in human terms. Those who have negotiated pension plans and contributed to them deserve some rewards at the end of their working days and they de-

serve something now while they are still working, and that something is the assurance by their government that they will have a pension when they retire. I hope the first session of the 93rd Congress will be the one to give them that assurance.

The need for pension reform is broader than just the recipients of the benefits, of course, and the call for reform is coming from many quarters. I know of no group which has flatly stated that the Congress should not be looking into this area, and I know of no one who would say that at least some reform is not needed. One point that is often overlooked in the discussions on this topic is that all American taxpayers may benefit in the long run from pension reform.

The Ways and Means Committee does not have to be told what has happened to Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance taxes in the last few years. They have gone up faster than any other group of taxes and we are faced with another increase of considerable proportions in the near future. If this Committee and the whole Congress can develop a measure which expands pension coverage and makes it a more significant part of the individual's retirement income, we may relieve some of the pressure on Social Security taxes in years to come. In voting to expand programs financed by this tax we are shifting a burden of almost unknown and incomprehensible size to the next generation of taxpayers. The goal of the bill we consider on the Floor then should be to both assure those who are now covered by a pension plan that they will indeed receive a pension and to broaden the group eligible to receive a pension. I will return to that point shortly.

I find a great deal to commend in both of the bills before you, H.R. 4200 as passed by the Senate and H.R. 2 as reported by the House Education and Labor Committee. Where they take differing approaches to the more important parts of a pension bill—such as in vesting—it can be hard to choose and where they are in accord it is even more difficult to disagree. Let me give you a few of my thoughts in these areas and then go on to a positive recommendation I have to make. I can support the Senate bill's approach to vesting, however, I find the greater flexibility of the House Education and Labor Committee's approach more attractive. Unfortunately, H.R. 2 does not allow new pension plans the right to choose from among the options which are available to plans now in existence, and I would hope your Committee might consider such a change which could act as an inducement to the establishment of new plans. The Committee is already aware that I regard expansion of coverage a most important goal and any flexibility we can build into these minimum standards may be very helpful in that respect.

I support the highest possible fiduciary standards that can be devised without unnecessarily adding burdensome costs to the operation of pension plans. In this respect, the Senate bill is lacking when it allows the Secretary of Labor to conduct investigations when he deems it appropriate. Language should be added so that the Secretary cannot undertake such an investigation on mere whim, he must have some substantial reason to believe that a plan needs investigation before he proceeds.

Portability has probably been the most hotly contested issue in the entire pension debate. As long as it is left on a strictly voluntary basis, I will support portability. Having it voluntary may in time give us the benefit of the experience of those companies who devise plans to allow employees to depart with the funds that have vested in them. There are a great many pension plans in this

country and each operates under different assumptions and contribution schedules. As desirable as portability may seem on the surface, I believe it is fraught with dangers and the Congress would do well to observe what happens under the voluntary plan over the next few years before enacting permanent, compulsory legislation.

One of the most important provisions of the bill is that allowing an individual whose employer does not have a pension plan to make tax exempt contributions (up to \$1500 a year) to a fund in order that the individual might provide better for his own retirement years. This approach is endorsed by the Administration and has been included in many of the bills offered by Members in both bodies.

To me it has the obvious appeal of providing the wage earner with a tax benefit employed for some time by his higher income, self-employed friends. The use of such a provision could become so widespread as to provide some relief from pressures for constant increases in Social Security benefits and taxes. If this section of the bill is properly administered and promoted by the government the benefits could be enormous. I commend it to you highly.

Before setting forth my recommendation for an addition to the bill, I must express my one area of disagreement. Reinsurance is the single solution to the type of situation we know best in Minnesota, that is where a single large employer suddenly abrogates almost all of its responsibilities under a pension plan. As much as I would like to support reinsurance I find that it is even more fraught with problems than the portability area. How can we add a provision that not only might be the cause of more pension plans not coming into existence but also could discourage benefit increases for those now covered? At least one firm I know of with a large pension plan told me earlier this year that reinsurance (under the formula then being considered in the Senate) would cost them an additional \$125,000 for benefit increases they had just negotiated. I do not have to go into the possible discouraging effects of such additional costs nor do I have to point out how they could act as a disincentive to businesses to establish additional plans. If the Committee decides to consider a reinsurance provision, it seems to me that the Education and Labor Committee's approach of setting the premium relative to unfunded liabilities is the more equitable approach. To do otherwise would have individuals and firms who have been conscientious about their plans pay for the oversight or irresponsibility of others who take a more liberal approach to meeting their funding responsibilities. Let us all face up to one essential fact at this point—all costs of pension plans are borne indirectly by the workers who contribute to the plan and ultimately by the consumer of his products. I believe it is incumbent upon all of us in the Congress to approve a bill that is reasonable, easily administered and not overly costly to those it is supposed to benefit most.

H.R. 4200 would establish an advisory panel within the Labor Department to work in the pension area. I would like to recommend something more than that. A Federal Commission on Pension Coverage should be established in this legislation. This Commission's long term goal, as its very name suggests, would be the extension of pension plan participation to more firms and workers in a sound and sensible way. I believe this Commission should be directed to issue an initial report in early 1975 to both the Executive and Legislative branches with such recommendations as it may see fit to expand pension coverage and to improve upon the standards to be set forth in the bill you are

developing. Thereafter, the Commission can issue an annual or other periodical report.

This Commission can be appointed in the usual manner with the President, Speaker of the House, and President Pro Tempore of the Senate appointing an equal number of members. Needless to say the Commission should be bipartisan. Naturally, I will leave the number of members, their term of office and the staffing specifications to the Committee, but I do have one specific recommendation to make. In addition to pension plan managers, company and labor representatives, members of the American Actuarial Association or American Society of Pension Actuaries, and the others one might typically find serving on such a Commission, I would hope that room could be found for representatives of the most important group of all—pension plan participants themselves. I am sure the Committee can take this proposal and extend it in such a way as to make it a very effective voice in the future expansion of pension plan participation.

In closing, allow me to again commend the Ways and Means Committee for its prompt action in this area and also for its willingness to gather the opinions and point of view of all of us who are concerned about pension plan coverage.

JUSTICE FOR UKRAINIANS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1973, I spoke before a meeting of 5,000 Ukrainian Americans. The rally took place in Central Park and was held in commemoration of the manmade famine in the Ukraine which took place in 1932-33. On the platform addressing the rally were U.S. Senator JAMES BUCKLEY and New York State Senator John Markey.

That the Ukrainians in the U.S.S.R. have legitimate grievances for past and present violations by the Soviet government of their fundamental human rights cannot be gainsaid. The intensity of their feelings are expressed in two documents which I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues:

[From Svoboda, the Ukrainian Weekly, Sept. 29, 1973]

RESOLUTION

(Adopted at the Mournful Rally in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the man-made famine in Ukraine, held on Sunday, September 23, 1973, at the Bandshell in Central Park, New York City)

We Americans of Ukrainian origin, assembled here to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the man-made famine in Ukraine, and to protest the current persecution and oppression in Ukraine by the Soviet Russian regime, do hereby decide unanimously:

Whereas the Soviet government has been arresting hundreds of Ukrainian intellectuals, trying them behind closed doors and sentencing them to severe terms of imprisonment, exile and indefinite incarceration in psychiatric wards; and

Whereas the Soviet Russian regime has been and is presently imposing and practicing a policy of Russification in Ukraine, so as to destroy the national, political, and cultural entity of the Ukrainian nation; and

Whereas the Soviet Russian government is guilty of crass violations of human rights as defined in the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights and its own constitution, by persecuting all religions in the USSR, namely Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Protestantism, Judaism, and Islamism, and by suppressing in a barbarous manner all cultural and intellectual freedoms, as evidenced by continuous arrests and trials of Russian, Ukrainian, Jewish and other intellectuals; and

Whereas the Soviet Russian government is now seeking favorable and advantageous trade agreements with the U.S. Government, especially the status of "most-favored-nation," whereby it would receive huge and unlimited financial and technological help from the United States:

Now, therefore, we unanimously resolve:

1. To wholly and unequivocally support the Jackson Amendment to the Mills-Vanik Bill calling for the rejection of the proposal by the U.S. Government to grant the USSR the status of "most-favored-nation";

2. To appeal to the U.S. Government not only to withdraw its proposal to grant the USSR any and all economic and trade privileges, but through the U.S.A. representative in the United Nations, to denounce the USSR as a violator of human rights and a government unworthy to be a member of the United Nations or to receive economic and technological assistance from the United States, a country traditionally known for its dedication to freedom and self-determination of all the peoples in the world.

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF HUMANITY AT LARGE

(The following "Appeal" to the conscience of the world was sent from Ukraine in July, 1973, and received by Svoboda, the oldest Ukrainian newspaper in the world, appearing in Jersey City, N.J., and was printed in its September 15, 1973 issue. The "Appeal" describes the current unbridled terror of the KGB and Soviet courts in Ukraine, and calls on the peoples of the free world to stand up in defense of the Ukrainian people, persecuted and oppressed by Soviet Russian despotism—Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.)

TO FREE MEN EVERYWHERE

Our Front is forced to work illegally and underground, and for this reason we are distributing this appeal anonymously.

We are appealing to world public opinion to stand up in defense of the Ukrainian people against Russian despotism. The United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which the governments of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR are signatories, guarantee each nation the right for national independence, as well as basic human rights. Nevertheless, both of these rights are disregarded by the parties and governments of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR, the latter merely a colonial administration of Ukraine controlled by Moscow.

The government of the Ukrainian SSR has not even reached a level of independence that would permit Ukrainian prisoners to serve their sentences in prisons in Ukraine, of which they are citizens and where they could avail themselves of some assistance from their families.

For efforts to implement these rights in Ukraine, many Ukrainian intellectuals were imprisoned and some were sentenced to death, for instance, L. Lukianenko and I. Kandyba (later their sentences were commuted to 15 years at hard labor);

For advocating intellectual freedom and for resisting Russification: V. Moroz, E. Sverstiuk, V. Chornovil, I. Svitychny, Ihor and Iryna Kalynets, V. Stus, Iryna Senyk,

M. Osadchy and I. Hel—just to mention a few, were given sentences of up to 15 years in prison and exile;

For protesting the illegal trial and for advocating human rights Prof. Leonid Pliushch, A. Lupynis and Gen. Petro Hryhorenko, and others were confined indefinitely to special KGB psychiatric wards;

I. Moisiev and Mykola Khmara were murdered for their religious beliefs, and others, like Rev. V. Romaniuk (10 years), were sentenced to long prison terms;

For refusing to denounce his father, Yuriy Shukhevych was sentenced to 15 years in prison after already serving 20 years;

For defending her husband, S. Karavansky, microbiologist Nina Strokata-Karavansky was sentenced to four years;

Executed for defending the national rights of Ukraine were A. Olynyk, P. Kovalchuk, I. Chayka, and others;

Murdered while in prison were Mykhailo Soroka, Vasyl Malchuk, and others;

Severely punished for defending the national rights of Ukrainians, Tartars, Jews, and other national minorities in the USSR were S. Karavansky, Gen. P. Hryhorenko and Ivan Dzyuba;

Pyotr Yakir and others were rearrested for speaking out in defense of discriminated Soviet Jewry;

In order to break the will of the imprisoned, the KGB uses new chemical and medical drugs with methodic cruelty to poison the food of such political prisoners as P. Starchyk, I. Dzyuba, V. Moroz, L. Lukianenko, I. Kandyba and others.

The terror of Brezhnev-Andropov exceeds in its sophisticated cruelty even that of Stalin and Beria.

The government of the United States and other capitalist countries share responsibility for the increased terror against us and the new wave of Stalinism in Ukraine and other Soviet republics, because at the time of mass persecution by the KGB, they are making deals with Moscow without demanding that the Soviet government observe national and human rights. By means of these deals, Moscow seeks to cement its total domination over the captive nations. The Conference in Helsinki has aided and abetted Moscow's reign of terror by not insisting that the USSR abide by the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Heed our warning—if human and national rights, freedom of thought and religious worship are not defended, not only by us who are already suffering persecution, but by all of the civilized world, then total terror will spread throughout the world, because the Russian chauvinists and Communists will not be satisfied with what they already have.

We are calling on workers, writers, artists, scholars, students and the youth, women's and church organizations, and honest people of all nations to demand an immediate end to the use of chemical and mind-twisting drugs on prisoners, release of all political and religious prisoners, liquidation of concentration camps, an end to the policy of Russification, and the establishment of national independence for the peoples held captive by the USSR, in accordance with the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 727

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I reluctantly voted against House Joint

Resolution 727, a resolution making continuing appropriations for the present fiscal year. I say reluctantly because I have the greatest respect for the diligence and energy and good judgment of the House Appropriations Committee.

I supported the necessity of establishing some form of hold harmless for local school districts which are ready and actually implementing compensatory education programs this year. Guaranteeing them at least 85 percent of the amounts available to them last year was a practical response to the dilemma we face.

I understand the idea that a compromise was necessary with the Senate and that the 115 percent ceiling was accepted by the House conferees in the spirit of compromise. As far as I can see, the ceiling will require that those States who, by virtue of the fact that they have more eligible children, would have received the largest increases, will share a much larger cut in the total ESEA amounts.

It makes no sense to me to take a disproportionately large amount of money away from those States who have the largest number of disadvantaged children. For this reason, I voted against the measure. It is a protest vote, cast in the knowledge that the measure would pass by an overwhelming majority.

KISSINGER AT PACEM IN TERRIS CONFERENCE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the important address given by Secretary Kissinger at this week's Pacem in Terris Conference here in Washington.

Secretary Kissinger noted that the renewed fighting in the Middle East indicates how elusive peace on earth is, but he also noted that:

We are at one of those rare moments where through a combination of fortuitous circumstances and design man seems in a position to shape his future. What we need is the confidence to discuss issues without bitter strife, the wisdom to define together the nature of our world as well as the vision to chart together a more just future.

The complete address follows:

TEXT OF SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE HENRY A. KISSINGER

THE NATURE OF THE NATIONAL DIALOG

This is an important anniversary. A year ago today—on October 8—came the breakthrough in the Paris negotiations which led soon afterward to the end of American military involvement in Viet-Nam. It is strangely difficult now to recapture the emotion on that moment of hope and uncertainty when suddenly years of suffering and division were giving way to new possibilities for reconciliation.

We meet, too, at a time when renewed conflict in the Middle East reminds us that international stability is always precarious

and never to be taken for granted. Pacem in Terris remains regrettably elusive. However well we contain this crisis, as we have contained others, we must still ask ourselves what we seek beyond the management of conflict.

The need for a dialogue about national purposes has never been more urgent and no assembly is better suited for such a discussion than those gathered here tonight.

Dramatic changes in recent years have transformed America's position and role in the world:

For most of the postwar period America enjoyed predominance in physical resources and political power. Now like most other nations in history, we find that our most difficult task is how to apply limited means to the accomplishment of carefully defined ends. We can no longer overwhelm our problems; we must master them with imagination, understanding and patience.

For a generation our preoccupation was to prevent the Cold War from degenerating into a hot war. Today, when the danger of global conflict has diminished, we face the more profound problem of defining what we mean by peace and determining the ultimate purpose of improved international relations.

For two decades the solidarity of our alliances seemed as constant as the threats to our security. Now our allies have regained strength and self-confidence, and relations with adversaries have improved. All this has given rise to uncertainties over the sharing of burdens with friends and the impact of reduced tensions on the cohesion of alliances.

Thus even as we have mastered the art of containing crises, our concern with the nature of a more permanent international order has grown. Questions once obscured by more insistent needs now demand our attention: What is true national interest? To what end stability? What is the relationship of peace to justice?

It is characteristic of periods of upheaval that to those who live through them, they appear as a series of haphazard events. Symptoms obscure basic issues and historical trends. The urgent tends to dominate the important. Too often goals are presented as abstract utopias, safe-havens from pressing events.

But a debate to be fruitful must define what can reasonably be asked of foreign policy and at what pace progress can be achieved. Otherwise it turns into competing catalogues of the desirable rather than informed comparisons of the possible. Dialogue degenerates into tactical skirmishing.

The current public discussion reflects some interesting and significant shifts in perspective:

A foreign policy once considered excessively moralistic is now looked upon by some as excessively pragmatic.

The Government was criticized in 1969 for holding back East-West trade with certain countries until there was progress in their foreign policies. Now we are criticized for not holding back East-West trade until there are changes in those same countries' domestic policies.

The Administration's foreign policy once decried as too cold-war oriented is now attacked as too insensitive to the profound moral antagonism between Communism and freedom.

One consequence of this intellectual shift is a gap between conception and performance on some major issues of policy:

The desirability of peace and detente is affirmed but both the inducements to progress and the penalties to confrontation are restricted by legislation.

Expressions of concern for human values in other countries are coupled with failure

to support the very programs designed to help developing areas improve their economic and social conditions.

The declared objective of maintaining a responsible American international role clashes with nationalistic pressures in trade and monetary negotiations and with calls for unilateral withdrawal from alliance obligations.

It is clear that we face genuine moral dilemmas and important policy choices. But it is also clear that we need to define the framework of our dialogue more perceptively and understandingly.

THE COMPETING ELEMENTS OF FOREIGN POLICY

Foreign policy must begin with the understanding that it involves relationships between sovereign countries. Sovereignty has been defined as a will uncontrolled by others; that is what gives foreign policy its contingent and ever incomplete character.

For disagreements among sovereign states can be settled only by negotiation or by power, by compromise or by imposition. Which of these methods prevails depends on the values, the strengths and the domestic systems of the countries involved. A nation's values define what is just; its strength determines what is possible; its domestic structure decides what policies can in fact be implemented and sustained.

Thus foreign policy involves two partially conflicting endeavors: defining the interests, purposes and values of a society and relating them to the interests, purposes and values of others.

The policy maker, therefore, must strike a balance between what is desirable and what is possible. Progress will always be measured in partial steps and in the relative satisfaction of alternative goals. Tension is unavoidable between values, which are invariably cast in maximum terms, and efforts to promote them, which of necessity involve compromise. Foreign policy is explained domestically in terms of justice. But what is defined as justice at home becomes the subject of negotiation abroad. It is thus no accident that many nations, including our own, view the international arena as a forum in which virtue is thwarted by the clever practice of foreigners.

In a community of sovereign states, the quest for peace involves a paradox: the attempt to impose absolute justice by one side will be seen as absolute injustice by all others; the quest for total security for some turns into total insecurity for the remainder. Stability depends on the relative satisfaction and therefore also the relative dissatisfaction of the various states. The pursuit of peace must therefore begin with the pragmatic concept of coexistence—especially in a period of ideological conflict.

We must, of course, avoid becoming obsessed with stability. An excessively pragmatic policy will be empty of vision and humanity. It will lack not only direction, but also roots and heart. General de Gaulle wrote in his memoirs that "France cannot be France without greatness." By the same token America cannot be true to itself without moral purpose. This country has always had a sense of mission. Americans have always held the view that America stood for something above and beyond its material achievements. A purely pragmatic policy provides no criteria for other nations to assess our performance and no standards to which the American people can rally.

But when policy becomes excessively moralistic it may turn quixotic or dangerous. A presumed monopoly on truth obstructs negotiation and accommodation. Good results may be given up in the quest for every elusive ideal solutions. Policy may fall prey to

ineffectual posturing or adventurist crusades.

The prerequisite for a fruitful national debate is that the policy makers and critics appreciate each other's perspectives and respect each other's purposes. The policy maker must understand that the critic is obliged to stress imperfections in order to challenge assumptions and to goad actions. But equally the critic should acknowledge the complexity and inherent ambiguity of the policy maker's choices. The policy maker must be concerned with the best that can be achieved, not just the best that can be imagined. He has to act in a fog of incomplete knowledge without the information that will be available later to the analyst. He knows—or should know—that he is responsible for the consequences of disaster as well as for the benefits of success. He may have to qualify some goals not because they would be undesirable if reached, but because the risks of failure outweigh potential gains. He must often settle for the gradual, much as he might prefer the immediate. He must compromise with others, and this means to some extent compromising with himself.

The outsider demonstrates his morality by the precision of his perceptions and the loftiness of his ideals. The policy maker expresses his morality by implementing a sequence of imperfections and partial solutions in pursuit of his ideals.

There must be understanding, as well, of the crucial importance of timing. Opportunities cannot be hoarded; once past, they are usually irretrievable. New relationships in a fluid transitional period—such as today—are delicate and vulnerable; they must be nurtured if they are to thrive. We cannot pull up young shoots periodically to see whether the roots are still there or whether there is some marginally better location for them.

We are now at such a time of tenuous beginnings. Western Europe and Japan have joined us in an effort to reinvigorate our relationships. The Soviet Union has begun to practice foreign policy—at least partially—as a relationship between states rather than as international civil war. The People's Republic of China has emerged from two decades of isolation. The developing countries are impatient for economic and social change. A new dimension of unprecedented challenges—in food, oceans, energy, environment—demands global cooperation.

We are at one of those rare moments where through a combination of fortuitous circumstances and design man seems in a position to shape his future. What we need is the confidence to discuss issues without bitter strife, the wisdom to define together the nature of our world as well as the vision to chart together a more just future.

DETENTE WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Nothing demonstrates this need more urgently than our relationship with the Soviet Union.

This Administration has never had any illusions about the Soviet system. We have always insisted that progress in technical fields, such as trade, had to follow—and reflect—progress toward more stable international relations. We have maintained a strong military balance and a flexible defense posture as a buttress to stability. We have insisted that disarmament had to be mutual. We have judged movement in our relations with the Soviet Union, not by atmospherics, but by how well concrete problems are resolved and by whether there is responsible international conduct.

Coexistence to us continues to have a very precise meaning:

We will oppose the attempt by any country

to achieve a position of predominance either globally or regionally.

We will resist any attempt to exploit a policy of detente to weaken our alliances.

We will react if relaxation of tensions is used as a cover to exacerbate conflicts in international trouble spots.

The Soviet Union cannot disregard these principles in any area of the world without imperiling its entire relationship with the United States.

On this basis we have succeeded in transforming U.S.-Soviet relations in many important ways. Our two countries have concluded an historic accord to limit strategic arms. We have substantially reduced the risk of direct U.S.-Soviet confrontation in crisis areas. The problem of Berlin has been resolved by negotiation. We and our allies have engaged the Soviet Union in negotiations on major issues of European security including a reduction of military forces in Central Europe. We have reached a series of bilateral agreements on cooperation—health, environment, space, science and technology, as well as trade. These accords are designed to create a vested interest in cooperation and restraint.

Until recently the goals of detente were not an issue. The necessity of shifting from confrontation toward negotiation seemed so overwhelming that goals beyond the settlement of international disputes were never raised. But now progress has been made—and already taken for granted. We are engaged in an intense debate on whether we should make changes in Soviet society a precondition for further progress—or indeed for following through on commitments already made. The cutting edge of this problem is the Congressional effort to condition most-favored-nation trade status for other countries on changes in their domestic systems.

This is a genuine moral dilemma. There are genuine moral concerns—on both sides of the argument. So let us not address this as a debate between those who are morally sensitive and those who are not, between those who care for justice and those who are oblivious to humane values. The attitude of the American people and government has been made emphatically clear on countless occasions, in ways that have produced effective results. The exit tax on emigration is not being collected and we have received assurances that it will not be reapplied; hardship cases submitted to the Soviet Government are being given specific attention; the rate of Jewish emigration has been in the tens of thousands where it was once a trickle. We will continue our vigorous efforts on these matters.

But the real debate goes far beyond this: Should we now tie demands which were never raised during negotiations to agreements that have already been concluded? Should we require as a formal condition internal changes that we heretofore sought to foster in an evolutionary manner?

Let us remember what the MFN question specifically involves. The very term "most favored nation" is misleading in its implication of preferential treatment. What we are talking about is whether to allow normal economic relations to develop—of the kind we now have with over 100 other countries and which the Soviet Union enjoyed until 1951. The issue is whether to abolish discriminatory trade restrictions that were imposed at the height of the Cold War. Indeed, at that time the Soviet Government discouraged commerce because it feared the domestic impact of normal trading relations with the West on its society.

The demand that Moscow modify its domestic policy as a precondition for MFN or detente was never made while we were negotiating; now it is inserted after both sides

have carefully shaped an overall mosaic. Thus it raises questions about our entire bilateral relationship.

Finally the issue affects not only our relationship with the Soviet Union, but also with many other countries whose internal structures we find incompatible with our own. Conditions imposed on one country could inhibit expanding relations with others, such as the People's Republic of China.

We shall never condone the suppression of fundamental liberties. We shall urge humane principles and use our influence to promote justice. But the issue comes down to the limits of such efforts. How hard can we press without provoking the Soviet leadership into returning to practices in its foreign policy that increase international tensions? Are we ready to face the crises and increased defense budgets that a return to Cold War conditions would spawn? And will this encourage full emigration or enhance the well-being or nourish the hope for liberty of the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union? Is it detente that has prompted repression—or is it detente that has generated the ferment and the demand for openness which we are now witnessing?

For half a century we have objected to communist efforts to alter the domestic structures of other countries. For a generation of Cold War we sought to ease the risks produced by competing ideologies. Are we now to come full circle and insist on domestic compatibility as a condition of progress?

These questions have no easy answers. The government may underestimate the margin of concessions available to us. But a fair debate must admit that they are genuine questions, the answers to which could affect the fate of all of us.

Our policy with respect to detente is clear: We shall resist aggressive foreign policies. Detente cannot survive irresponsibility in any area, including the Middle East. As for the internal policies of closed systems the United States will never forget that the antagonism between freedom and its enemies is part of the reality of the modern age. We are not neutral in that struggle. As long as we remain powerful we will use our influence to promote freedom, as we always have. But in the nuclear age we are obliged to recognize that the issue of war and peace also involves human lives and that the attainment of peace is a profound moral concern.

THE WORLD AS IT IS AND THE WORLD WE SEEK

Addressing the United Nations General Assembly two weeks ago, I described our goal as a world where power blocs and balances are no longer relevant; where justice, not stability, can be our overriding preoccupation; where countries consider cooperation in the world interest to be in their national interest.

But we cannot move toward the world of the future without first maintaining peace in the world as it is. These very days we are vividly reminded that this requires vigilance and continuing commitment.

So our journey must start from where we are now. This is a time of lessened tension, of greater equilibrium, of diffused power. But if the world is better than our earlier fears, it still falls far short of our hopes. To deal with the present does not mean that we are content with it.

The most striking feature of the contemporary period—the feature that gives complexity as well as hope—is the radical transformation in the nature of power. Throughout history power has generally been homogeneous. Military, economic and political potential were closely related. To be powerful a nation had to be strong in all categories. Today the vocabulary of strength is more complex. Military muscle does not guarantee political influence. Economic giants can be militarily weak, and military strength may

not be able to obscure economic weakness. Countries can exert political influence even when they have neither military nor economic strength.

It is wrong to speak of only one balance of power, for there are several which have to be related to each other. In the military sphere, there are two super powers. In economic terms, there are at least five major groupings. Politically, many more centers of influence have emerged; some 80 new nations have come into being since the end of World War II and regional groups are assuming ever increasing importance.

Above all, whatever the measure of power, its political utility has changed. Throughout history increases in military power—however slight—could be turned into specific political advantage. With the overwhelming arsenals of the nuclear age, however, the pursuit of marginal advantage is both pointless and potentially suicidal. Once sufficiency is reached, additional increments of power do not translate into usable political strength; and attempts to achieve tactical gains can lead to cataclysm.

This environment both puts a premium on stability and makes it difficult to maintain. Today's striving for equilibrium should not be compared to the balance of power of previous periods. The very notion of "operating" a classical balance of power disintegrates when the charge required to upset the balance is so large that it cannot be achieved by limited means.

More specifically, there is no parallel with the nineteenth century. Then, the principal countries shared essentially similar concepts of legitimacy and accepted the basic structure of the existing international order. Small adjustments in strength were significant. The "balance" operated in a relatively confined geographic area. None of these factors obtain today.

Nor when we talk of equilibrium do we mean a simplistic mechanical model devoid of purpose. The constantly shifting alliances that maintained equilibrium in previous centuries are neither appropriate nor possible in our time. In an age of ideological schism the distinction between friends and adversaries is an objective reality. We share ideals as well as interests with our friends, and we know that the strength of our friendships is crucial to the lowering of tensions with our opponents.

When we refer to five or six or seven major centers of power, the point being made is not that others are excluded but that a few short years ago everyone agreed that there were only two. The diminishing tensions and the emergence of new centers of power have meant greater freedom of action and greater importance for all other nations.

In this setting, our immediate aim has been to build a stable network of relationships that offers hope of sparing mankind the scourges of war. An interdependent world community cannot tolerate either big power confrontations or recurrent regional crises.

But peace must be more than the absence of conflict. We perceive stability as the bridge to the realization of human aspirations, not an end in itself. We have learned much about containing crises, but we have not removed their roots. We have begun to accommodate our differences, but we have not affirmed our commonality. We may have improved the mastery of equilibrium, but we have not yet attained justice.

In the encyclical for which this conference is named, Pope John sketched a greater vision. He foresaw "that no political community is able to pursue its own interests and develop itself in isolation" for "there is a growing awareness of all human beings that they are members of a world community."

The opportunities of mankind now transcend nationalism, and can only be dealt with by nations acting in concert:

For the first time in generations mankind is in a position to shape a new and peaceful international order. But do we have the imagination and determination to carry forward this still fragile task of creation?

For the first time in history we may have the technical knowledge to satisfy man's basic needs. The imperatives of the modern world respect no national borders and must inevitably open all societies to the world around them. But do we have the political will to join together to accomplish this great end?

If this vision is to be realized, America's active involvement is inescapable. History will judge us by our deeds, not by our good intentions.

But it cannot be the work of any one country. And it cannot be the undertaking of any one Administration or one branch of government or one party. To build truly is to chart a course that will be carried on by future leaders because it has the enduring support of the American people.

So let us search for a fresh consensus. Let us restore a spirit of understanding between the legislative and the executive, between the government and the press, between the people and their public servants. Let us learn once again to debate our methods and not our motives, to focus on our destiny and not on our divisions. Let us all contribute our different views and perspectives but let us, once again, see ourselves as engaged in a common enterprise. If we are to shape a world community we must first restore community at home.

With Americans working together, America can work with others toward man's eternal goal of a *Pax in Terris*—peace abroad, peace at home and peace within ourselves.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, five centuries ago, it was a widely accepted belief that the world was flat, and that any mariner who was foolhardy enough to sail out too far from land would either fall off the edge or be devoured by monsters, or both.

In 1492, however, a bold Italian sailor named Christopher Columbus challenged this belief. He was a man with the vision to see the world differently, and the courage to risk his life for his belief.

As an American of Italian descent, I naturally take a great deal of pride in the achievements of Christopher Columbus. His accomplishments, however, are something that all Americans should be proud of. His actions give a clear example of a great man who reached out into the unknown in pursuit of knowledge and truth, even in the face of unfavorable public opinion.

We can praise Christopher Columbus for the results of his explorations. His discovery of the Western Hemisphere doubled the size of the known world. Until that recent time when men adventure through space to other planets, Colum-

bus must certainly rank as the greatest explorer in the history of mankind.

We can praise Columbus for his daring. He led an unwilling crew aboard three fragile sailing ships on a 33-day journey into an unknown ocean, peopled with all sorts of legendary monsters and dangers. In doing so, he demonstrated a spirit of courage and faith in the face of adversity, and of perseverance on behalf of just and worthwhile causes, that has become the backbone of the American way of life.

We can praise this great explorer for his sheer determination. His life from boyhood was dedicated to the project of sailing westward to find the Indies. He struggled against poverty, argued with geographers and sailors, and coped with court intrigues until he finally enlisted the enthusiastic support of a queen and her court treasurer. He kept his rebellious and fearful crew on their westward course until his ships reached what he supposed to be the Indies of his dreams.

We can praise Columbus for his noble motives. Without a thought of personal gain, he sailed forth into the void in the service of his queen and fellow men.

We can praise him for all of this, and more, but it is the spirit of this explorer even more than his achievements, that personifies his greatness. He set a standard for this Nation which even now challenges us to step forward courageously in the defense of our convictions and not to fear the possibility of seeking new answers in the unknown. For, as long as there are men whose spirit drives them to seek the truth, there will be great cultures in which to learn and prosper.

CITY OF SAVANNAH, GA., AND
CASIMIR PULASKI

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, October 7, the Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus of Savannah, Ga., held impressive ceremonies observing the 194th anniversary of the death of the siege of Savannah in which Casimir Pulaski, a Polish nobleman, serving in America's fight for freedom, was shot and killed.

I am pleased to know that the Savannah Historical Sites and Monuments Commission is attempting to restore the battlefield site, and already has title to a small acreage of land and some historical buildings. There is still available about 50 additional acres for this project.

I fully support the idea of such a restoration and hope that some means will be found to accomplish the restoration of the battlefield as an example of our appreciation of the contributions made by ethnic idealists who fought for our cause for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with my

remarks, I wish to include the attached correspondence from the mayor pro tempore of the city of Savannah supporting the idea of establishing the battlefield to its original state and complete action on this project in time for America's bicentennial.

The letter follows:

CITY OF SAVANNAH, GA.,
October 11, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Impressed by your comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Polish contributions to the United States and the sacrifice of such noblemen as Casimir Pulaski on the altar of American freedom, I thought you would like to know that Savannah did not let the observance pass unnoticed.

Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus held impressive ceremonies on Sunday, October 7th at the Pulaski Monument, located in a beautiful Savannah park. U.S. District Judge Alexander A. Lawrence, historian, author and student of the law, was the speaker. As Mayor Protem, I introduced him.

Monsieur de la Gorce, minister plenipotentiary of France, and the French consul general from New Orleans were also here for the observance of the 194th anniversary of the Siege of Savannah in which Pulaski was killed, along with more than 1,000 Frenchmen. The battlefield is only a few city blocks away from the monument.

Speakers at the various functions brought out details of Pulaski's heroic death, and how the loss of his religious scapulars, had given him a premonition of his impending death.

LaPayette was in Savannah in 1825 to lay the cornerstone for a Pulaski monument. He noted at the cornerstone laying ceremony that he had introduced Pulaski to the American Army, had introduced him to the commander in chief, George Washington, and now some 46 years later he was participating in a ceremony at a monument to the gallant Pole.

The Savannah Historic Site and Monuments Commission after a ten-year struggle has a toe-hold to restore the battlefield site. They now have title to 5.6 acres and also some nationally rated historic buildings. About 50 additional acres are available. The French are interested in some form of participation in the project which is in close proximity to I-16 and I-95.

It would be fitting if this project could reach fruition by the time of America's Bicentennial. This was the site of one of the bloodiest battles of the Revolution, and a great example of the ethnic contribution to American freedom by Poles, French, Irish and others who gave their lives in this battle. Why not a national monument, like Andersonville?

Thus would be created a site of great pride for Polish Americans who would want to visit the battlefield during their travels on the two major Interstate Highways.

Permit me to echo the warm sentiments you have expressed on the part Polish-Americans played in making America great.

Sincerely,

FRANK P. ROSSITER,
Mayor pro tempore.

4-H WEEK

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that Congress and indeed the entire Nation, honor the 4-H Clubs of

CXIX—2145—74—Part 26—51

America. Members of 4-H are dedicated to and adhere to the basic principles of morality, ethics, and human relations so necessary to a truly great society. The four H's stand for head, heart, hands, and health and represent the wide range of 4-H Club activities.

Mr. Speaker, I have been personally associated over the years with the members of this outstanding organization. I have been impressed with their courtesy, good manners, and patriotism. They love America and its principles of representative government.

The 4-H Clubs were created as a part of the Smith-Lever Agricultural Extension Act, passed by the Congress in 1914. May I remind my colleagues that a great South Carolinian, Congressman A. Frank Lever, was an author of the act. Congressman Lever was interred on the campus of Clemson University, one of the Nation's greatest land-grant institutions which he supported with great devotion.

Mr. Speaker, the youth of our land are our most precious assets. We know that as each new generation of leadership takes its place the foundation for what is practiced in maturity will be what has been learned in its youth. The example of the 4-H organization has spread across the face of the Earth since its inception. More than 75 nations have adopted the basic 4-H plan to their own land. No finer ideals could be advanced by our Nation than the ideals of the 4-H organization.

Mr. Speaker, during National 4-H Week 1973 it is a special pleasure to pay tribute to the 4-H Clubs of America and to wish for these splendid young people the very best always.

PENNSYLVANIA GOVERNOR SUPPORTS H.R. 10036

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee this week began a month-long set of hearings on H.R. 10036, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1973, as introduced by our colleagues LUD ASHLEY and BILL BARRETT, and the various housing and community development programs offered by the administration.

Today the subcommittee received excellent testimony in support of H.R. 10036 from the Hon. Milton Shapp, Governor of my State of Pennsylvania.

With his testimony, the Governor today reinforced the fact that he is one of the Nation's most knowledgeable and erudite State executives.

I commend his testimony to my colleagues. And I would like to include it in the RECORD at this time:

TESTIMONY OF GOV. MILTON J. SHAPP BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 12, 1973

I appreciate the opportunity to appear be-

fore you today to testify on H.R. 10036, the proposed "Housing and Urban Development Act of 1973." The need for comprehensive legislation in this area is crucial, and I commend this committee for moving ahead with consideration of this proposal.

The events occurring since the national administration's cruel, abrupt and unjustified imposition of the moratorium on federally-subsidized housing programs last January have shown beyond a doubt that it is up to Congress to take the initiative in developing programs to house our low-and-moderate income citizens.

This is so because the Nixon administration, in my view, has shown itself to be completely incapable of addressing a domestic priority as vital as all others: decent housing for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, before I offer my comments on H.R. 10036, I would like to make some brief comments on the administration's proposals. The President, as I mentioned a moment ago, imposed a moratorium on federally-assisted housing programs in January, contending that the existing programs hadn't worked and that new approaches were needed. The administration assured the nation that, if it would only wait patiently for a few months, all the problems of housing our low-and-moderate income families would be solved.

I might note here that we in Pennsylvania were not content to "wait." The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania initiated a suit in federal court last spring, contending that the moratorium was an illegal defiance of the will of Congress. Two separate federal courts upheld Pennsylvania's contention, and ordered the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to immediately begin processing applications for subsidized housing. Only a last-minute order by Chief Justice Burger stayed the effect of the lower courts' order and now the court has agreed with the Chief Justice but the basic issue is yet to be resolved by the courts.

Last month, the Nixon administration finally offered its housing proposals to the Congress. In his message the President abandoned the national housing goals contained in the 1968 Housing Act, which committed the nation to the production of an average of 600,000 units a year for a ten-year period for low-and-moderate income families. Under the pretext of making greater use of "existing housing stock," the administration has announced its intention to discontinue any real effort to meet the goals set by Congress in 1968.

One of the most unfortunate features of the administration's proposals is the statement in a summary of the draft legislation which sets forth a "Congressional finding" that federally subsidized housing programs have not made an adequate contribution toward attaining the national housing goal of a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family. Yet, in the four years before they were terminated by the administration, the two principal subsidized programs, the Section 235 home ownership program and the Section 236 rental program, produced one million housing units for low-and-moderate income families, the greatest number of such units produced in so short a time period in our history. The failure of these programs will be due to their suspension by the Nixon administration and not to any shortcomings in the programs themselves.

Obviously, without funding, which was ended by the administration, the programs can contribute nothing and they thereby become the failures the President claims them to be.

The President also proposes that direct housing allowances to low-income persons

may be the answer to our housing needs, but he adds that a final decision on this approach won't be made until late 1974 or 1975. The President did not suggest what those families needing government-assisted housing are to do in the interim. I also have serious doubts about the usefulness in my state of a federal program of direct housing allowances to low-income families. What we need in Pennsylvania, and in most other areas of the nation, as well, is a production-oriented housing program to stimulate the construction of new housing. Housing allowances will not do this, and, in areas where the local housing market at present has few vacancies, there is an additional problem with the housing allowance method: giving money directly to low-income families might act as an inflationary pressure to drive up rents, since the lack of vacancies will deny any real housing choice to such families.

In offering my views now on the proposed "Housing and Urban Development Act of 1973," I want to note that Pennsylvania has long been a national leader among the states in the fields of community development and housing. We have been a full partner with the federal government in these areas, and we hope to remain so once the present difficulties with these programs have been resolved. To date, Pennsylvania has invested \$6.8 million in housing assistance fund dollars to aid about 120 groups, and this has resulted in 8,778 units of federally-assisted housing in various stages of construction and occupancy, with a total mortgage value of about \$164,675,000.

In January of 1973, the Appalachian Regional Commission released a report on housing development in the 11 states in which it is involved. In a section of the report dealing with "Suggestions for Program Improvement," the Commission said it wanted to "Encourage each state to establish and provide funding for an agency similar to the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs. This state agency has two assets that would, if utilized be helpful in many of the states in the Region." The two assets were identified as technical assistance to nonprofit sponsors and loans and grants.

During the past 22 years, Pennsylvania's community development program has provided one-half of the local share for federal urban renewal programs. Because of the non-cash credits given local communities, the state share has, as a practical matter, often amounted to 90 percent of the local cash contribution for such programs. Some \$200 million in state funds have gone to some 80 city and county urban renewal authorities to assist over 600 urban renewal projects, and over \$1.1 billion in federal urban renewal funds have come into Pennsylvania.

Following the disastrous flooding caused in my state last year by Tropical Storm Agnes, Pennsylvania also made available to flood-damaged communities \$151 million in urban renewal appropriations, and \$3 million in special housing assistance funds.

We have also created a Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency, similar to those in other states, but with broader powers, to finance rental and purchase housing for moderate and middle income families. It was only in September of this year that we received a definitive court ruling, affirming the constitutionality of this agency's powers and we are now ready to go. The Agency expects to close its first loans within the next month and we expect it to be a major tool in our efforts to make more housing available in Pennsylvania.

As a general comment on H.R. 10036, I want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, and your colleague, Congressman Ashley, for

your proposed legislation, which recognizes that community development and housing are closely linked, and must be treated as a joint process. For too long we have ignored the basic fact that we are only treating half the problem when we eliminate substandard housing units without also renewing the neighborhood surrounding the housing. This is a key difference between your legislation and that offered by the Nixon administration, the so-called "Better Communities Act," which makes no attempt to build communities or make them better.

I also applaud your provision to require state, local and county governments to file detailed funding applications showing that they have developed a comprehensive program to eliminate or prevent slums, blight and deterioration, and to provide adequate community facilities. Heavy emphasis has been placed, justifiably, on the provision of low-and-moderate-income housing.

This requirement of a detailed application meeting certain established national priorities is a sharp improvement over the Nixon administration proposal which would simply "dump" large amounts of cash on local communities, with no real guidance as to how the money would be used. The permanent "hold harmless" provision contained in H.R. 10036 is particularly welcome, since we in Pennsylvania have calculated that, once the "hold harmless" provision of the "Better Communities Act" has been phased out over a four-year period, total federal dollars coming into Pennsylvania will decrease substantially. In fiscal year 1975, for example, the Nixon administration legislation would distribute within Pennsylvania \$184.1 million. By 1979, that sum will decrease to \$132.4 million.

Also in positive contrast to the Nixon administration's policies, is your provision for interim funding of housing programs in the period before the block-grant provisions of H.R. 10036 become effective. The President's plan would, essentially, leave these needs unmet until 1975. I also endorse your call on Congress to fund existing categorical community development programs, as well, until new programs are enacted. The unacceptable alternative to such interim funding, and the one proposed by the administration, is to hold these existing housing and categorical community development programs "captive" while Congress debates the various community development proposals before it.

Now I want to offer some views which I believe represent those of most, if not all, of the members of the National Governors' Conference, on the importance of a major state role in the areas of community development and housing. The perspective of the state is simply broader and more comprehensive than that of an individual community or county, and, in Pennsylvania, we have not hesitated to use our leverage through various programs such as urban renewal to urge localities to do certain things, such as to control development on the unprotected 100-year flood plain along Pennsylvania's rivers.

For example, following last year's flood in the Wilkes-Barre area, the feeling of some local officials was that the most important flood-recovery priorities were to save the business structure and the tax base of the affected communities, even if that meant rebuilding on the flood plain, and, to some extent, placing the needs of individual citizens in a lower priority.

With the leverage of the millions of dollars in state urban renewal grants, we in Pennsylvania have been able to bring about some changes in these priorities, and I think that

the people who live in these flood-ravaged communities may be better protected in the years ahead as a result of our efforts.

We support 100 percent federal funding of community development costs. But, the side effect of total federal funding will be to deny Pennsylvania the leverage it now has to discourage such things as exclusionary development practices and poor flood plain development practices. We hope, therefore, that the community development and housing legislation as finally adopted by Congress, from the point of view of the states, will contain strong provisions for state monitoring of allocations. In short, we believe that the states should continue to be able to apply incentives for sound community development based on housing needs and social and economic factors.

There is another aspect of state involvement in community development which I would like to mention briefly. Senate Bill 268, the "Land Use Policy Planning Assistance Act," passed the U.S. Senate earlier this year by a wide margin. If, as expected, this or similar legislation is also approved by the House of Representatives, enormously important land use planning responsibilities would be assigned to the states, and substantial federal funds for land use planning by the states would be authorized.

Pennsylvania supports the passage of a federal land use policy act, and is anxious to accept the planning responsibilities such legislation would give to the state. However, in line with the thoughts I have just expressed I believe that there is a major incongruity, once the relevance of community development and housing to land use is noted, in assigning these enormous responsibilities to the states, while, at the same time, providing for direct funding of most community development and housing programs directly to local communities. Thus, while the states will be asked to prepare land use plans under S.B. 268 or similar legislation, at the same time massive amounts of money that will be used to implement these plans will go directly to local communities with no real monitoring, review, or control by the states. Gentlemen, they just won't work, and the concept must be changed to give the states the power to both make and implement these policies.

Consistent with these comments, I want to offer a specific suggestion which I think would go a long way in aiding the states in having a strong role in carrying out the goals of H.R. 10036. We feel that, in many cases, the small, fragmented nature of local government outside the major cities in our metropolitan areas is going to prevent these local governments from effectively carrying out the requirements imposed by H.R. 10036 as a condition to receiving housing and community development block grants. Where there is failure to carry out the requirements, the funds would be withheld by the federal government. As we read the provisions of H.R. 10036, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would have discretion in allocating these unused monies. We believe it is important to require the Secretary to allocate to the state such funds as have been withheld from communities in metropolitan areas. After all, the monies were originally intended for use in that state. Failure to require this, we believe, could result in money originally allocated for one state going to another state because of the failure of local communities to meet the requirements of H.R. 10036.

We would also like to see stronger emphasis in H.R. 10036 on the need for total metropolitan area planning. This would be a partial solution to the problem of fragmented local governments which lack the technical and administrative skills to meet the require-

ments for either the community development or housing grants.

In the area of housing, we are pleased that you have recognized the need to maintain production of new housing for low-and-moderate-income families, as well as the need to utilize what is available in the current housing stock of the nation. Nonetheless, our feeling is that there are a number of technical difficulties with the Section 402 and Section 502 Programs as contained in H.R. 10036. The Ad Hoc Task Force on Housing of the National Governors' Conference will submit a paper to this Subcommittee's staff dealing with these technical problems. This task Force has been working with the staff of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Housing for some time, and I am sure it can offer useful assistance to this Subcommittee's staff as well.

I have, however, one specific suggestion on the housing program which I would like to offer at this time. There is a need for a long-term federal commitment to programs to house our low-and-moderate-income families. However, we do not believe that this need can be met by the three-year funding provisions of H.R. 10036. Without some form of long-term commitment, we see no practical way to implement the long-term subsidy commitments which state and local governments will view as one of the important ways to deal with housing problems. We suggest, therefore, that a portion of the block grant housing funds be in the form of long-term contract authority for the Section 402 and Section 502 programs.

I will now conclude with two additional comments on other provisions of H.R. 10036. First, I particularly want to commend the Chairman for his continuing efforts to secure compensation for those homeowners, mainly in Philadelphia, who were the blameless victims of the Federal Housing Administration's inability in administering the Section 221(d) (2) and Section 235 Used Housing programs.

Finally, I want to mention a recent study conducted by the Housing Assistance Council, a nonprofit organization seeking to increase the production of housing in the rural areas of the nation. That study showed that there has been a consistent bias in national housing policy against rural areas for many years. As an example, as of 1970, total federal expenditures for housing, excluding public housing and rent supplements, worked out to \$91 per capita in metropolitan counties, \$40 in non-metropolitan counties, and only \$35 per capita in most rural counties.

In his recent housing message to Congress, President Nixon almost totally ignored rural housing, and I note that your legislation does not deal with the housing programs of the Farmers Home Administration. Nonetheless, I think we need to carefully consider our rural housing needs and to explore ways to increase housing production there. Often overlooked is the fact that some of the worst poverty is found in our rural areas which have few organized groups fighting for their interests.

In closing, I want to offer the services of the staff of the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs to you if there is any way in which their wide technical experience in housing and community development can be of assistance to you.

Thank you for this opportunity to offer my comments on H.R. 10036.

PULASKI DAY PARADE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, On Sunday, I had the honor of participating in the Pulaski Day Parade in Philadelphia.

This day was set aside to pay tribute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski who saved the entire American Army at the Battle of Brandywine, and all of the Polish people who have helped to build our country.

Additionally, I want to give recognition to everyone responsible for making the Pulaski Day Parade such a tremendous success especially the guest of honor, Lt. Comdr. Charles P. Zuhoski, U.S. Navy, who was released from Hanoi on March 14 after being imprisoned for more than 5 years.

At this time I enter into the RECORD the remarks I made at the ceremonies following the parade:

We are here today to honor Count Casimir Pulaski, who gave his life for America's independence and the contributions of Polonia in general, which has done so much for this country.

Few people realize that Polish people were among the first settlers in the colonies and that they were the first to fight for their rights as citizens in this land.

On October 1, 1608, one year after the founding of the colony, a group of Polish settlers landed at Jamestown, Virginia. They were artisans and craftsmen who had been encouraged to come to the new world by the British so they could begin sending glass and wood products to England.

Although the British were dependent on the Poles for the financial success of the colony they decided that citizenship was a privilege reserved only for Englishmen so the Polish workers were denied the right to vote.

The same undemocratic spirit, unfortunately still survives in much of the world today. Too many persons, who falsely think themselves the best kind of Americans, 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 as anybody else in the colony and if they were not given their rights they would not work.

So they closed down the glass factory, the tar distillery, the soap works, the wood shops and, according to the records of the time, 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 and the commercial activity of the colony, the reason for its establishment, quickly came to an almost complete halt.

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, the members of the Jamestown general assembly quickly declared their Polish fellow-colonists citizens with every right and equal representation.

It was this same desire for freedom and the right to govern themselves which later lead to the revolt of the Polish people against the foreign domination of their country.

It was during this fight that Pulaski gained fame as the hero of Czeszochowa (Chestahova) and as a fighter for democracy.

After the unsuccessful fight in Poland, Pulaski was forced into exile. In Paris he met Benjamin Franklin who recommended him to General Washington.

As we all know, Pulaski was put in charge of the colonists small unit of cavalry which was to save the entire American army at the Battle of Brandywine.

Later he fought in the south and later died of wounds he received during a cavalry charge during the battle of Savannah.

Today we pay tribute to this great hero and to all of the Polish people who helped to make America great, but we must remember that when Pulaski fell in battle on October 11, 1779 while fighting for American liberties, Poland was not free.

Poland is still not free today. Its people cannot act as Polish patriots, nor openly cherish what is good and noble in Polish traditions.

Pulaski's cause was the cause of freedom. It is the eternal cause of mankind. In its steadfast pursuit lies the best hope of the world.

Thank you.

NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to pay tribute to one of America's staunchest friends and allies, the Republic of China, on the occasion of their 62d anniversary.

A remarkable story can be told about these people. Twenty-four years ago, on December 8, the Nationalist Government moved to Taiwan when the Chinese Communist armies overran the mainland. In spite of the many hardships encountered by this young Government, the Republic of China is experiencing an astounding rate of economic growth. This, in spite of the fact that since 1965 they have received no economic aid from the United States.

This is the way they would have it. They do however need our support in other ways. They do not want to be cast aside in favor of the Communist Chinese, and rightly so. We not only have a moral obligation to the Nationalist Government, but the preservation of freedom for this island nation is in our own best interests.

The word "détente" is being bandied about a great deal these days, but it should not be achieved at the expense of our friends and allies. This indeed, would be a great tragedy.

LAND FOR CALIFORNIA INDIANS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the tragic history of the actions of the Federal Government toward the native Indians of this country has been well documented. During the years of westward expansion, the rights of Indians to property and to life itself were not respected.

Since that time, the record has not been that much better. Funding for programs that would aid in job training and placement, in upgrading the level of health care, in sponsoring the production of much-needed housing, and in developing educational programs to meet the special needs of these people has not been forthcoming.

At the conference of the State Bar of California last year the resolution which follows was passed. This resolution directs that Congress provide land for tribal Indians in California who presently have no land of their own.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of this resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 5-20 PROPOSED BY
AUBREY GROSSMAN

Resolved, that the Conference of Delegates recommends to the Board of Governors of the State Bar of California that it memorialize Congress, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is the sentiment of the Bar of California that Congress should adopt a law which will provide a land base for all California Indian Tribes which presently have no, or an infinitesimal, land base.

STATEMENT OF REASONS

To an Indian Tribe a land base is absolutely indispensable for cultural, religious and economic reasons. In 1853 Indian Tribes held Indian Title to practically all of California. Beginning in that year all their land was taken from them; in order to accomplish it 90-95% of the Indians were wiped out; almost all of the Tribes were destroyed, together with their culture and language. This land was taken from them without their consent, and without the payment of a cent.

The Government proposes to pay its debt to the Indians by calculating the value of California (in 1853) land as 47 cents an acre. There are various ways to show how much this figure undervalues California in 1853. One simple way is to note that 50 times that much was taken out of California in gold alone. Because of the smallness of the payments and because none of the money goes to the Tribes, there is no possibility of any Tribes using this money to buy a land base.

The legalities are simple. In the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 the Government announced its policy toward Indian lands, as follows:

"The utmost good faith shall always be observed toward the Indians, their land and property shall never be taken from them without their consent, and in their property rights and liberty they shall never be invaded or disturbed."

Congress reenacted the statute, with only slight changes in wording, in 1789, 1804, 1834 and 1850. Various Presidents and their Commissioners of Indian Affairs reaffirmed this as the governing law.

The consent of Indian Tribes was usually obtained by treaties. Treaties were actually negotiated with the Indians of California, but the Senate refused to ratify them.

The United States Government is not without responsibility for the genocide against the California Indians. The description given this genocide by the great California historian, H. H. Bancroft, is:

"One of the Last Human Hunts of Civilization, and The Basest and Most Brutal of them all..."

The Federal Government's confession, delivered by the Secretary of the Interior, read as follows:

"It will be for Congress to determine what measure of compensation is due to the survivors of those more than one hundred thousand Indians who were done to death by the actions and laches of the guardian government between the years 1848 and 1880."

Most Indian Tribes have a land basis, pitiful and uneconomic as it may be. Most California Indian Tribes have no tribal land at all—and they should be given such a base. If it were not dictated by law, it would be required as a matter of simple justice and morality.

DIGEST

Digest: Indian Tribes; Land Base.

Proposes that Congress be memorialized to provide a land base for all California Indian tribes which presently do not have one.

A LOOK AT NO-FAULT DIVORCE

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Vera Glaser, in her third article of a series on no-fault divorce, examines the extent to which no-fault divorce is adding to our total welfare burden. Unquestionably, for many mothers with families who have been left alone by fathers not inclined by love or law to live up to support obligations, welfare becomes the answer. The article, which appeared in "The Miami Herald," follows:

NO-FAULT CAN LEAD TO POVERTY

(By Vera Glaser)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is closing in on deadbeat daddies.

The number of fathers who duck support obligations to their children is a national scandal.

And the trend toward "no-fault" divorce laws encourages nonpayment, some experts contend.

By removing any finding of guilt in a marriage breakup, the laws also remove any guidelines judges may have for bearing down on a spouse who simply walks away from an obligation.

CONGRESS SHOWS CONCERN

The result can be poverty for one, or both, partners.

Non-supporting fathers are nothing new, but as their numbers increase, Congress is showing concern.

"A major weakness of divorce laws is the ease with which a parent, usually a father, can avoid his court-imposed duty of child support," says Senator Henry Bellmon (R., Okla.).

"He can move to another state or get an unlisted telephone number. The full burden

of supporting the children then falls on the mother, forcing many women into welfare." Bellmon has introduced a bill to deduct child support directly from a parent's salary via the Social Security system.

Other bills in the hopper would make it a crime to leave the state to avoid paying child support, and would garnishee federal and military pay, if necessary, to collect.

Meanwhile, the number of poor families headed by women is rising, while that headed by men is falling, according to the U.S. Census.

What this means to the children is clear: Those in the male-headed poor families have a fifty-fifty chance of breaking out of poverty. Those in the female-headed families have virtually none.

Betty Spalding, chairwoman of the National Organization for Women's family task force, notes that the divorce rate has zoomed in states with "no-fault" laws and says:

"There is a direct relation between the number of divorces granted in a state and the size of its welfare rolls."

The biggest single item in the U.S. welfare budget is Aid to Families of Dependent Children (AFDC), which this year will cost almost \$4 billion, paid out to about 11 million recipients.

California, the state with the most divorces, also leads the league on AFDC with 1.4 million recipients. The Legislature is considering payroll deductions for child support.

Within one year after their divorce decrees, only 38 per cent of fathers were in full compliance with court orders for child support, according to a 1955 study, the only statistical evidence available on child support payments, published by the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

By the tenth year, 79 per cent of the fathers had stopped paying.

State agencies, with varying degrees of success, pursue collections for welfare mothers.

But the woman who tries to support her family without federal aid has to hire a lawyer and go to court if her husband reneges, something she can rarely afford.

She may need the support payments to cover day care while she works. Assuming she does shop for a lawyer, she will find them reluctant to take a small-bore case. The whole process can take weeks or months.

The only answer: welfare.

Recently Rep. Martha Griffiths (D., Mich.) asked a witness at the Joint Economic Committee, "To what extent does the enforcement of child support obligations force mothers onto welfare rolls?"

Witness Johnnie Tillmon of the National Welfare Rights organization replied:

"If he doesn't have to, the father will not pay. In a lot of states the amount ordered is not enough."

AFFLUENCE DOESN'T HELP

Mrs. Tillmon recalled that her husband, residing in Arkansas while she lived in California, had been required to pay \$5 per week per child.

"The district attorney in California said it would cost too much money to track him down, that they would rather pay the \$300 a month (welfare) to me."

Unmarried, unemployed, and low-income divorced mothers are more or less expected to populate the welfare rolls.

What is surprising are the affluent fathers who push their wives onto AFDC.

Doctors and lawyers in the \$25,000-and-up bracket are child-support delinquents, according to a recent California study published by the Rand Corporation.

AFDC mothers who were called together for a discussion group were "apprehensive" about meeting each other, according to the report, because "each thought the others

would be members of a culturally disadvantaged minority. They were in for a shock.

"Two were college graduates, one an ex-school teacher. Several had been secretaries, one an art major. Most had owned their own homes before a broken marriage."

The study charges that "Many judges and lawyers find child support cases boring, and some are naturally hostile to the concept of father's responsibility for children."

Under the law, both parents are equally liable for support of their children.

COVERING THE ESSENTIALS

Some men are seeking and winning custody of their children, and some women—like the Ohio clerk who was ordered recently to pay her ex-husband \$50 a month toward support of their five children—are taking on new areas of responsibility.

But the proportion of those cases remains small.

Child support awards are usually based on the father's ability to pay and the mother's earning capacity. They average \$15 to \$30 per week per child. About \$75 per month is typical in California.

The sums are to cover food and shelter. To get funds for medical, dental care or college, the mother has to go to court again.

ISRAEL-SYRIA CRISIS

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while Israel was preparing for prayer, Egypt and Syria were preparing for war. It had been 10 days since Rosh Hashanah, the start of the new year, 10 very significant days. These are the days during which God places the names of the children of Israel into the Book of Life. They are days of reaffirmation and rededication to God's laws, and they are days of extra devotion to living as God would have you live. Finally, at the end of that time, comes the day of atonement, Yom Kippur. This is the holiest of holy days. It is a day of prayer and fasting, and a day to seek forgiveness for past sins.

Yet, to Egypt and Syria, the new year had been a day to plan new bloodshed. The 10 days of reaffirmation, were days of rearmament, and the day of atonement was the day of attack. There can be no question as to who launched this vicious offensive. Egypt and Syria joined in plotting and executing one of the most blatant and outrageous violations of international and moral laws since World War II. There can be no justification for this brutal action.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility, and indeed the responsibility of all peace loving nations, to serve clear notice to Egypt, Syria, and all other nations who are supporting this outrage, that they will gain nothing through their actions and that, in fact, they will lose a great deal. If Egypt and Syria expect to gain through their criminal and savage attacks, they are sadly mistaken. Full and unequivocal notice should be given immediately to that effect.

The United Nations and its members

must stand ready to defend Israel's undeniable right to peaceful existence. It is also of paramount importance that those nations lending support to the Arab atrocities be placed on immediate notice. There can be no question that Russia is actively supporting the Arab assault by supplying massive amounts of weapons, missiles, and aircraft. Perhaps the recent visit by Secretary Shultz to Moscow convinced Russian leaders that America was not really all that concerned with the plight of those Jews wishing to emigrate to Israel, and was, therefore, not really all that concerned with Israel itself. Nothing is further from the truth. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the time has come to send Secretary Shultz back to Moscow. I suggest that he make it clearly known that continued Soviet involvement in the Middle East will severely damage any trade agreements which they might hope for. While President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger were quick to take affirmative action in attempting to convince Egypt and Syria to cease hostilities and negotiate a speedy peace, Russia was taking swift action to supply the Arab nations with increased amounts of sophisticated and deadly armaments. This sort of action must be halted at once.

The long standing and firm friendship between the United States and Israel is highly cherished and we must take every step to restore peace to this valiant nation.

President Nixon must make sure that Israel receives sufficient weaponry, Phantom jets, tanks, et cetera to make up for losses suffered as a result of this surprise attack upon Israel.

THE CHILEAN TRAGEDY

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the world recently viewed with great dismay and sorrow the tragic and bloody overthrow of President Salvador Allende of Chile by a military junta. This development was particularly troublesome because a freely elected government, in a nation with strong democratic traditions and a political armed forces, was summarily ousted by right-wing military elements.

Many of the policies pursued by the Allende government were not dissimilar from those of his predecessors, such as the gradual nationalization of certain industries. Dr. Allende and his advisers seemed to be trying to make an honest effort to effect needed, democratic social reforms and to achieve a more equitable distribution of wealth and resources among the people. While a number of the policies were not successful, a good deal of the blame for their failure must rest with the forceful opposition of the military, the ill-conceived intervention of large multinational corporations—most

of which are based in North America—and the refusal of the U.S. Government to undertake a positive and cooperative policy with the Chilean Government.

Especially reprehensible are the policies now being pursued by the ruling junta in the wake of Dr. Allende's death and the revolt against his government. Aside from public book burnings, the dismissal of university presidents and other educators, the dissolution of the freely elected Congress and the outlawing of various political parties and publications, I am deeply troubled by the reports of mass arrests, mysterious deaths, mistreatment and execution of political prisoners and the inability of these prisoners to secure asylum in foreign embassies or to leave the country. The action being taken by the Chilean military junta against former government officials, students, intellectuals, opposition political leaders and others is clearly in violation of numerous international agreements and conventions to which Chile is a party.

I am hopeful that these repressive and dictatorial policies—which certainly warrant condemnation by men of good will throughout the world—are only transitional and that the ruling junta will soon come to the realization that they are only serving to besmirch Chile's image in the world and needlessly exacerbate an already very tense situation.

For its part the United States should do what it can to make certain that the Chilean rulers reconsider many of its present policies and redirect its priorities and energies toward restoring meaningful reforms, stability, democratic procedures and internal harmony in that very troubled land. Further, this country and other nations should insure, through existing international mechanisms, that all political prisoners will be accorded fair, humane and just treatment and that there will be a prompt end to senseless killings and recriminations.

Mr. Speaker, the sad state of affairs in Chile was very aptly described in a recent New York Times editorial. I submit this editorial herewith, for inclusion in the Record, and express the hope that the present Chilean regime will once again allow democracy to prevail throughout the country:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 7, 1973]

CHILE: STILL OFF COURSE

Chile's military rulers are launching a worldwide publicity campaign to explain why they felt compelled to destroy the elected Government of President Allende and to try to purge the country of Marxist influences. They will discover, however, that their actions at home will always have far greater impact on their international standing than public relations efforts abroad.

It has been the military's home-front excesses—the executions, even if the numbers killed have been wildly exaggerated abroad; the mass arrests, many based on hearsay or grudges; the brutal treatment of detainees, now so well documented to admit of doubt; the deliberate stoking of xenophobia against all foreigners—these actions have blackened the once-enviable reputation of Chile's armed forces in the Americas and beyond.

In a country as bitterly polarized as Chile

had become during the Allende Government's attempts to impose drastic Socialism opposed by the majority prompt pacification and reconciliation could not be expected. But the junta will surely render these imperative long-run goals impossible if it carries out what seems to be a plan to try every major figure of that Government within its reach before military tribunals on charges of treason.

The trial of Luis Corvalan, the Communists party secretary-general, is a case in point. Strange as it seems to those unfamiliar with Chilean politics, the Communists not only had played by the democratic rules but had been a force for moderation and compromise within the Allende coalition, repeatedly critical of the more revolutionary Socialists. In the absence of solid evidence in open court, the junta will have difficulty convincing the world that Mr. Corvalan was guilty.

Apart from its zeal to punish Allende associates and to root out Marxists, the junta has hinted at a long stretch of military rule under something like a corporate state structure. A new Constitution will reportedly provide for a continuing military role in gov-

ernment, including representation in legislative bodies. And in one of its most ominous actions, the junta is replacing all rectors of Chilean universities with military officers.

If it persists in measures so destructive of Chile's democratic tradition, the junta will court not merely the hostility abroad that seems to worry it but eventual disaster for itself at home. The hope must be that many of these actions are stopgap measures taken in haste and that the military leaders will ultimately reject the corporate state, opting instead for a return to democratic, constitutional government, with the armed forces returning to their traditional place on the sidelines.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1973

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family of a mem-

ber of my staff in my district office in Lexington, Ky., I was unable to attend House proceedings on October 11, 1973.

Had I been present on the floor of the House on October 11, I would have voted in favor of House Joint Resolution 727, a bill providing further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1974. I also would have voted in favor of H.R. 10614, the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1974.

In my absence I was given a live pair against recommitting the conference report on House Joint Resolution 727 to the conference committee, and a live pair in favor of final passage of the bill.

Since there were so few Members against the military construction authorization, H.R. 10614, I was unable to receive a live pair; however, I was given a general pair.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Saturday, October 13, 1973

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally; and it shall be given him.—James 1: 5.

"God give us men! A time like this demands

Strong minds, great hearts, true faith
and ready hands;

Men whom the lust of office does not
kill;

Men whom the spoils of office cannot
buy;

Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will
not lie;

Men who can stand before a demagog,
And damn his treacherous flatteries
without winking!

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above
the fog

In public duty and in private think-
ing."

—JOSIAH GILBERT HOLLAND.

And now, O God, help us to make a wise decision regarding the nomination of our new Vice President, particularly since he is an honored Member of our own body. God bless GERRY FORD. 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

NOMINATION OF VICE PRESIDENT— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-165)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed: *To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 2 of the Twenty-fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, I hereby nominate Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan, to be the Vice President of the United States.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 13, 1973.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the transmittal of the letter from the President of the United States on the nomination of our colleague, GERALD R. FORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED MODIFICATION OF 25TH AMENDMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention at this time to take this unanticipated half hour at this particular juncture. However, the reason I did make the request was because of an overriding sense of necessity to speak at this particular time with respect to, among other things, the announcement just received from the President.

I know that everybody is more or less in a congratulatory mood, particularly in this House and on this side of the Capitol. However, I must remind my associates and fellow citizens generally that

there are many disturbing elements that should preoccupy our thoughts at this time.

The quick succession of events that have literally shaken everybody in the country I do not think will be removed permanently, or at least removed from this penumbra of suspicion and doubt that seems to permeate our country, particularly in the highest offices. I think it solves the problem that was created by the manner in which the Vice President submitted his resignation, but since this matter has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, I think it is proper that we ought to remind this committee that not only should it consider this particular nomination submitted for its consideration, but it should look into the ominous aspects of the 25th amendment in the light of developments today.

There were some of us who opposed that amendment in 1966. There were some of us who spoke against it. I hate to say that some of the specific examples that we feared have come to pass.

Another section of the 25th amendment—and God forbid it—could easily be resorted to at this time in a way that we cannot foresee now. Therefore, I think it is very, very necessary that this committee examine not only the nomination but the need for the entire Congress and the Nation to reexamine whether or not we should modify this 25th amendment.

At the time it was being debated, I did not think that the committee or its chairman at that time were serious about its consideration because it had many, many escape hatches that were nebulous, that in unsettled times, as I said then, could confirm the fears of such men as Madison, who at the time they were deliberating in the Constitutional Convention the section on the Presidency were warning about "bold and venturesome men."

It seems to me that where it is possible in a setting of very unsettled and