

from Arab producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself, Ms. ABzug, Mr. NIX, Mr. KYROS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. PODELL, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. SARBANES):

H. Con. Res. 356. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to possible curtailment of oil supplies from Arab producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Res. 604. Resolution to authorize a feasibility study for locks along the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. BEARD, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. ESHELMAN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. STUDDS):

H. Res. 605. Resolution to authorize markers in Statuary Hall for the location of the desks of nine former Members of Congress who became President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H. Res. 606. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Privacy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LATTI:

H. Res. 607. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to prohibiting combat by U.S. troops in the present conflict in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LATTI (for himself, Mr. WYLLIE, and Mr. SYMMS):

H. Res. 608. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to prohibiting combat by U.S. troops in the present armed conflict in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARAZITI:

H. Res. 609. Resolution preventing U.S. troops from being introduced in the Middle East conflict without prior congressional authorization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. STARK):

H. Res. 610. Resolution that it is the sense of the House that there be no action on confirmation of the Vice-Presidential nominee until such time as the President has complied with the final decision of the court system as it regards the White House tapes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself and Mr. CLAY):

H. Res. 611. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that there be no action on confirmation of the Vice-Presidential nominee until such time as the President has complied with the final decision of the court system as it regards the White House tapes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HALEY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BAFALIS, and Mr. BURKE of Florida):

H. Res. 612. Resolution to seek peace in the Middle East and to continue to support Israel's deterrent strength through transfer of military supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11003. A bill for the relief of Charles William Thomas, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 11004. A bill for the relief of Jorge Mario Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER:

328. Petition of the Kentucky State Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Edgewood, Ky., relative to aid to North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

329. Also, petition of Leonard H. Davis, Vandalia, Ohio, and others, relative to inequities in the National Guard Technician Act of 1968; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EDUCATION IN THE 1970'S

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, there are few today who do not realize that we are living in an era of rapid social and technological change. These changes extend to all aspects of our society, affecting the very foundation of our culture. Everyday we can see more of our basic values and ethics being brought into question, and can witness the effects of the acceleration of technological and scientific acumen on our institutions and society.

Change breeds apprehension, and conjures up the futuristic worlds envisioned by George Orwell and Aldous Huxley in their classic books.

However, change need not be our enemy, for we do have some controls over our destiny.

With this perspective in mind an important and relevant consideration should be our educational system, and the alterations in it which may be needed to keep abreast of the new ideas and innovations.

Mr. Don Moore, a member of the California Task Force on Early Education, discussed in a recent speech to the Contra Costa County Teachers Conference the importance of how we educate the children now entering the educational system to cope with change, and how the system itself should be modified to reflect the changes in our world.

What and how we teach our children

today will be a critical contribution to the world of tomorrow. His speech follows:

TASK FORCE ON EARLY EDUCATION

I hope to accomplish two objectives in the time allotted to me today.

First, to profile the child as he is today—as he comes to us in the schools.

And second, to assess his future needs in terms of the society into which he is apt to graduate.

Let's take a look at the 5-year-old we'll be seeing for the first time next September.

He has already learned a complete language system, including vocabulary, syntax, phonology, morphology, and semantics.

If he has been confronted with two language systems, he has learned two language systems between ages 2 and 4.

He apparently has done this with relative ease whether the language was Chinese, Greek, Hungarian or Swahili.

He can imagine things that do not exist and create them with tools without having been taught to imagine, to create, or to work.

He can laugh at himself and at others. He can cry when he is hurt physically and cry when he is fed.

He can hate selfishly enough to place his baby sister in the electric dryer and turn it on.

He can love unselfishly enough to risk his own life to help another who is in danger.

He can be physically punished with little damaging effect so long as he is completely convinced that the hand on his bare bottom belongs to someone who really cares about him personally.

On the other hand, he can be irreparably damaged by one parent withholding an invisible, unmeasurable and largely indefinable feeling called love.

Left alone he will figure out by experimentation the secret of reproduction and will by some strange chemistry reproduce his specie, love, nurture and educate his offspring.

On the other hand, led to believe that the same strange chemistry is wrong or evil

or dangerous, he can become impotent, frigid, neurotic, suicidal and/or insane.

He can create music, dance, poetry and epic literature without understanding harmony or counterpoint, rhythm or melody, iambic pentameter or rhyme and without spending 10 weeks analyzing *Silas Marner*.

In fact, he does all this and more—without trained, credentialed teachers—without instructional materials or curriculum—without principals, superintendents, school boards, special buildings and equipment, an Educational Code or a State Legislature.

He does it all without Freud, Dewey, Piaget, Bruner, Skinner, Jensen or any other in-vogue educational high priest to sprinkle holy water on the process.

And there he is at age 5 for good or bad—knowing more already than all we teach him in the next 13 years of his life.

And here we are confronted by two demanding groups.

Neither recognizing that the child is half educated before the schools get him. And that his learning pattern and potential are already largely structured.

One group, the adult society for the most part, want the schools to be accountable to them for educating children as they believe children should be educated.

The other, the younger generation mainly, are telling us that what society wants is irrelevant to children's real needs and that the schools are obsolete anyway.

Okay, there's the first dilemma. But, that's only half the story.

Let's now take a look at the future of our society. The world this five year old will graduate into in 1986!

A few months back a young man who works with me at the Times Mirror Company came to me holding a letter in his hand.

He had worked for the company for three years and the letter was from the Vice President of Personnel.

His question to me was: "Do you think I should join the company retirement plan?"

(It's an excellent plan and I had never considered not joining it myself.)

We sat down and "reasoned together."

The young man showed me the letter which stated how much his monthly contribution would be; how much he would get at retirement (75% of his salary); and the date of his retirement—2011 A.D.!

His reasoning went like this:

By 2011, and probably far sooner, we would have total Social Security in the U.S.

Medical care would be free to everyone. His wife could get a job (probably with Women's Lib and the drive for token women) even easier than he, and could earn as much as he.

His children would be 18 in 1990 and 1991 respectively, and free education at all levels would be available then.

Finally, he was not at all sure he'd still be on this planet in 2011. Nor was he sure the company would be.

And he, in fact, did not join the very excellent retirement plan.

You see we are now seeing in the marketplace what we began to see in the schools 15 years ago—the first generation of what scholars are calling "The Post Industrial Society." This society is predicted to differ as radically from what we have today as we now differ from the Middle Ages.

(Moore then drew an analogy between the Industrial Age—Post Industrial Age dilemma and two large tapestries mounted one over the other on a wall.

(He stated that after World War II the top tapestry—the one we can see, the Industrial Age—began to develop holes in its fabrics due to rot.

(At first, we did not realize that what we saw through the holes was woven into the second tapestry—the Post Industrial Age.

(As the holes got more numerous and larger and resisted all our attempts to patch them up, we became alarmed at the problems we saw on the second tapestry.

(Moore suggested that the primary reason we see the post industrial society as a problem is that we are looking at it through the industrial age whose fabric is rotting away before our eyes.

(Moore continued stating that we must now take a new tack and look at the Post Industrial Age in relation to its own entire societal fabric and disregard the Industrial Age except as we must manage it in its dying hours.

(This will take courage and capital, but it is necessary if we are to make the great transition from one age to another.

(Moore said this will not be easy and pointed out that no other civilization in history made the great transition.

(On the other hand no other civilization ever realized what was happening because the changing of other ages took place over centuries of time.

(We are the first civilization to see it happen in one generation. We are, thus, the first generation to stand some small chance of controlling our destiny.

(To make it we must do three things:

(1) Intelligently foresee the lead indicators of the new age so we will know what kind of new institutions are called for.

(2) Have the courage to carefully and humanistically dismantle the old institutions before they crumble and fall and take us with them.

(3) Reorient our view of change—seeing it not as an enemy, but as a friend.)

Let's discuss these three challenges.

First, what are the lead indicators already apparent in the Post Industrial Society?

(1) It is crystal clear in 1973 that we are midway into an incredible knowledge explosion and a concurrent communications revolution.

Knowledge is doubling every ten years. This means that by 1983 there will be twice as much to know and twice as much to teach. By 1993 there will be 4 times as much.

It will be humanly impossible for the aver-

age teacher to keep up with this explosion even in one field. How then can we accomplish the multidisciplinary approaches necessary in the future without bringing computer assisted teaching technology into the classroom?

The incredible speed of modern news reporting enables the reporter to affect the news story he is reporting. That was not anticipated by the writers of the Constitution.

Can we really find an impartial jury of 12 men and women to try Watergate cover-up defendants if they are indicted? The founding fathers, far-seeing as they were, could not foresee TV coverage of government.

By the time the young children now entering our elementary schools become adults, we will have machines which can reason better than the brightest person alive. Machines which can be multidisciplinary "specialist-generalists" if you will. And all our kids need to gain access to this information is a knowledge of typing and calculating machine operation.

(2) A second major trend is that problems are no longer unilateral but multilateral. Problems are interrelated so that solutions must be made by multi-institutional cooperation. All of our problems today are at least national in scope. Many are international and tomorrow they may well become interplanetary.

(3) A third lead indicator is the clear emergence of a Biological Revolution. Its implications are frightening.

We are anticipating: genetic surgery by 1995; animal cloning by 2005; and human cloning by 2020.

We will soon know the answer to the mystery question which keeps education an art rather than a science:

What happens in the human brain, electro-chemically, at the moment of insight?

We'll soon know, and soon thereafter we'll learn how to measure it.

And then we'll have electro-chemical accountability.

Are your states' school systems ready for that?

(4) A final lead indicator is that many of the ethics of the Industrial Age will not fit the Post Industrial society.

The Work Ethic—the concept that a person is more worthy simply because at a given moment in time he has a salable skill won't make it into the Post Industrial Age.

It will be replaced perhaps by a *Craftsmanship Ethic*. An ethic which says the worth of work is in the quality of the workmanship and the personal satisfaction and social responsibility of the workman or workwoman.

The Poverty Ethic—the concept that we will always have poor people and that it's O.K. to be "poor but honest" won't make it in the future. Hundreds of billions of dollars have been spent in television and newspaper advertising convincing all of American society that the upper-middle class lifestyle is a must. The "dignity of poverty" is an absolute euphemism in tomorrow's world. There will be a leveling of society.

The Expansion-Consumption Ethic—the concept that it is good to expand and good to consume won't make it. It must be replaced by a conservation ethic. An ethic which says we don't have to do everything we can do just because it's profitable or fun.

Six percent of the world's 3½-4 billion people live in the U.S. We consume 45 percent of the GNP of the planet.

That can't go on without serious international repercussions.

The Success Ethic—the concept that it is very important to be successful in the eyes of others won't hold up either.

What you do.

How much you earn.

Your lifestyle.

Where you were educated.

These things will give way to a value structure which will stress:

Are you responsible to other people?

If so, are you enjoying your life?

Does it satisfy you and those in your immediate family?

If you are a responsible and satisfied and happy person, it really doesn't matter whether other people think you're successful.

And that changes motivation radically—does it not?

Finally, *The Educated Ethic*—the concept that you can and should get educated—will give way to a *Learning Ethic*.

If knowledge doubles each decade, no one will ever again be *Educated* as we once thought we were.

All diplomas should be printed on paper that self-destructs every 5 years.

The concept of tenure is ridiculous and civil rights of teachers must be protected by some new mechanism.

Curriculum as a body of facts and concepts is obsolete if knowledge doubles each ten years.

Curriculum becomes a process of learning to be a relearner.

The teacher becomes a process facilitator and guidance specialist.

The school ceases to be a place and becomes a concept. I defy the most creative architect to design a building in 1973 which will be relevant in 1990. But society will still be paying for that building in 1990!

Let's view this educational change in terms of what it may mean for early education.

First, the structure of the schools (particularly K-4) must change.

(1) We must make contact with parents during the child's infancy and pre-K years with an effective and comprehensive parent education program.

(2) We must involve the parent in the K-4 school experience so that parents will understand the learning process in these critical years.

(3) We must ungrade K-4 to provide the kind of structural flexibility necessary to implement a non-competitive, diagnostic/prescriptive approach to early education.

(4) We must reduce the adult-child ratio to at least (1-10) by the inclusion of paraprofessionals, parent and student aides and perhaps retirees into the program.

(5) We must maximize the master teachers skills and experience by creating clearly stated objectives and instructional materials specifically designed for use by non-professionals under a teacher's supervision.

Having changed the structure of the schools what should the young child be taught?

I'd like to share with you the recommendations of those of us on the California Task Force on Early Education.

We believe every effort should be made to help children to acquire the basic learning and communications skills. And we would like to see added to the traditional three R's, effective listening and viewing, since we do live in an increasingly audio-visual world. We believe children should be taught to manipulate a typewriter keyboard and a ten-key calculator, since it is by these devices that our children will work with machines.

We hope that every child will learn how to retrieve and process data. Memorization of facts in a world where knowledge doubles each decade and in a world where we will have electronic access to information banks is obsolete.

We hope that each child will leave his early education experience with a strong desire to continue learning. We live in an intellectual age in which the desire to learn and the joy of learning are vital concepts for effective and happy people.

We hope that the preservation of individual creativity will be a key goal for all children. Much creativity is smashed in the first five years of life. Regrettably, a great deal is also crushed by repressive grade-oriented, highly competitive school programs.

We hope that every child will emerge from his early education experience with the feelings of self-esteem so important to effective living and to happiness.

We hope that every child will have learned to love and to receive love. We do not see this becoming obsolete.

Finally, we hope that each child will have learned to be reasonably secure in a world which he knows he can never control, never really completely understand, and never predict the future of with confidence.

Let's conclude with what I referred to as the *Friendship of Change*.

We face a new age which in many respects is distinct from all previous human experience.

History gives us no guidelines for changing ages in one generation.

Rapid and radical change threatens our power, our security, our adjustment.

We, therefore, see change as the enemy.

Let's find a new perspective.

Let's assume that change is our challenge and our hope for continuity as a civilization.

Let's assume that power, security and adjustment are the real enemies.

I do not believe mankind was ever intended to have great power.

It is often in moments of great power that people and nations become their most corrupt, their most arrogant and, finally, their cruelest.

It is when we find ourselves without force that we very often become our most creative, ingenious and humane.

I do not believe mankind was ever intended to be secure.

Soon after we sense great security, we become weak, alienated and unhappy.

It is in moments of insecurity when we recognize how frail we really are—lost in space on a small planet—that something in us makes us strong, tolerant, and even, in some strange way, hopeful.

I don't believe that we were intended to be well adjusted.

Often when we think we're well adjusted we quickly decide we are also bored to tears, unchallenged and soon we're dead.

In facing great problems which frighten us mankind is magnificent.

In coping with change we become alive.

We were created to solve problems. In the instant of solution or resolution we are our happiest and proudest.

We are the leaders of the most exciting age which ever was. We are where it is. And no one, ever, has been where we are before.

What we perhaps have forgotten and must now remember is that we were not created to be static or problemless.

It is easier for me to say this than for us to do it.

But we must learn to love the problems because mankind is beautiful in adversity.

THE ISSUE OF THE PRESIDENTIAL TAPES

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, in the present controversy over the Presidential tapes it is most unfortunate that many take a political position and permit their views to be shaped by the politics of the present administration. However, the fact that a basic constitutional question has been raised to issue and is being carried to the Supreme Court should impel us all to examine the matter with a view to its long range consequences.

In times past a deep and fundamental

wisdom has prevailed over the conflicts of personalities and parties. Instructive in this regard is an article in the New York Times of October 12, 1973. In that article former Senator of Montana, Burton K. Wheeler recalls a bitter and divisive struggle in our recent past which also raised the basic constitutional question of separation of powers. The right of the Congress to the Presidential tapes raises the issue again, and I accordingly submit for your consideration the very thoughtful and incisive comments of Senator Wheeler:

THE PRESIDENT'S INTEGRITY

(By Burton K. Wheeler)

WASHINGTON.—In the course of the consideration by the United States Senate in 1937 of President Roosevelt's proposal to increase the number of justices he could appoint to the United States Supreme Court (the Court-packing plan), an incident arose which may shed some light on the present efforts of Congress and the special prosecutor to obtain the tapes of private conversations held by the President in the White House.

I had been requested by a number of Democratic and Republican Senators to spearhead the opposition to the Court-packing bill. The proponents had alleged that the Supreme Court was delinquent in its consideration of cases. These charges of delinquency had to be answered.

Prior to my testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee I went to see Justice Brandeis. I told him that an authoritative response to the charges being leveled at the Court by the Roosevelt Administration was imperative and that I wanted him and Chief Justice Hughes to testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee. The Justice responded that under no circumstances would he testify or recommend that the Chief Justice testify.

He quickly added, "Not because he would not be an outstanding witness fully capable of responding to any question, but it just would not be the right thing to do. It might establish an unfortunate precedent." Brandeis added, "In lieu of such testimony ask the Chief Justice to give you a letter which will set the record straight."

Brandeis called Chief Justice Hughes and asked if he would see me on a vitally important matter. I went immediately to the Chief Justice's house. I told him of my conversation with Justice Brandeis and that Brandeis had finally suggested that he write a letter. Chief Justice Hughes said, "Did Brandeis say that?" I reassured him that he had. The Chief Justice then said, "I will see what I can do."

He called me on Sunday evening and suggested that I come to his house. I drove there immediately. He greeted me saying, "Well, the baby is born." He handed me a letter which was a complete answer to all of the charges. I thanked him and started to leave. He asked me to stay. In the course of a rather lengthy discussion he said the proposed legislation would destroy the Court as an institution.

The letter, which I presented during the course of my testimony before the committee, was so devastating in effect that Vice President Garner told President Roosevelt that the Court-packing proposal was dead.

The Chief Justice's letter specifically avoided argument on the questions of policy raised by the proposed legislation and thereby avoided a demand that he appear for questioning before the Senate committee. Justice Brandeis and Chief Justice Hughes, in my view, rejected my plea to testify before Congress because they thought it improper for a justice of the Supreme Court to submit himself to questioning by the legislative branch, even though they believed that passage of the pending legislation would destroy the Court.

While I do not remember the precise

words said to me by Justice Brandeis, implicit in our conversation was the thought that Congressional questioning of a member of the Supreme Court would be a serious invasion of the independence of the judiciary and would jeopardize the integrity of its decision-making processes.

It appears to me that the request of Congress for the White House tapes may constitute a similar threat to the integrity of the decisional processes of the President. If Congress, other than in an impeachment proceeding, can subpoena the documents revealing the deliberations of the President in the execution of his functions as Chief Executive, it could with equal justification subpoena the records of the justices of the Supreme Court to determine the manner and bases upon which the justices arrived at decisions in controversial cases. In my view also, the special prosecutor is no more entitled to the tapes than is Congress. If he argues that the grand jury, as part of the judicial system, is entitled to the tapes, then he is asserting the right of the judiciary to examine in an area which Brandeis and Hughes thought would be an improper invasion of the separation of powers doctrine, if exercised by Congress.

The Supreme Court, if it holds that Congress, in other than an impeachment proceeding can obtain the records of Presidential conferences, will set a precedent for Congress to obtain records or other evidence of Court deliberations.

It seems highly unfortunate that a constitutional confrontation of this magnitude should arise over tapes when, in all likelihood, they will shed little, if any, light on the Watergate controversy. Pursuit of the tapes may result in a precedent-setting decision by the Supreme Court which will ill serve the future of democracy and our form of government.

THE NAVY'S NEW F-14 TOMCAT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with approval today of the conference report on the military procurement bill, I am pleased that we are giving substantial funding for the Navy's new F-14 Tomcat. I recently had the opportunity to go aboard the Tomcat and get a feel of its great performance characteristics. In talking with the men who fly this new version of a long line of Grumman "Cats," I am convinced this is perhaps the best aircraft the Navy has ever procured. Certainly the performance and maintenance superiority is obvious and I believe the future will prove this to be one of the finest weapons systems this Nation has yet to devise.

I include as a portion of my remarks an article from the San Diego Union of October 8, 1973, written by Dave Polis: NAVY'S NEW F-14 TOMCAT DRAWS HIGH PRAISE HERE

(By Dave Polis)

In an unprecedented feat in this day of complex aircraft and weapons systems, the men flying and maintaining the Navy's newest fighter, the Grumman F-14 Tomcat, are averaging a full 30 hours of flight time a month per aircraft.

The man in charge of the program at Miramar Naval Air Station, Capt. Lewis (Scotty) Lamoreaux, said the Tomcat "has already met and exceeded expectations. It's better than we ever dreamed."

The Tomcat, latest in a long line of "cats" Grumman has built for the Navy, is especially designed to outmaneuver enemy fighters in aerial dogfights, while giving the fleet the added capability of launching the most sophisticated air-to-air missile system in existence.

INITIAL CONCEPT

Cmdr. Sam Leeds, who heads the reactivated Fighter Squadron 1 at Miramar, said the F-14 is proving to be a highly dependable, high performance airlift.

Its dependability, Lamoreaux said, can be traced to the initial concept for the twin-engine sweep wing aircraft, and that was to combine already proven engines and weaponry systems with a new airframe or structure.

The Navy was originally scheduled to receive F-111 sweep wing aircraft, but they proved too heavy for carrier operations.

Lamoreaux directed the F-14 program in Washington for the chief of naval operations before coming to Miramar last year.

TRAINING AIDS

Lamoreaux, who helped introduce the F-4 Phantom to the Navy 14 years ago, recalls "We were lucky to get in four or five hours of flying time a month with anything working."

The F-14, by contrast, is averaging three times the planned number of flying hours after two months of operation. Lamoreaux credits the filers and maintenance personnel at the base for this record.

The training center at Miramar utilizes the latest computer technology and visual aids to train personnel connected with the base program. He said the base had people fully prepared for the F-14 when it first arrived.

Fighter squadrons 1 and 2, which advanced from readiness to operational status in record time, are scheduled to be deployed aboard the nuclear-powered carrier Enterprise early next year.

Appropriately, it was the old Squadron 1 that was first assigned to a carrier role in 1925 and later distinguished itself during World War II before being deactivated.

While Congress continues to debate the merits of the Tomcat, Vice Adm. Robert B. Baldwin, commander of the Naval Air Force, Pacific Fleet, leaves no question about his wishes:

"We've got them and we want as many as we can get as quickly as we can get them."

The Tomcat carries six Phoenix missiles, each weighing 1,000 pounds, and other less sophisticated air-to-air and air-to-ground missiles.

SMALL BOAT LOCKS NEEDED AT QUINCY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a resolution that would enable the Corps of Engineers to make a study of the need for separate locks to handle the increasing small boat recreation traffic on the Upper Mississippi River.

The existing Federal navigation project, constructed during the 1930's and placed in operation in 1940, consists of a series of dams and locks and channel dredging designed to provide a minimum channel depth of 9 feet for commercial barge traffic on the Upper Mississippi River. Most of the locks in the system are

single locks; however, some were built roughing out space for what were termed auxiliary locks, locks intended for the use of small boatowners.

Barge traffic and recreational boating has more than doubled since the project was placed in operation. At the present time, boaters frequently experience long delays in attempting to pass through the locks, because of the need to accommodate commercial traffic first.

Figures show that the tonnage passing through the locks at Quincy, Ill., has more than doubled in the past 10 years. Also the number of small recreational craft owners has multiplied.

Since first priority is given to commercial traffic, if a major boat is expected any time within a half hour, small boats are not allowed to pass through the locks. On a peak weekend, the lock may handle 250 boats; due to lock congestion small boaters are greatly inconvenienced and boater safety is sometimes threatened.

I, therefore, believe that a study appears to be justified to determine the feasibility of completing the locks partially begun at Quincy.

Text of resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Resolved, by the House of Representatives, That the Public Works Committee shall request the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the reports of the Chief of Engineers on the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minnesota, printed in House Document No. 137, 72nd Congress, First Session, and other pertinent reports with the view to determining whether it is advisable in the interest of navigation to modify the existing navigation project on the Upper Mississippi River to provide for separate locks or other means to permit independent passage of recreational craft in view of the needs and safety of the present and anticipated heavy volume of small craft utilizing this waterway.

THE SUCCESS OF THE 1973 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for the past few months the National Captive Nations Committee, led by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, has collated reports received from all sections of our country and abroad on the recent 15th observance of Captive Nations Week. These reports reflect a vivid moral conscience among our people toward the 1 billion captives in the Red empire, which truly augurs well for our own future.

Greatly encouraged by this development and the success of the recent observance, I should like to introduce into the RECORD several additional examples of the successful week:

The proclamation by Gov. Thomas J. Meskill of Connecticut;

A report "Rally Sounds Freedom Call" and President Chiang Kai-shek's message in the Free China Weekly;

A report in America on "Captive Na-

tions Week Commemoration in Cleveland"; and

The Detroit program, "Captive Nations Week—1973":

OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF THOMAS J. MESKILL, OF CONNECTICUT

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 15-21, 1973

In 1959 the Congress of the United States approved the annual observance of Captive Nations Week. The dates for the 1973 observance are July 15 through July 21.

The purpose of Captive Nations Week is to call public attention to the plight of numerous countries in Eastern and Central Europe, and elsewhere, whose people are forced to live today, as they have for many years, under oppressive Communist rule.

For us in the United States, Captive Nations Week serves to emphasize anew the value of the liberty and independence we are privileged to enjoy. It is fitting, therefore, that we reaffirm, in connection with Captive Nations Week, our support of the just aspirations of the millions of people in captive nations throughout the world.

I am pleased to call public attention to the observance of Captive Nations Week in Connecticut and I urge our citizens to be mindful of its objectives.

RALLY SOUNDS FREEDOM CALL

Vice President C. K. Yen said July 17 that the Republic of China will never change its basic anti-Communist policy.

In a speech at a Captive Nations Week rally, Yen said the Republic of China has suffered a series of diplomatic setbacks but changes in the international situation will never affect its firm anti-Communist stand.

"Our country has never been discouraged by adversity," Yen said, adding: "It will never change its course or allow itself to be influenced by unfavorable aspects of the objective situation."

On the contrary, he said, the Republic of China has become more resilient and is working hard to raise the standard of living of its people.

He said the Republic of China has to make it clear to the world that it always identifies itself with the free world.

"We must let the world know where we stand in order to assure peace for the world," he added.

Ku Cheng-kang, honorary chairman of the World Anti-Communist League, presided at the mass rally, which was held at the Sun Yat-sen Memorial Hall in Taipei July 17.

A message sent by President Chiang Kai-shek was read at the meeting, which was attended by more than 3,000 representatives of the people from all walks of life.

In an opening speech, Ku said all freedom-loving people should continue to expose Communist peace plots and join all the forces of freedom, both behind and outside the Iron Curtain.

He called upon the captive nations to launch all-out struggles against their Communist rulers.

U.S. Representative Jack F. Kemp (Republican—New York) told the meeting, which highlighted the Republic of China's observance of Captive Nations Week July 15-21, that the American people are convinced that "Communism is the major threat to world peace and stability."

He said the strident forces of isolationism and retreat in the United States do not speak "for those who understand the lessons of our recent history in dealing with Communists."

"Nowhere can man be totally free until everywhere men are free," the American lawmaker said.

Also present at the rally were members of the foreign diplomatic corps.

American Ambassador Walter P. McCaughy said freedom and the rights of man are

the universal aspirations of mankind and cardinal principles of the U.S. Declaration of Independence.

A declaration was adopted at the rally. Also passed were messages addressed to President Richard Nixon of the United States, President Nguyen Van Thieu of the Republic of Vietnam, President Lon Nol of the Khmer Republic and the people of captive nations.

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S MESSAGE TO THE MASS RALLY SUPPORTING CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Support of the captive nations and peoples in their struggle against Communist tyranny and persecution and for freedom demonstrates the moral force of humankind and constitutes the mainstream of the world anti-Communist movement. Universal human freedom can be assured only after the captive peoples have been freed. World peace can be attained only after captive nations have cast off tyrannical rule.

Influenced by Communist smiling diplomacy, bluffing and temptations, appeasers of the world have lost their ability to distinguish right from wrong and no longer have the conscience to promote the good and punish the wicked. Perverse theory is prevailing. Justice is giving ground to the forces of evil. These developments have confused the camp of freedom and abetted the growth of Communism. Even so, the fierce struggle for freedom of the people shut behind the Iron Curtain and the support for their emancipation provided by peace-loving people outside the Iron Curtain have never ceased despite the buffeting from waves of appeasement. To the contrary, captive peoples and their supporters are marching forward with firm steps along a brightly illuminated road and showing matchless courage as they overcome tens of thousands of difficulties.

The three virtues of wisdom, benevolence and courage, as cherished and passed down by our ancient sages, make up the essence of our cultural tradition. Throughout our history, whenever evil forces prevailed, the altruistic and upright people have always shown their great wisdom by adhering to the right against the wrong, renouncing wrongful gain for justice, displaying their great benevolence in national salvation and summoning their great courage to surmount the crisis and turn back the perverse tide. At this moment of world turbulence and turmoil, all of us in the Republic of China should burnish bright this tradition and demonstrate a spirit of surpassing wisdom, benevolence and courage. We should take our stand determinedly and undauntedly and dedicate ourselves to the great task of national and world salvation. We should give our support to the liberation of the captive nations of the world and deliver our compatriots from their crucible of suffering. In other words, we should take up the difficult task of reshaping the world's destiny by destroying the tyrannical Communist rule now afflicting the earth and by delivering humankind from the Red holocaust.

We believe that true world peace can be brought into existence only after the triumph of human freedom and that this triumph can be made manifest only by the mighty combined force of world justice and the masses of people shut behind the Iron Curtain. I should like to take this opportunity to express my wish for success and victory in our struggle against Communism and enslavement and for freedom and peace.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK COMMEMORATION IN CLEVELAND

Every year since 1959, by an act of the United States Congress (HL 86-90) the President of the United States is directed to designate the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time that all nations are free again.

This year, as previously, Captive Nations

Week in Cleveland as commemorated under the auspices of the American Nationalities Movement of Ohio.

Captive Nations Week commemorates the long-standing desire for freedom and independence by more than 20 nations ruled directly or indirectly by the Soviet Union.

All nationalities, patriotic groups, veterans and civic organizations took part in ceremonies emphasizing human rights and religious freedom.

The program consisting of "Interfaith services" conducted by representatives of the Jewish, Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox faith took place on Monday, July 23, 1973, in the Rotunda of Cleveland City Hall, 601 Lakeside Avenue, at 7:30 p.m. The Honorable Ralph J. Perk, Mayor of Cleveland, founder and chairman of the American Nationalities Movement gave the main address.

Participating in the program were: The Cleveland German Choir, The Luthuanian Choir and the Ukrainian Chorus "Dnipro."

The Chairman of the Captive Nations Week commemoration Nicholas A. Buvur and Bohdan Futey was the program Chairman.

INTERDENOMINATIONAL PRAYER SERVICE, CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 15, 1973

The following format has been established for 1973 Captive Nations Week Commemoration:

1. Mass gathering at the Kennedy Square at 2:30 p.m. on Sunday, July 15, 1973.
2. Commence official program at 3:00 p.m. with an Interdenominational Prayer Service and a proper address from clergy on behalf of the Captive Nations.
3. All present will then march south on Woodward Avenue and west on the Riverside Road to the Ethnic Festival ground where a Commemorative Program will take place at 4:00 p.m. consisting of:
 - a. Presentation of the flags.
 - b. American National Anthem.
 - c. Reading of the Captive Nations Week proclamation by:
 - President R. M. Nixon.
 - Governor W. Milliken.
 - Mayor R. Gribbs.
 - d. Main address—Congressman Charles Diggs.
 - e. Remarks of a Vietnam POW and laying of the wreath for those who died in defense of freedom.
 - f. Adoption of Resolutions.
 - g. Closing remarks.
4. Other activities planned in conjunction with Captive Nations Week are:
 - a. A cancellation stamp will be used at the Detroit main Post Office throughout July reading: "Observe Captive Nations Week Third Week of July".
 - b. As in the past, proper radio and television programs will precede Captive Nations Week Commemoration.
 - c. All nationalities represented in captive Nations Week Commemoration will participate in the Captive Nations Festival as part of the City of Detroit Ethnic Festivals on July 13, 14, and 15.

ARTICLE PAYS TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN WHALEN'S VIEWS ON CUBA

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, last February I joined with 10 of my colleagues in issuing a paper entitled "A Détente with Cuba," recommending a re-

view of and positive changes in our policy of isolating Cuba. Congressman CHARLES WHALEN of Ohio was the principal spokesman for our group and, as the following article from the Miami, Fla. News makes clear, he remains an articulate advocate of the need for lessening tensions between the United States and Cuba.

The article follows:

TIME TO REVIEW OUR FAILING POLICY TOWARD CUBA

(By Clarke Ash)

So far there is no reason to believe that newly nominated Secretary of State Henry Kissinger will change this country's attitude toward Cuba.

Merwin Sigale, Miami News Latin America writer, reports that the administration's hard line on Castro reflects the basic wishes of President Nixon. It is unlikely that the secretary of state will change it.

Still, Kissinger's influence with the President is considerable, and as one professional Latin observer remarked: "Henry is liable to leap out of bed one morning and say, 'Let's review our Cuba policy.'"

Whatever Dr. Kissinger's thoughts upon arising, the administration will come under increasing pressure to normalize relations with our key neighbor in the Caribbean.

Our policy of isolation is slipping badly in the rest of the hemisphere and a growing number of congressmen are wondering how we can profess to hate Cuba while cozying up to its chief sponsors, Russia and China.

Typical of the congressional critics, but perhaps more articulate than most, is Rep. Charles W. Whalen of Ohio. Whalen was one of 11 Republican House members who published a paper in January on the fallacies of our Cuba policy. Last month Whalen enlarged the case in a special article for the Washington Post.

Whalen regards our Cuban policy as "... clearly outdated and inconsistent with the international detente which the President himself has so effectively fostered." He says recent authoritative articles in the Soviet press suggest that the Russians are interested in a U.S.-Cuba rapprochement. "These reports stem, perhaps, from Russian frustration with the limited returns on their \$1.5 million per day investment in Cuba. Or perhaps they reflect a growing disenchantment with Castro."

"Regardless of the Soviet's view of Cuba, one thing is clear: a reduction of the Soviet military presence on that island is not in the best interests of the American nations. Further, a triangular U.S.-Cuba-Soviet dialogue could lead to positive negotiations on this issue."

Mr. Whalen might have applied the same argument to the political prisoner issue which stirs such bitter emotion in Miami. Under the present arrangement, or non-arrangement, the refugees and the U.S. government are totally without pressure to assist Castro's political victims.

Rep. Whalen wrote his article before the recent OAS meeting in Lima, but he correctly predicted that the U.S. would find itself in an increasingly weak posture as it tried to maintain its quarantine against the Cuban government. The upshot of the Lima meetings was the appointment of a committee to study a complete realignment of the Inter-American system, with special emphasis on how the U.S. should relate to other nations.

Meanwhile, seven OAS members now recognize Cuba: Argentina, Barbados, Chile, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru and Trinidad-Tobago. Others expected to join the list soon are Panama, Venezuela, Ecuador, Costa Rica and Columbia. Canada has been doing business there for years.

Whalen says State Department experts are being pressured to search out new reasons

for our policy since the old ones—the Soviet military presence and the obligations of the OAS ban—no longer make sense. Like Sigale, he reports that our present policy is based on the President's personal wishes, and he suggests the President may be influenced by an unfavorable meeting with Castro in 1959 and "by his Cuban-American neighbors in Florida."

Why should we consider normalization? An obvious reason is to improve the inter-American system.

"Eliminating the Cuban issue," Rep. Whalen says, "... will enable the OAS to focus attention in more urgent priorities such as trade, economic development and regional integration. A significant contribution toward the realization of these objectives will occur if the United States conforms its Cuban attitudes to our new pragmatic approach to China and Russia."

FORMER IDAHO SENATOR LEN B. JORDAN SPEAKS ON ENERGY

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, a very good friend and distinguished colleague, former Idaho Senator Len B. Jordan, recently brought his considerable experience and insight to bear on the subject of our current energy crisis in an address before the Idaho Petroleum Council.

As the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and from his vantage point on the Senate Finance Committee, Senator Jordan was well recognized for his understanding of energy matters, both in terms of the Nation's trade and economic picture and in terms of the environment.

Since leaving Washington in January, by his own choice, he has been involved in the kind of in-depth research he never felt he had time for during his demanding and often hectic years of Senate service. A thorough scholar, Len Jordan's brand of careful, thoughtful analysis is the substance of his recent address entitled "Energy—Today and Tomorrow." I am inserting it in the RECORD today so that my colleagues and others may have the opportunity to read this most timely and important message.

The address follows:

ENERGY—TODAY AND TOMORROW

I was pleased to accept the invitation to speak today at the annual meeting of the Idaho Petroleum Council.

Since my retirement from the United States Senate, where among other duties was my service on the Fuels and Energy Subcommittee, I have devoted much time in examining the general subject of energy in this nation—where it comes from today, sources for the future, the sudden surge in demand, and the causes of the current shortages especially in oil and natural gas. My remarks will be based on my experience and on my studies and research.

The subject for discussion is "Energy—Today and Tomorrow."

The cold, blunt fact is that this country is running short on energy today. Unless we launch an immediate and intensified crash program to develop new energy sources, to maintain and expand our present sources, to adopt firm energy conservation measures, to

get back on the road to being self-sufficient in energy, then the outlook for tomorrow and coming years is full of peril and danger to the security of this nation.

I want to stress the importance of self-sufficiency because I think it is not only possible of achievement, but absolutely essential for our economic stability and our national security.

At the present time we must import about 33% of our oil. By 1985 imports will increase to 50% which would create an intolerable situation.

About 60% of the free world's known petroleum reserves are in the Persian Gulf area of the Middle East. Japan, Europe and the United States all compete for foreign oil. The result is twofold—prices escalate, creating for the U.S. at least, greater problems in our balance of payments, and secondly, dependence on foreign oil makes our nation extremely vulnerable from a national security standpoint. Dependence on foreign oil would reduce our nation to a second or third rate world power.

The real crisis staring us in the face is time. We're dragging our feet and wasting time, while shortages of energy become more widespread.

I would describe today's situation as precarious and tense, but not desperate. I repeat—the crisis is in time. The crunch we find ourselves in today no doubt is going to grow more severe for the next two or three years, and we might as well face up to that harsh fact.

Time therefore becomes precious, and obviously the time for action is now. We must clear the decks, launch the crash program mentioned previously, and place solution of the energy problems at the top of the national priority list where it belongs.

A moment ago I mentioned potential danger to the national security. Continued neglect and stalling will result in a very real threat to our national defense security; national economic security; and consumer, or "people's" security.

Now, let's place this energy picture in its proper perspective. Oil and natural gas furnish about 78% of our energy; coal about 17%; hydroelectric power 4% and nuclear power 1%. About 40% of the electric power is generated by oil and gas.

In this country, we have 6% of the world's population and use 33% of all energy. There is no cosmic law that guarantees us such a disproportionate share in the future. Growth in demand has been staggering, and is expected to double by 1985. We are using about 17 million barrels of oil a day, and at least a third of that has to be imported.

Ominous headlines have been in the news since the Labor Day weekend regarding Middle East oil producing countries. That's the area of the world we have to look to more and more for foreign imports. Supplies from Canada and Venezuela have peaked out, and now we face what one writer in the July Reader's Digest called "excruciating international blackmail."

The writer was a prophet, because just 10 days ago, Libya completed its nationalization of western oil companies by seizing 51% ownership of the firms. Libya's premier announced that the price of crude oil will be nearly doubled—and get this, he also said Libya would no longer accept American dollars as payment for its oil.

Other Arab nations backed Libya 100%. Saudi Arabia advised American oil company officials that if the United States does not adjust its Middle East pro-Israel policy in the next six months, it will reduce its oil production by one million barrels a day, which would add to the growing worldwide shortage of petroleum.

Oil has become the most potent diplomatic weapon of all, and the oil-rich nations of the Middle East are in a position to call the shots. Watch the headlines in coming weeks and months. There will be a lot of news—most of it bad—affecting this country.

Oil is the lifeblood of America. We simply can't run without it. A vivid illustration takes place in southern Idaho each year. Many of you will recall that I have often referred to the Snake River as Idaho's main artery. But the Snake would not be a working river without oil. That's what fuels the tractors and combines and other farm equipment and machinery—oil—to plant crops in the spring and harvest them in the fall.

The basic question now is what are we doing and what further should be done to meet the emerging energy crisis.

Back in 1971, President Nixon delivered his "clean energy" message to Congress. The President noted then that prices of oil, coal, natural gas and electricity had been increasing at a slower rate than consumer prices as a whole. He said energy had been a bargain in the United States. The price, he indicated, must go up.

In February of this year, President Nixon told Congress:

"We must face up to the stark fact in America that we are consuming more energy than we produce."

As recently as last weekend, the President again stressed the importance of action now on energy legislation.

The President is trying to set a new national course that will "insure necessary supplies of energy at acceptable economic and environmental costs."

In one of his previous messages to Congress, he said: "One reason we use energy so lavishly today is that the price of energy does not include all the social costs of producing it."

In times of crisis, the universal practice is to look for someone to blame. Rather than trying to pin any blame, let's just take a look at what has caused gasoline and heating oil shortages.

Let me list 10 major factors which, combined, are the primary underlying causes. I don't hold the petroleum industry entirely blameless, but in fairness to oil companies, I simply point out that they had no control whatsoever over these ten factors:

1. New automobiles, coming on the road about 200,000 a week, are all equipped with emission control devices, and most have power steering and brakes, automatic transmission and air conditioning. With all that equipment, most of the vehicles have enormous appetites for gasoline and their miles per gallon performance is drastically cut.

2. There is a shortage of refineries in this country. Attempts have been made for the past several years to build new refineries, especially on the eastern seaboard, where 40 per cent of the consumption takes place but which has only 12% of the refining capacity. Opposition from environmental groups was a major obstacle, plus uncertainty of the quality and quantity of crude oil which might be available.

Refineries, which cost from \$200 to \$300 million, have to be built to handle the type of crude oil available. Most of the crude in this country is low sulfur sweet crude. Most of the mid-east oil is high sulfur sour crude. Numerous refineries in this country have launched expansion projects, and new refinery units will be built when and where sites become available.

3. In many parts of the country—but not in Idaho—electric power companies had to turn to light distillate oils to generate power. Coal and the heavy residual oils, with their high sulfur content, were banned under tough anti-pollution laws. The power companies had two choices—use oil or close up shop. Power companies are using about 200,000 barrels of these light oils a day, and their use to generate power is 50 per cent wasteful. These oils are refined to heat home and small office buildings, and to fuel farm equipment and trucks. This is a major reason for the scarcity of heating fuels.

There were 40 million acres of additional farm land opened for production this year, being removed from the set-aside program

by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Another 19 million acres will be added next year. Exact figures on how many of the 40 million acres actually were planted are not available yet, but estimates are well over 50%. Demand for gasoline and diesel on the farm was up sharply as a result.

5. Nuclear energy to share the energy load is not available in much quantity yet. For the last 10 or 15 years, expectations were that nuclear power would be in much greater abundance than it actually is.

6. The greatest discovery of oil ever made in the Western Hemisphere occurred in 1968 on Alaska North Slope area. There's a proved reserve of about 10 billion barrels of oil there—still underground five years after discovery. The people of this country need that oil urgently. It's low sulfur, the kind that most U.S. refineries are designed for, and there may be additional staggering billions of barrels of oil there yet to be found. Alaska's vast petroleum potential could enable this country to escape the increasing blackmail from the Middle East. And it makes sense to me to import oil from one of our own states rather than the volatile mid-east nations. The proposed trans-Alaskan pipeline, which has been blocked for five years, would require about eight square miles of territory. Alaska has something like 586,000 square miles. Congress realizes the urgency of having the Alaskan oil available as quickly as possible, after all the delay. Both houses passed the pipeline bill before the August recess. The differences in the two bills should be ironed out quickly now that Congress is back in session, and the final version sent to the President soon.

7. The Outer Continental shelf—30 to 200 miles off the Atlantic coast, off the California coast and in the Gulf of Mexico—offers another vast potential for new oil and natural gas reserves. No exploration has been allowed off the Atlantic coast, and drilling was halted off California after the unfortunate Santa Barbara oil spill a few years ago. Only a small fraction of the leases in the Gulf of Mexico have been made available for exploration.

8. This country has a supply of coal that would last several hundred years, but the use of coal is dwindling, throwing added burden on oil and gas.

9. As with oil, we are using natural gas in this country far more rapidly than it is being found. In 1954, the Federal Power Commission fixed the price of gas at the well-head at a rate only one-third to one-half the comparable consumer cost of other energy sources. Natural gas, which is clean-burning and non-polluting, quickly became in great demand. The artificially low price was like being able to buy a T-bone steak for the price of a hamburger. Several dozen million homes and hundreds of thousands of industries converted to gas. Exploration, production and distribution costs, meanwhile, skyrocketed—and the low price remained constant. Incentive in this high risk business to look for additional reserves dried up. Exploration dwindled sharply—and our natural gas reserves continue to be eroded. Experts claim that there are trillions of cubic feet of natural gas under the North Slope in Alaska, and in all likelihood additional trillions under the coastal seabeds. But thus far, oil and gas companies have not been allowed to produce and deliver it.

10. The subject of natural gas leads to the 10th and final point to mention—and that's the weather. Last winter, a severe early cold spell caused natural gas companies to suspend service to hundreds of thousands of industrial customers on interruptible contracts. The industries had to switch to their fall-back system—heating oils—and that is another major reason why the fuel oil situation last winter was so critical.

As we approach fall and winter this year, the weather again will be the prime factor.

Faced with the knowledge that the non-

renewable resources of planet Earth are being consumed at an alarming rate, we must move at once on a two-pronged effort:

First, conservation of energy at all levels, and secondly, a thorough and dedicated program to research and develop alternate sources of energy. Each should have immediate high priority.

Let us consider each of these goals.

First, conservation.

What can we do to conserve present inventories of known reserves?

Here are a few suggestions.

Let us start with energy used in industry, since this is the segment of greatest use, constituting two thirds of total energy usage. To list a few:

1. Reverse the trend which in recent years has been away from coal to oil and gas.
2. Eliminate waste.
3. Recycle metals.
4. Higher utilization of both renewable and non-renewable resources.

5. Conversion of solid wastes to energy.

Conservation of energy for non-business purposes, which constitutes the other third of total energy use, brings us into the picture as individuals. Here are a few things we can do:

1. Turn out the lights when not in use, and if possible, use less heat in the winter and less cooling in summer. Just a very few degrees will make a lot of difference.
2. Have experts check your home for better insulation, double windows, and weather stripping at all openings.
3. Use public transportation more, or car pools, for commuting to work.
4. Drive slower. Speed limits of 60 miles an hour on interstate and 55 miles on primary and secondary highways would save gasoline and lives, too.
5. Plan your driving to accomplish several errands with each trip.

6. Insist on local government cooperation in recycling reusable solid wastes and conversion of non-reusable solid wastes into energy. Land fill disposal is costly and wasteful. The technology is available to convert solid waste into energy by a clean burning process.

What must we expect from government?

Congress and state legislatures must work together to conserve energy resources and to provide for proper land and water use planning, reclamation of strip mined areas, strict regulation of off-shore drilling pipeline transportation and ocean shipping, in order to provide the least possible impact to the environment.

Congress must take the lead in providing funds and encouragement to industry in joint ventures for research and development of alternate sources of energy such as coal gasification and liquefaction, geothermal, shale oil production and others. For most of these the technology is already known. What is needed now are pilot plants to bring the cost-benefit ratio into the range of practicality.

Looking into the future where the technology is less advanced are nuclear fusion, solar energy and hydrogen research and development. These are the "clean" sources for the future. We have spent \$25 billion to put men on the moon. Surely the development of a clean source of energy is no less important.

Idaho has no fossil fuels.

Until we know the sources of future energy for Idaho, Congress should not designate anymore of our valuable and renewable river resources as wild or scenic rivers. The moratorium concept is still preferable to a permanent commitment. Sponsors of new Middle Snake legislation have yet to tell us what the trade-off might be in terms of imported oil from the Middle East or elsewhere, to replace development forever foreclosed.

What we can to conserve present resources and what we must do to find alternate sources of energy still leaves us with critical

problems. I have mentioned previously that oil and natural gas now provide about 78% of our energy. At our present rate of consumption and unless relief comes from other sources, the world's supply of non-renewable oil and gas may be reduced to dangerous levels by the year 2000—just 27 years from now. In fact, some experts claim that the year 2000 will mark the end of the oil era.

This era of scarcity is not confined to Idaho or any other single state or all 50 states collectively.

The dilemma of oil shortages is global. This country, once self-sufficient, now has to compete with Japan, Western Europe and other areas of the world for foreign oil.

Neglect of our own oil and gas potential seems to be not only incredibly foolish, but a threat to the national security. Oil and gas companies, with full and equal attention to the environment, should be allowed to search for, produce and deliver these energy fuels which are so urgently needed by the people of America. The paramount fact to be remembered is that the country practically runs on oil and gas, and until new energy sources are developed people of the country must continue to rely on oil and gas, for most of their energy requirements.

There are alternative sources of energy that must be developed under the crash program I mentioned. I would frankly like to see more of a sense of urgency at the national level. I think that all attitudes of complacency have disappeared, but just a lukewarm approach is not going to be sufficient.

Mankind in the last 30 years consumed more energy than in all the years of history before 1940—and by the end of this century, the world's rate of energy consumption likely will quadruple.

On a permanent basis, it is unlikely that the United States can expect to keep on pre-empting one third of the world's energy, with only 6% of the world's population. Under present projections, the population of the world will be 50% greater by the year 2000, and per capita use of energy will probably double, especially if the presently undeveloped nations claim a more proportionate share of world resources.

Present energy sources will have to be joined by other sources to share such a staggering demand that is growing every day.

Fuels for the future will include not only oil and natural gas and hydroelectric power, but additional nuclear power, solar power, ocean power, geothermal power, the gasification and liquefaction of coal, synthetic fuels, fuel from oil shale and tar sands, tertiary recovery of petroleum from previously abandoned wells, hydrogen and perhaps other more sophisticated sources.

We'll need them all to share the load—and the crash program that I strongly recommend means to start immediately, with the full resources of government and private industry assigned to the job.

Looking at this entire energy dilemma calmly but soberly, I would say it is no time to try to pin the blame on anybody or any group. The nation has a gigantic task ahead, and we should be united in the undertaking. The country should not be divided into environmentalists and anti-environmentalists, because no group and no individual has a monopoly on the desire for clean air, water and land. I believe we are well on the road to winning the fight against pollution—but losing ground thus far in efforts to restore adequate energy supplies for the people of this country.

The environment does not—and cannot—stand alone as our only national priority. It should share equal billing and attention at the top of the list, but not to the exclusion of all else. Energy companies have other vital responsibilities in addition to eliminating dirty air and water.

Look at it this way. The treasures beneath

the earth's surface are there for the benefit of mankind. The earth's surface must be disturbed in the extractive process, but not ravaged or devastated beyond restoration. I grow deeply concerned and worried when so many million acres of our lands are proposed for permanent lock-up. If our uncommitted public lands have more than one use, then this country is going to have to take advantage of all those uses. The multiple use concept is sound public policy.

Surely there is enough of everything for everybody, if we use our resources wisely and thoughtfully—and that includes land, water and sub-surface treasures.

Energy is going to cost more. There's no doubt about that.

The day of cheap energy is gone—forever. The public must be willing to pay the cost for whatever energy is required—and the requirements are massive, indeed. A free market is historically a better mechanism for allocating resources than mandatory rationing.

This nation has the highest standard of living in the history of the world. I want to see it remain that way, and to include all our people. I want to see other nations increase their own standards, not have the United States sink back to lower levels. It is unthinkable to me to have this wonderful country become a have-not nation, or to become second-rate in any way. Yet we are no longer self-sufficient in oil.

I would like to see a restoration of national pride, of self-reliance for people as individuals and the nation as a whole, of self-sufficiency insofar as possible in critical areas such as energy supplies.

Common sense tells us that we have to restore balance between environmental and energy goals. The two are compatible, because without energy, we cannot continue to clean up the environment. There has to be a meeting of the minds just for the sake of the people of this country.

Let me leave you with this final thought. The one overriding point I want to stress is that we don't have to make a choice between a clean environment and enough energy to provide for our individual and national needs. We can have both—but shouldn't have one at the expense of the other.

Let a clean environment and ample energy sources be our National goal.

NOMINATION OF HON. GERALD R. FORD AS VICE PRESIDENT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the President on his nomination of our distinguished minority leader, GERALD R. FORD, as Vice-President-designate.

Mr. FORD has earned the respect of Members on both sides of the aisle. His experience, hard won in dealing with the most difficult issues of our times, will be influential in closing the gap between the executive department and the Congress.

What is needed most at this crucial time in our history is a leader who can unite our Nation; a man so outstandingly qualified that his selection would help to heal the wounds of divisiveness. I believe the President has made such a choice in Mr. FORD.

Hopefully, Mr. FORD's nomination sig-

nals an era of new understanding and cooperation in congressional Executive relations.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to seize upon this opportunity for bringing about a new beginning. GERRY FORD has not only been a dedicated public servant and a competent legislator, but has also been an outstanding congressional leader. It is in the best interests of our Nation that Mr. FORD's nomination for Vice President be promptly confirmed so that we can get on with our Nation's urgent business.

CALIFORNIA EFFORTS AT FIGHTING DRUG ABUSE IN THE SCHOOLS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Crime issued a report over the summer concerning the drug abuse problem in the schools.

The committee has called on Congress to provide funds for both student and teacher drug education programs, to force manufacturers to cut back their production of harmful drugs, and to monitor the effectiveness of the radio and television industry's regulation of drug advertisements.

Mr. Speaker, I have written principals and superintendents of schools in my State of California about their views of the committee's recommendations. Their letters relate, as well, the independent efforts they are making to fight the drug abuse problem. Their evaluation and experiences should be of great interest to all Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, selections from these letters follow:

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS

LETTER FROM JOE MERLO, PRINCIPAL, LA HABRA, CALIF.

You stated that you would be interested in additional suggestions. One that comes quickly to mind is that doctors should somehow be held responsible for the indiscriminate renewing of drug prescriptions for patients they have not seen recently and for the renewing of drug prescriptions without checking to see when the last renewal was allowed. The home medicine cabinet is probably the best source of supply for amphetamines and barbiturates that our young people have.

LETTER FROM W. ODIE WRIGHT, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

At the present time drug abuse prevention in the Long Beach Unified School District includes classroom instruction, inservice education for teachers, forums planned and scheduled for Adults/Evening High School and programs sponsored by school-community committees and/or parent teacher associations. A bulletin is enclosed to explain our program in more detail. In addition, we would suggest that communities be encouraged to develop or expand existing programs which emphasize the importance of values and self concepts in an effort to counteract the pressures on young people to misuse drugs. One very important aspect of this approach would be increased opportunities for involvement in volunteer activities in which meaningful contributions can be made to the well-being of others. Red Cross Youth ac-

tivities would be an example of the type of involvement which should be encouraged (enclosure No. 2).

LETTER FROM JACK W. JOLLEY, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, WALNUT, CALIF.

The first recommendation is all well and good but where do we get the funds? I realize recommendation number two says the federal government will aid school boards to secure adequate financing but that does not give us the dollars to do the job. Many of us in education have assumed as much as can be done for the money being spent for education. Several very worthwhile things have been given to the schools to do without any financial aid with them. We have just worked longer and harder to do the job. There is, however, a limit. We have arrived at that point.

If the committee would like to see their recommendations implemented we must talk about finance and specifically what type of program we are to design. How extensive will the program be in our district? A drug counseling staff could be one or more. Would each district develop their own program or is it to be standardized to some degree?

LETTER FROM A. HUGH LIVINGSTON, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, SAN MATEO, CALIF.

While this school district is not in your congressional district, you may be interested in our long standing efforts to combat the drug problem. Six years ago the district initiated the development of two of the most successful films in the area of drug abuse. These films, "Escape to Nowhere" and "LSD-25," have been used throughout the nation. In addition, the district developed teaching materials including materials for parents and students to discuss together which complemented the films.

Two years ago the district initiated the development of a drug counselor position on each of our eight campuses. These individuals were selected for their background in understanding the drug scene and serve pretty much on call around the clock seven days a week. This program is now funded in its entirety by the district.

Due to the distressingly low level of federal support and the very serious restrictions on financing recently enacted in California, the district now faces a crucial decision. It can be argued that drug abuse counseling and prevention activities are essentially community mental health and public health matters. Consequently, funding should come from those sources at the local, state, and federal levels. Regrettably, this district faces the prospect of abandoning this important community activity in order that it may direct its ever-limited funds to its primary mission of education of children. This is not an easy decision to reach.

In my judgment, such federal funds as are available through the President's Commission on Criminal Justice could be spent far more meaningfully by helping institutes such as this provide services to people rather than to assist police departments with computerizing of their criminal information statistics.

LETTER FROM H. D. LOVIK, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, VISALIA, CALIF.

Thank you for the information on drug abuse. One area that is having some success in our vicinity is a program between juvenile officers and school people that has a goal to assist students concerning value clarification. Students who have developed a strong system of personal values tend not to get involved with drugs. This is a pilot program covering several elementary and high schools in Kings and Tulare Counties. The plan first requires in-service training for teachers, and then is presented to students.

LETTER FROM JAMES C. HARRISON, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, MONTEREY, CALIF.

I am pleased with the recommendations of the committee. The problem of drug abuse by

youngsters in school is a family and community problem. We've taken a two-pronged approach in trying to solve the problem in Monterey. (1) School Community Counselors who are "street people", who work in the schools on both a preventative and an identification basis. These people also work in the community with parents and young adults. (2) The Use of Peer Counselors—well trained high school students who are going into the elementary schools to relate with students at that level on a preventative basis and also on an identification basis. These students are not only trained in drug abuse information but also in group techniques, techniques of working with students and their parents.

LETTER FROM RAFAEL ESTUPINIAN, PRINCIPAL,
POMONA, CALIF.

As principal of an inner-city Junior High School, I have been increasingly aware of the drug abuse problem in my community. Fremont Jr. High, student population approximately 840 students, is about 35% black, 40% Chicano and the rest white students from lower socio-economic homes. About 85% of our students are on the free lunch program. There are practically no recreational facilities in the immediate vicinity and the occurrence of vandalism is high.

Curiously enough, the students do very little experimenting with hard drugs. Marijuana and "pill-popping" are also a rarity. However, the inhalation of intoxicating fumes from spray cans of various types is rampant and our major problem.

This is primarily a problem among the Mexican-American student population. We have had many parent meetings but can make no progress because of lack of funds. We need:

1. A detoxification center (medical)—Even though the students do not use heroin or other hard drugs, there are over 4,000 adult addicts in this valley.
2. Youth recreational facilities.
3. Jobs for youths.
4. Money to start a bilingual adult drug education program.

LETTER FROM RICHARD E. MILES, PRINCIPAL,
SYLMAR, CALIF.

It is interesting to note that we also received a letter with the same date as yours from the Drug Abuse and Opportunity Education Section of the Los Angeles Unified School District announcing training available from the Los Angeles Center for Group Psychotherapy for a total of 30 school people (15 each semester) from the hundreds of schools in this district.

The letter went on to say that the program is funded by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, but that there would be no funds available to the school for substitutes to cover the person chosen to attend the 12 all day sessions in the training program. This would make it difficult to release a teacher to the program.

We commend your efforts in dealing with this problem. It appears to us, however, that anything done for the individual pupil in the individual school will continue to depend on the staff of the individual school and on the available resources from the school's community. If you can find a way to give additional support at this specific level, I am sure it would be most helpful and effective.

LETTER FROM LOUIS KAPLAN, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE

You must be aware that nowhere in the program of teacher training in colleges and universities is emphasis placed on providing teachers with a background for conducting an instructional program on drugs in the public schools. Few districts have specialists in this area. If we are to provide effective teacher training on the job, there must be some leadership and expertise provided by some agency outside of the schools; whether

this be the public health department or some other department in the local community, county, or state is a matter which will have to be worked out. What is required is that specialists in this area provide instruction for teachers, that funds be made available to school districts to release teachers to participate in the instructional program, that efforts be made to develop learning materials including films, filmstrips, books and other publications that are technically accurate and educationally sound, and that support be provided to school districts to procure and utilize these materials.

LETTER FROM WESLEY STEWART, DIRECTOR OF
INSTRUCTION, EXETER PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Value clarification through education in the classroom based upon the grade of the local communities. I believe that once people can break the barrier of fear surrounding the unknown in dealing with others, that people want to do what is right. Doing what is right we just could be incorporated in a value clarification course or curriculum—this is where drug abuse instruction begins.

LETTER FROM STANLEY ONDERDONK, PRINCIPAL,
NOVATO HIGH SCHOOL

Active drug traffic and its attendant related promotional activities on campus appears to be inhibited in relation to the degree of direct observation by school staff members.

In view of the above, the recommendation is made that any drug abuse oriented Federal Funding to schools during the current phase of Drug Abuse be directed primarily at increasing campus supervisory/security personnel.

TRIBUTE TO JERRY FORD

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time this body pauses to remember a deceased colleague or former Member, to pay tribute to a life of service that has ended.

How refreshing, and how gratifying it is to me, and to these other friends of JERRY FORD, to be able to pay tribute to his life of service, not at its end, but at the beginning of its pinnacle, as he is about to accept his most important assignment.

That he will carry out this assignment in a manner reflecting credit on him and on those who had such confidence in him, we in this House can have no doubt. From both sides of the aisle, comments about our friend from Michigan have flowed like a mighty river, ever since the President grinned at him over our applause in the East Room last week. And all of those comments have had one central theme: A man whose word is his bond, whose verbal commitment is a sacred promise, who is, in a word, trustworthy.

Trustworthy. Worthy, that is, of trust. Worthy of the trust that our President placed in his hands last Friday night. Worthy of the trust that the Constitution of our great Nation places in the office to which he will soon be confirmed. Worthy to exercise the even higher responsibility that the Constitution places on him, should, God forbid, he be required to step in and assume it.

We will miss you, JERRY. But we know you will not be far away from this House that you love and that loves you.

THE STATUS OF H.R. 4200

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving many inquiries concerning the status of pension reform in the Congress, particularly the status of H.R. 4200, a House bill with Senate amendments containing pension provisions. The House Ways and Means Committee is now considering the various pension proposals before it. I personally am hopeful that some good legislation on this subject will come out this year.

These people writing to me are particularly concerned about the effect of section 706(f) of H.R. 4200 which would in effect limit the corporate contributions to an employee pension plan. Mr. Randolph H. Aires, of Sears, Roebuck & Co. recently communicated with me on this and I recommend his remarks to my colleagues:

THE STATUS OF H.R. 4200

The inquiries and alarms expressed by Sears employees concerning the impact of Senate floor amendments to HR 4200 seem to be understandably justified. Our research people have run several sample applications of the rather complex formulae set forth in these amendments which would limit future company contributions to employee profit sharing accounts (by limiting the deductibility of such contributions)—and this impact is truly formidable. Samplings were taken among profit sharing accounts of employees now earning from \$7,000 to \$11,000 per annum, who do not participate in Sears Supplemental pension plan. These samplings demonstrate that a great many employees whose earnings are less than \$11,000 per annum now have profit sharing accounts which, under the formulae would "fund" annual "pensions" upon their retirement in excess of 75% of their highest annual wages.

The amendments would therefore prohibit the deductibility of any further employer contributions to these accounts, and severely limit the amount of company contributions to other employee profit sharing accounts now and in the future.

Another effect of the amendments would be to require cumbersome annual computations as to each of the accounts of 225,000 Sears profit sharing participants and to open and close the door to further company contributions erratically, depending on the fluctuations in the market value of Sears stock in their accounts.

I didn't think we had come to the point where Congress would deem it necessary or wise to exercise such strict concern over the quantum of corporate profits channeled toward the retirement security of rank and file employees. After all, there are plenty of other "calls" on company profits for debt payment, dividends, modernization, expansion, etc., which would serve generally to keep this particular use of such funds within reasonable bounds.

Over the past ten years, Sears has contributed the following amounts to Sears employees' profit sharing accounts:

	million
1963	\$59
1964	66
1965	70
1966	75
1967	75
1968	87
1969	101
1970	99

1971 ----- 116
1972 ----- 129

These amounts presently are based on 11% of profits before taxes. Obviously, to the extent that any portion of the company contributions is not deductible, the net amount going to our employees would have to be decreased. The impact on our plan would be substantial.

Yours very truly,
RANDOLF H. AIRES,
Assistant Director, Governmental Affairs.

KAREN KUPCINET FOUNDATION FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a brief moment to share with my colleagues the outstanding achievements of Mr. Irv Kupcinet, the noted columnist for the Chicago Sun Times. Mr. Kupcinet, or "Kup" as he is known to all those who follow his daily prose, is being honored this weekend in Chicago by his friends and the Weizmann Institute of Science, for his and his family's continual service to the community.

The testimonial to "Kup" is in the form of an innovative and invaluable student exchange program, called the Karen Kupcinet Foundation for International Relations, named for his daughter, whose young life ended tragically while she, herself, was still a student.

The foundation will sponsor an exchange program involving all countries of the free world, in which post graduate students will attend, in Israel, once a year, a seminar toward peaceful relations. At a time when world peace is of primary concern to all people, and is the vocalized main objective of so many of our students, what better way to further this goal than to let the students themselves—our leaders of tomorrow—participate in an exchange seminar of this type.

I salute the Weizmann Institute and Mr. Irv Kupcinet for creating such an educational and beneficial living memorial to Karen, and hope my colleagues will join with me in wishes for much success for Kup and the Karen Kupcinet Foundation for International Relations.

WE NEED A NEW MINIMUM WAGE BILL

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, certain things and people are legend in this House. John Dent is one, a legend of drive and of spirit. But now, when we need his drive and spirit to get a new minimum wage bill, they are nowhere to be found.

If you can hear me, John, I would like to dedicate a poem to you:

There once was a man named John Dent,
Whose time was very well spent,
Writing bills that defy,
Schemes for pie in the sky.
Oh, where has John Dent's spirit went.

CONGRESSMAN HAILS CHRIST HOSPITAL ON 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this year Christ Hospital in Jersey City, N.J., is 100 years old. For a century this fine institution, an affiliate of the Episcopal Diocese of Newark, has been serving the people of our community.

Small as hospitals go in this metropolitan area, Christ Hospital has some unique qualities. It has attracted the support of the great and the small, literally. Two Governors led fund raising campaigns long ago while two others sent dinners for the patients.

The illustrious Stevens family of Castle Point, Hoboken, and the president of the old Lackawanna Railroad bailed it out of many financial crises—and there were many for a hospital where the first 60 years, more than one-half of the patients were charity cases.

Gifts in the six numbers can be listed on one hand including one of \$500,000 from the Federal Government which allowed the hospital to replace the old barn and ambulance house with an extremely modern power and laundry plant 5 years ago. But, it has always had the nickel, dime and "in kind" support of the "little" people of the area. And thousands of children across the country read "The Daisy," a little paper about child patients in the hospital's pediatrics ward, called the Daisy Ward. Their 50-cent subscriptions amounted to more than \$60,000 by 1911.

The hospital has quite a few "firsts" and some "onlys." When Daisy Ward opened in 1876 it was the only all-children ward in the locality. Hospital people came "from the four corners" to see the only photomicrography magic lantern slides "in color by the French method" in 1915, and again in the 1920's to see the one of two known hospital convalescent homes established because "it was not like the good old days when people took care of their own old folks."

There was also a Social Service Guild of over 100 women who went into the homes, "caring for mothers, rehabilitating wage earners, giving babies the proper start in life with food and clothing and sending children and old people to the country for summer vacations."

A new air-conditioning system, innovative bookkeeping method, and the only and biggest 200,000-volt deep therapy X-ray unit in the vicinity attracted attention in the 1930's. The famous Dr. Kessler maintained a rehabilitation unit for men crippled in mine accidents until the 1950's in the 1888 building which is still in use.

Today, architects and steel engineers

come to see the "radical new steel structural framework" of the radiology building which defers obsolescence, the plague of all hospital planners. A column-free span of 54 feet is the key to the expandable, flexible design and walk-in floors sandwiched between regular floors, houses all pipes, conduits and wiring allowing repairs and alterations without disturbing hospital routine.

Christ Hospital today is a rare combination of the old and the new—in many ways the best of both—with old buildings and new, but with the same old spirit. Hospital records dating back to the beginning show the determination and desperate struggle of the community general hospital to survive and maintain standards through world depressions and wars, interspersed with local crises.

Mr. Speaker, on this great occasion I join with all the people, great and small, of Hudson County and wish Christ Hospital well as she begins another hundred years of service.

MR. AGNEW'S FAREWELL

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times today published a most perceptive editorial which addresses former Vice President Spiro Agnew's televised farewell remarks. I insert it in the Record for the interest of all readers:

MR. AGNEW'S FAREWELL

There would be greater pathos in the fate of Spiro Agnew if his had been a fall from grace rather than from arrogance. Many Americans, after witnessing the incongruous White House festivities in celebration of the nomination of Mr. Agnew's successor, might have found it possible to sympathize with any forthright statement by the former Vice President.

Instead, they got, via television, the self-serving tale of a man who maintains that he was the innocent victim of a conspiracy. Mr. Agnew did not content himself with denying that he had done anything beyond living by what he maintained was the customary Golden Rule of American politics—the now nauseating familiar "everybody does it" line of defense. He rolled out a blunderbuss with which to defame all his detractors—the witnesses against him, the prosecutors and, of course, the news media. The forty pages of sworn charges against him, carefully documented by the Justice Department, were brushed aside as a mere compendium of malice—the work of "self-confessed bribe brokers"—even though they showed kickbacks still being made to him four years after he became Vice President.

In a manner unhappily all too characteristic of this master of doubletalk, Mr. Agnew had prefaced his TV speech by letting the word go out—through an interview with a journalistic confidant—that his resignation had been forced by pressure from the highest levels of the Nixon Administration.

The contrast between that imputation of intra-Administration betrayal—similar to many Mr. Agnew had made earlier when he was accusing Justice Department officials of knifing him—and his subsequent extravagant televised praise of Mr. Nixon suggests that the whole Agnew speech was merely another

concession to image-building, aimed at earning him points for loyalty and magnanimity. The public will not so easily be deceived by this latest transparent application of the Nixon-Agnew doctrine that previous "facts" can be rendered inoperative by the projection of a new message.

Mr. Agnew cannot expect to be judged in a vacuum that eliminates from memory his own earlier views and statements. In 1970 he urged Federal prosecutors to "focus the spotlight of publicity" on "criminal elements," including "the tax cheat." In 1969, while taunting those who engaged in the "politics of protest," he mocked: "Thou shalt not ask forgiveness for thy transgressions, rather thou shalt demand amnesty for them."

In his farewell address, a new measuring rod emerged as he attested to his own purity, except "perhaps, judged by the new post-Watergate political morality." That yardstick implies an astonishing view of the pre-Watergate state of law and morals on the part of this law-and-order Administration's erstwhile chief moralist. The most charitable interpretation of his parting message is that it reflected faithfully the plastic ethics of the Nixon White House. Spiro Agnew remained, until the end, the echo of his master's voice.

ABUSE OF MILITARY TRANSPORT BY SENIOR OFFICERS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to stop the pervasive abuse of military transport by senior officers to junket around the world.

At present senior officers—colonels and above—whether retired or active duty can travel absolutely free anywhere in the world—to top it all off, can make advance reservations 30 days before their trip for a five-destination jaunt.

In addition, senior officers are provided special VIP lounges and ground transportation anywhere in the world.

This worldwide free junket service for senior officers must and can be stopped by Congress.

In addition, the legislation that I am proposing today provides a graduated fee schedule for space available transportation by various officers and enlisted men. Officers and enlisted men would be permitted to travel on a space available basis while paying a regular DOD tariff. It should be noted that the regular DOD tariff is extremely low and equivalent to charter flight costs. In effect, all military personnel will be able to fly space available at an extremely low fee. Officers in the rank of major and above will pay a full 100 percent regular DOD tariff. Captains 75 percent, 1st lieutenants and 2d lieutenants 50 percent and all warrant officers and enlisted men 50 percent. In addition, warrant officers and enlisted men on emergency leave may travel for free.

The purpose of this bill is twofold: one, to stop the abuses of the system by senior officers and two, to establish a reasonable fare schedule for all military personnel.

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the report I submitted to you following my attendance at the International Civil Aviation Organization Conference:

The Honorable CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Recently I was honored to be selected as a delegate from this body to attend the International Civil Aviation Organization's conference on skyjacking. Accordingly, I spent the 13th, 14th, and 15th of September in Rome, the "eternal city", which was the location of the conference. I would now like to submit a report to the House containing my observations and impressions of that meeting.

As one of the first orders of business a rule was adopted requiring a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority vote for the passage of matters proposed to the conference. This proved to be a major stumbling block to significant progress by the delegates. The multitude of smaller nations, which were strongly represented, especially those in the mid-east and Northern Africa voted as a block against those resolutions which contained any meaningful note of firmness and purpose. Indeed, most of my experiences in the working sessions support the conclusion that in many of the Mid-east nations a hijacker is looked upon as something of a hero and, "unofficially" admired.

This attitude was directly responsible for the defeat of a proposal to eliminate sanctuaries for air pirates. Also attendant to the defeat of this concept was what I could characterize as a hyper-sensitivity to sovereignty to the degree that many of these nations were unable to accept any idea of an elimination of national havens for these criminals. To do so seemed to them to be a surrender of their national identity to the will of an international body.

Considering the range and speed of today's commercial aircraft, it is obvious that skyjacking can be effectively controlled and curtailed only through international cooperation.

The absence to agreement by even a few small nations, who have little or nothing to lose, can be disruptive of all the efforts of other countries who have much to lose. All this became even more clear as I observed the series of negative responses to sound and thoughtful proposals.

The only solution to this difficulty which comports with our history and traditions is to vigorously pursue negotiations and constantly emphasize the positive benefits of mutual cooperation. In this regard I would offer for your consideration a brief passage from the book entitled *International Law* written by the distinguished Dr. Charles S. Rhyne who among other positions has served as President of the World Peace Through Law Center, American Bar Association. "The effectiveness of international law depends on the willingness of states to abide by it. Since the decision to follow international law precepts is left to the discretion of individual states subject to their international law obligations, it would seem that international law would be, on occasion, hopelessly ineffective to control the action of states who could follow, or breach the law, depending upon whether or not it served their interests at the time. While this is possible, powerful forces nevertheless exist in the inter-

national community which might lead states to discover more often than not that it is in their best interest to follow international law. These forces can best be termed *sanctions*." Dr. Rhyne goes on to identify *world opinion* as the most effective such sanction. I would therefore conclude my report by urging the administration and this Congress to make every effort consistent with our foreign policy to increase world awareness of the need to eliminate skyjacking and educate other nations that this can be done through full cooperation among nations, all the time emphasizing in every way possible that the overwhelming weight of world opinion is that this is an immediate and desirable goal.

This report would be unacceptably incomplete if I failed to comment on the very high degree of competence exhibited at all times by Ambassador William Rountree. I was accorded every consideration by him and his staff and their efforts added immeasurably to the sessions of the conference and again, Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the Minority Leader, Mr. Ford, for making possible my attendance at the conference.

Sincerely,

DICK SHOUP,
Member of Congress.

UNFAIR CHARGES AGAINST HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN LEWIS DESCHLER

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in the grim atmosphere of accusations and recriminations that presently prevails in our Nation and, most particularly, our Capital City, it was perhaps not surprising that Ralph Nader, who apparently considers himself omniscient on all subjects, has chosen to make unfair and unwarranted accusations about one of the most respected and most effective employees of the Congress—Lewis Deschler, the House Parliamentarian.

Mr. Nader's comments, as well as certain cryptic statements that appeared in a national news magazine, are completely without foundation. I have had the privilege of knowing Lew Deschler for a number of years and can personally vouch for his fairness, his good judgment, and his expertise in a most complicated and difficult position.

Mr. Deschler has held his present position as House Parliamentarian since 1928 and has served the House of Representatives well for almost 50 years. During this time he has unquestionably made many decisions, always based upon constitutional and parliamentary considerations, that have been of tremendous importance to our Nation. In doing so, he has understandably made some determinations that were not popular with all Members. However, I know of no instance when Mr. Deschler was not willing to assist anyone who sought his help and offer fair and wise counsel regardless of that individual's politics or position on the issue under consideration.

We are now faced with one of the gravest crises in our Nation's history, and

it is essential that we work together without rancor and dissension if we are to resolve the difficult questions which face us as a nation. The Congress in the next few weeks must make a decision of enormous importance to the future of our country, and during these deliberations the leadership of the House will rely heavily upon the wisdom and knowledge of this outstanding and dedicated public servant.

I believe the following quotation from an editorial by James A. Eldridge concerning Chillicothe's native son which appeared in the Chillicothe Gazette, the oldest newspaper west of the Allegheny, of October 12, 1973, expresses not only my feelings but those of a great many of my colleagues:

It gives me a high sense of confidence in this grave hour to know that such a man as Deschler brings to those who must lead us now a sense of continuity, devotion to our Country and the much-abused system which governs us, and the maturity and wisdom that come only from experience.

Following is this excellent and thought-provoking editorial in its entirety which I would like to share with my colleagues:

CHILLICOTHEAN IN EYE OF THE STORM

(By James A. Eldridge)

"The hidden despot" is what consumer advocate Ralph Nader recently called Lewis Deschler, parliamentarian of the U.S. House of Representatives and a native Chillicothean.

The phrase is, perhaps reflective of some accuracy in measuring the influence wielded by the large, genial 1922 graduate of Chillicothe High School on all legislation that has been passed by the house since Deschler was named parliamentarian in 1928 by Speaker Nicholas Longworth.

Today, Deschler after nearly 50 years as a member of the staff of the House of Representatives stands at the elbow of House Speaker Carl Albert as this country writes a unique and traumatic chapter in our history in the wake of Watergate, the Agnew resignation and the selection of a new vice president.

Two recent issues of Time magazine have made cryptic reference to Deschler's backstage role as Agnew sought to escape the loss of his high office and a jail term by appealing to the House for impeachment proceedings that he hoped would block court action against him.

When Agnew went to the office of Speaker Albert to request that action by the House, Albert immediately sent for Democratic majority leader Congressman Thomas O'Neill and Republican minority leader Gerald Ford—and Deschler.

Deschler's role was to counsel the Speaker and House leadership on Constitutional precedents—if any, and proper parliamentary procedures.

After several hours of consultations the Speaker denied the Agnew plea and ploy and the rest is current history.

Late last week I telephoned Deschler's office to request a telephone interview. A very courteous aide informed me that in view of the gravity of the situation the parliamentarian had laid down a strict ruling against talking to any member of the news media.

However, in view of the hometown connection the aide promised to lay the Gazette's request before Deschler—a few hours later he telephoned to say that Deschler would talk to me on Wednesday of this week.

What follows is an account of that conversation—an exclusive interview—and a profile of Deschler. Gazette readers will understand the restraints under which Deschler

and I talked—in a time of crisis for the government in which all the constitutional forces of the Republic are being called into play, frequently in unprecedented areas.

"Early on in this job I established a passion for anonymity. My first loyalty is to the House and the Speaker. I am here to serve the members of the House of Representatives," Deschler began.

"As far back as the time when radio interviews first began I laid down the rule that I was not available. I am not running for public office. I do not need the public exposure. In fact, such exposure would damage my bipartisan role and my ability to help the members do their jobs."

But in a sense he is the man who lays down the law to the lawmakers. It has been said that he acts as constitutional lawyer, historian, adviser and confessor to the always independent, sometimes rambunctious members of the House.

By keeping the rules of the House at his fingertips Deschler's opinions can—and have decided the course of the nation's history.

Alaska and Hawaii came into the Union when they did because Deschler searched a century of House precedents to find a rule allowing the statehood bills to bypass the Rules Committee, where they had been blocked.

And in the Depression days, he thumbed back through 15,000 pages of House rulings to find in President Andrew Jackson's era the legislative key that opened the door for President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Hundred Days" of high speed reform legislation.

But at the same time, Deschler gave impartial parliamentary advice to FDR's political opposition who sought rules to block Roosevelt's program.

Some years back Newsweek magazine pointed out that some of Deschler's rulings are almost of world-shaking consequences. Immediately after World War II when the British loan came to the House for approval the question rose as to whether it would have to be referred to the hostile Ways and Means Committee or would go to the sympathetic Banking Committee.

Speaker Sam Rayburn sent it to the Banking Committee—armed with the precedents Deschler gave him on the subject. But neither of them ever discussed the advice the parliamentarian gave the Speaker.

But together they moved history because Britain's fate—and the course of world economics—might have taken a fatal turn if the House had not approved the loan.

Deschler's opinions have ranged from such solemn matters as the procedure for declaring World War II, to deciding how soon Americans could buy a drink after the repeal of Prohibition.

After a mixup in timing between the House and the Senate, Deschler advised that April 7, 1933, was the earliest date thirsty citizens could hoist a highball. The ruling stood.

Perhaps that's why Nader called Deschler a "hidden despot" some 41 years later.

Deschler has served Speakers Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, Rayburn, Martin and presently Speaker Albert.

He was born in Chillicothe in 1905, the son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Deschler. The family home was at 143 E. Fifth St.

After graduating from CHS he attended Miami University where he played varsity football. It was in 1925 that he went to Capitol Hill as a messenger after a friend introduced him to Speaker Longworth of Cincinnati who gave him the job.

Incidentally, it is Longworth's widow, the celebrated Alice Roosevelt Longworth, who is presently the tartar-tongued grand dame of Washington society.

Deschler completed his college and law education at night. And it was in 1928 that Longworth named him parliamentarian after he had served as assistant parliamentarian for a year.

Our conversation took place on Wednesday of this week—just hours before Agnew's resignation and while the question of his impeachment by the House was germane.

Deschler's comments to me were a combination of restraint, forcefulness and frankness.

He made clear to me, with great courtesy, the delicacy of his position and the historic necessity to refrain from pre-judgments and forecasts of things to come.

Three hours later the situation on Capitol Hill abruptly changed as Agnew stepped down from the vice presidency.

Now the House and the Senate must work with President Nixon to fill the vacant vice presidency and there are no constitutional precedents as to how to proceed in evaluating Nixon's nominee.

So as we watch Speaker Albert's limousine move from high level conferences at the White House back to Capitol Hill we can be certain that Deschler stands nearby to advise the Speaker on matters parliamentary and matters constitutional.

A traditionalist who has served the House of Representatives nearly 50 years, Deschler put it quite simply, "This is my life, my love."

It gives me a high sense of confidence in this grave hour to know that such a man as Deschler brings to those who must lead us now, a sense of continuity, devotion to the country and the much-abused system which governs us—and the maturity and wisdom that come only from experience.

And Lewis Deschler is a "professional" of the first order. Had Nixon and Agnew depended upon such men—instead of the sleazy hacks they elevated to powers, the ship of state might be sailing in calmer waters today.

WOMEN ENCOURAGED TO ENTER CONTEST ON THE POLITICAL PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE AMERICAS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a contest whose theme is "The Political Participation of Women in the Americas—Means to Promote More Political Participation by Women."

Sponsored by the Organization of American States' Commission on Women, this contest is an excellent way to contribute to the sadly deficient literature on women in society. It should increase our knowledge of women in all the Americas and encourage much needed research on the topic of women's political participation.

The contest is open to women applicants—though unfortunately limited to those up to 35 years—and I would encourage any woman with an interest in women's participation in the political process to submit her unpublished work no later than May 1, 1974. The prize is \$2,000 and publication by the Inter-American Commission of Women, all rights retained by the author.

For further information, write to: Contest Award Information, Inter-American Commission of Women, Organization of American States, Washington, D.C. 20006.

WHY DO WE NEED A STRONG NAVY?

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with our action today on the conference report of the military procurement bill, I feel it is important to remind my colleagues of the somewhat precarious position the Navy finds itself in today. I recently obtained a copy of a memorandum entitled "Why Do We Need a Strong Navy?" and I include it in the RECORD as a portion of my remarks:

WHY DO WE NEED A STRONG NAVY?

At the close of World War II, the U.S. Navy had 5,718 ships and 37,735 aircraft. As recently as 1968, there were 976 ships and 8,491 aircraft. At the end of this budget year (30 June 1974) there will be only 523 ships and 6,603 aircraft in the Navy's inventory.

While our Navy was shrinking the Soviet Navy has undertaken a dramatic period of fleet modernization and expansion. A major Soviet shipbuilding program has increased both the numbers and capabilities of their major warships—but more importantly, the character of the Soviet fleet has changed from a Navy committed to the defense of home waters to an ocean-ranging naval force capable of carrying the Soviet flag to all the seas of the world.

The high costs of the war in Vietnam and the heavy commitment of Navy ships to the Western Pacific prevented the investment of money in new ship construction needed to keep our fleet modern. Because of limited budgets it has been necessary to retire large numbers of aging hulls in favor of a smaller but younger fleet of ships equipped with modern weapons.

There are two major areas of concern for the Navy of the future. We must maintain a fully capable and credible nuclear deterrent, and we must have a naval force capable of facing the new Soviet fleet in a conventional war at sea wherever vital U.S. interests might be threatened.

On the side of strategic nuclear deterrence, we have to look to the day when our Polaris/Poseidon submarine fleet runs out of useful service life. The earliest Polaris subs built in the 1950's will reach the end of their service life in the late 1970's, and the entire Polaris fleet will eventually require replacement through the 1980's as the later subs exceed their twenty year life span. Why twenty years? Because a Polaris submarine hull operating at ocean depths almost continuously for twenty years is subjected to stresses and operating conditions far beyond those experienced by surface ship hulls. The high demands for hull strength under heavy sea pressures and crew safety do not allow the greater margin for failures that can be tolerated in surface ships.

Aside from the hull-life aspects, we have to consider the state of Soviet anti-submarine technology at the time these Polaris subs need replacement. We have no sure way of knowing just how fast the Soviets are progressing in their ability to locate and attack submarines. Our calculations on this progress are estimates based on what they are putting in their anti-submarine ships now, and our best guesses as to what they have coming and where they are placing their emphasis in anti-submarine research and development work.

It takes about ten years from the beginning of a major advance in technology to putting actual equipment in the fleet—for both of us. Since we have very little precise knowledge about the work underway in So-

viet research and development until finished hardware gets to their fleet, there is almost a ten-year time lag in our ability to react to any major technological breakthrough. We are left, therefore, with a very difficult prediction process in designing operating and survival capabilities into our new submarines—in an area where we can never afford to be second best.

Thus, the Trident system is a necessary technological advance to be sure we complicate the Soviet anti-submarine problem adequately to ensure this nation maintains a fully effective capability to react to a nuclear strike. At the same time we provide for the orderly replacement of our Polaris/Poseidon subs as they become overage.

Turning now to the problem of conventional war at sea, we are faced with the need to do much more with a lot less. In a world still far from stable, where the political and economic forces bring us in direct competition with the interests of other nations, there is no guarantee that all the influential players will limit their actions to honorable and peaceful measures. For the foreseeable future, ambitious nations will exercise some restraint in their pursuit of vital interests only when the penalties exceed the profits. Although such a world is not of our choosing, it will be tempered largely by the capabilities of the major nations to back up what they say or do.

To provide some added choices between nuclear response or submission, it will be of vital concern that we maintain the capacity for a range of actions appropriate to the size and nature of international problems, and that this capacity be visible, before the fact, so we are less apt to have to use it. In designing a Navy to safeguard our vital national interests we must not only have the capability to protect those interests, but that capability must be visible to others if we are to avoid being called out to prove it.

Thus, a leaner and more capable fleet that can live within the constraints of our national defense budget must have both the toughness and visible presence to discourage any potential troublemaker. With a Soviet fleet testing its deep sea legs on, under and above the oceans of the world, we must have the ability to meet them in each of these environments.

The high-low mix concept of U.S. naval forces was designed to fulfill these dual requirements of *real* and *visible* naval power. The high portion of this mix is to be made up of highly capable and more costly ships and aircraft that can project great striking power into an area where the full range of enemy threats (submarines, surface ships, aircraft and missiles) may be concentrated. These conditions dictate the carrier task force with the ability to move rapidly, strike with overpowering force and defend itself against enemy threat concentrations. The carrier, with its surface escorts and anti-submarine protection, is the only naval force in the world today that can bring this combination of striking power and survivable defense to bear in a high threat ocean area. Concerted Soviet reactions to the movements of our carrier forces are the best testimony of their high regard for the carrier's power.

At the low end of the mix are the less capable, lower cost naval ships needed in larger numbers to protect the sea lanes where the enemy threat is spread more thinly. These vital arteries of commerce in peacetime, and military support in wartime, carry the lifeblood of our nation. The economic vitality of the U.S. is dependent on the flow of energy and other raw materials to our shores, and finished products and food to the rest of the world. Ninety-nine percent of these materials must move in ships over the vast network of ocean trade routes. Largely beyond the range of effective shorebased attack or defense, these widespread shipping arteries necessarily thin out

the naval forces of both friend and enemy requiring greater numbers of smaller escorts to provide protection. If the enemy ever were to concentrate major forces in a selected open ocean area, our high threat task force would then be required to move in quickly to destroy or disperse his units.

The very basic and essential task of escorting maritime shipping, where the enemy would find it difficult to concentrate his forces effectively, is the job of the new family of Navy ships—the Sea Control Ship (or mini-carrier), and the smaller destroyer escorts. With the capability to fend off submarines, surface raiders, aircraft and missiles in smaller numbers, this new generation of escort ship give reasonable assurance that the flow of seaborne materials will get through.

The final major segment of needed naval capabilities is the ability to project military forces ashore. While our recent Vietnam experience has made this prospect rather sensitive with many Americans, it would be a serious over-sight to ignore the important role it has played in many areas of the world over our history, and the importance it can have in the future. The proximate ability to put U.S. troops ashore in a troubled area has prevented many tense situations from developing into full blown hostilities in the past (e.g. Lebanon, Jordan, Dominican Republic and Suez crises). Modern 20-knot amphibious assault forces, to be augmented by the new LHA helo assault ships now under construction, are prime elements of this essential capability to exert persuasive U.S. presence and influence in distant trouble spots.

An important secondary role of these smaller but numerous amphibious and escort ships is to contribute to the worldwide visibility, or presence of U.S. seapower—the visible strength mentioned earlier. The Soviet Navy has shown a great awareness of the importance of naval presence around the world; a lesson we should heed and understand, and indeed one which we taught them.

As naval warfare has always been an arena where mobility—or rapid movement—is at a premium, the longer range future of our fleet will require greater speeds and faster reactions. The technology of hydrofoil and surface effects ships is here—only the applications require development. A significant part of the U.S. Navy research and development effort is being directed toward the refinement of hydrofoil and surface effects concepts and designs. It is entirely feasible that major warships of this century will be able to make ocean transits and fight at speeds above 80 miles per hour traveling on the cushion—or "surface effect"—of a bubble of air.

The U.S. Navy of the next decade and beyond is planned for world conditions that are not hypothetical—they are present and real. Both the capabilities and expressed intentions of the Soviets to extend their naval influence across the oceans of the world are present and real. Our political and economic dependence on the seas are also present and real. The question facing us is not *if* we must cope with these factors, but rather *how* we must cope with these factors!

The Trident submarine, nuclear carrier, carrier escorts, sea control and ocean escort shipbuilding programs are vital elements of the Navy's plan to cope with these factors, as the F-14 air superiority fighter was planned to give our carrier forces the ability to fight and survive in an area of high air missile threats.

THE GATEWAY CARGO CONFERENCE

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1973, the Civil Aeronautics Board issued an invitation to U.S. and foreign airlines to inaugurate international air cargo service on a "flag-stop" basis at Bangor, Maine. In order to hasten the day when Maine area shippers and industry will enjoy direct air cargo service to Europe and the Orient, the Gateway Cargo Conference was held recently in Bangor, Maine. The conference, under the sponsorship of Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis, promoted the magnificent Bangor International Airport as an international air cargo terminal. It was attended by representatives of airlines from all over the world. The featured speaker was the Honorable Robert T. Murphy, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who has long been a strong supporter of improved air service in the New England States, and whose expertise has been of great assistance to our State. I wish to place Mr. Murphy's remarks in the RECORD:

CITY OF BANGOR, MAINE—CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

This certificate awarded to the Honorable Robert T. Murphy, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, in recognition of and appreciation for his leadership and concern for the preservation and development of Bangor International Airport.

Recognizing that additional airport facilities are necessary on the East Coast, he has consistently with his national responsibilities as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, encouraged and advised the City in its efforts to bring Bangor International Airport into the main stream of the national air transportation program.

JOHN J. MOONEY,
Chairman of the Council.
MERLE F. GOFF,
City Manager.

REMARKS BY HON. ROBERT T. MURPHY, MEMBER, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BANGOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, GATEWAY CARGO CONFERENCE LUNCHEON, BANGOR, MAINE, SEPTEMBER 20, 1973

It is a true privilege to be here again among my friends in Maine on the occasion of this important Gateway Cargo Conference. I want you to know that it is not a sense of duty that compels my appearance before you today. Rather, I come willingly, prompted by a sense of pleasure at being invited by Governor Ken Curtis, to help in something in which I firmly believe. I believe in this airport and in you, the people who are making it go. In my view, Bangor International Airport is a national air transportation asset and anything we can do to properly enhance its utilization is truly a contribution to the national interest.

I have been up here several times in the past few years. As we meet today I cannot help but recall the pleasure of my participation in the dedication of your impressive and functional new terminal building in April 1972. Among those present and sharing in the ceremonies that happy day was the late Chester M. Wiggin of New Hampshire who was then the Federal Co-Chairman of the New England Regional Commission and who was destined later to become a Member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It

was Chet Wiggin who, more than any single individual in the Federal Government, was responsible for the appropriate grants of federal funds that made this terminal building a reality. His untimely and tragic death has deprived us of the potential benefits of his continued guidance and valued contribution to the solutions of New England's manifold transportation problems. I know that I speak for all of you when I say that so long as this airport continues to exist and prosper, his memory will ever remain green in this, his neighboring State of Maine.

Before saying any more, I want to congratulate you, Governor Curtis, and all the Maine officials present here, especially Peter D'Errico, the competent Manager of BIA and Merle Goff, your energetic and competent City Manager, for scheduling this event. It seems to me that this Gateway Cargo Conference was a stroke of promotional genius both in its timing and in its execution. I trust that it will succeed in focusing appropriate attention of transportation experts on the excellence of the product which you have to sell, namely, the superb facilities and unique location of Bangor International Airport. You have endeavored to bring together in one place many of the people and the companies most likely to benefit from the special advantages found here. Scheduling this conference is just another manifestation of the type of self-starting, aggressive and cooperative effort which you, Governor Curtis, Congressman Bill Cohen (your former Mayor), and the people in this part of Maine have exercised in promoting this airport from the day in 1968 when it was deactivated as an Air Force Base.

Since that time you have literally moved heaven and earth in your single-minded determination to exploit the facility not only for the benefit of the people of Bangor and the economy of Maine but also, in the final analysis, for the benefit of this nation's trade and commerce generally. No chronology of your effort is needed here but I recall the first visit of Governor Curtis to the Board which brought forth the study by our staff on the feasibility of establishing Bangor International Airport as an international gateway. As you know, that study concluded that the establishment of a flag-stop cargo service at Bangor would be a sensible beginning and could enable Maine area shippers and consignees to receive the first true North Atlantic cargo service. Subsequently, in March 1973, the whole Board and many of our staff heard the forceful plea by your Governor for Board action. In this endeavor he was joined by Mayor John Mooney, City Manager Merle Goff, Congressman Bill Cohen and representatives of both Senator Muskie and Senator Hathaway.

Following this effective presentation, at my urging and with the complete cooperation of my colleague, Chairman Bob Timm, Vice Chairman Whitney Gilliland and Member Joe Minetti, the Board issued a press release inviting U.S. and foreign airlines to apply to the Board for authority to operate flag-stop cargo service at Bangor. To facilitate and encourage such applications from foreign carriers, it was emphasized that no reciprocal rights would be required from foreign governments for U.S. airlines in exchange.

Seaboard World Airlines, to its everlasting credit, came forth on August 23 with the first application for cargo authority. That application was promptly supported by persuasive briefs filed on behalf of Bangor by your able Washington counsel, Cecil A. Beasley, Jr., and on behalf of the State of Maine by our former distinguished General Counsel, Joe Goldman. In that connection I am pleased to announce that today, in Washington, the Board has issued a formal order directing all interested persons to show cause why Seaboard should not be granted this authority. Pursuant to this expedited proceeding, therefore, and in the absence of any unforeseen impediment, this outstanding

cargo carrier should soon be authorized by the Board to serve your city.

It is fitting that Seaboard World Airlines should be the first to request this special authority and it is in the interest of Bangor and the United States transportation industry alike that they have initiated this forward step. Seaboard enjoys an enviable reputation. It is our first and only scheduled all-cargo flag carrier on the North Atlantic and we at the Board know them as efficient, hard working specialists in the area of air cargo and freight operations. They carry the U.S. flag with pride and ability into every major cargo terminal in Europe. Their certificated routes extend to numerous cargo centers in the United States. Some time ago, as evidence of their commitment to aggressively develop air cargo, Seaboard chose to operate independently of the IATA rate conferences and with great courage has been able to maintain its position of pre-eminence on the North Atlantic with consequent benefits for shippers and users of its special services. If the cargo traffic is there, Seaboard will find it. You can count on that. Perhaps there will be others, both U.S. and foreign flag carriers, who will respond to the Board's initiative.

An important aspect of the Board's Press Release which I am not certain has been fully appreciated is that the offer of Bangor is not limited to all-cargo flights. Rather U.S. and foreign carriers will be permitted to operate combination aircraft (that is, aircraft carrying both passengers and cargo) into and out of Bangor for the purpose of enplaning or deplaning cargo (they could not of course originate or terminate passengers at Bangor). It is very possible, therefore, that a number of carriers may wish to take advantage of your excellent customs clearance procedures for passengers (available on a 24-hour a day basis) while they are loading or unloading cargo traffic at Bangor. The point I want to make is that not only the cargo carriers but also the far more numerous combination carriers can put down at Bangor for cargo. It is these carriers with their cavernous belly spaces ready for containers who carry a large share of the cargo moving by air. I expect that as time goes on Bangor will be able to tap this additional source of traffic.

I am convinced that reasonable traffic is available to support cargo operations at Bangor. It remains only to be developed. I truly believe that the accessibility of this new direct service, plus the resources at hand in the fields and factories and waters of Maine, plus the strong will of Maine's people, will generate new traffic opportunities for this deserving area.

Bangor has another significant advantage in attracting cargo which has received little attention. I refer to the potential rate advantage. It is possible that Bangor may in the future be able to offer the lowest rates of any point in the United States for cargo to and from Europe. Bangor is only 3,079 air miles from London. New York is 3,452 air miles or 12 percent further than Bangor. The IATA ratemaking system currently in effect does not fully recognize the advantage resulting from Bangor's favorable location. Under this system, I am informed by our staff that a 250 pound shipment moving from Bangor to London under the general commodity rates would cost the shipper \$203.25. In our decision on February 6 of this year in the *IATA North Atlantic Cargo Rates Case*, the Board concluded that the present rate system unduly prefers New York and unduly prejudices certain other named gateway cities in the United States. In that case we directed the carriers to file tariffs with the Board which were based upon the operated mileage between U.S. gateway points and points in Europe computed at the New York-European point-to-point rate per mile. Under the principles of this decision, if applied to Bangor and if the mileage used is the actual nonstop mileage between Bangor

and London of 3,079 miles (assuming Seaboard or some other carrier begins nonstop operations in the market) the rate for the same general commodity shipment of 250 pounds, I am informed, would drop from \$203.25 to \$165.80. This would compare with a rate of \$185 for the same shipment from New York to London—giving Bangor a rate advantage of nearly \$20 over New York. In addition, the application of the principles of this case to Bangor would make available to Bangor all specific commodity rates applicable to New York, but upon this same rate per-mile basis.

I cannot promise you that these rates will necessarily occur. The tariffs filed to implement our February decision have not yet been evaluated by the Board and as yet no nonstop cargo flights are in operation between Bangor and Europe. In my view, however, a rate differential such as I have described would reasonably reflect the superiority enjoyed by Bangor as a result of its fortunate location geographically closer to Europe than any other major U.S. point.

I want to tell you also about a recent development in our aviation negotiations with Canada that could be good news for Bangor International Airport. Some time ago representatives of the State of Maine and the City of Bangor, ever vigilant for new opportunities for the airport, came to the Board with the suggestion for a new air route between the Maritime Provinces of Canada via Montreal and Bangor. This was later expanded to include Portland. This was not an illogical proposal since a Canadian carrier serves between these Canadian points and regularly transits the air space over the State of Maine. We requested the State Department to put the idea before the Canadians pointing out that there was some Bangor-Canada air traffic which must now travel circuitously via Boston or by air taxi or surface modes. While it was thought that the volume of traffic would not warrant scheduled services by a U.S. carrier, it was believed that it might be sufficient to warrant a traffic stop by a Canadian carrier which is engaged in transporting cabotage traffic between its provinces while transiting the airways in close proximity to these two points in Maine. Thus, besides traffic between Montreal and Bangor and between the Maritime Provinces and Bangor, such a carrier could also transport internal Canadian traffic which has both its origin and destination in Canada. The State Department agreed with the Board's request and eventually so did the Canadians.

Accordingly, within the past few weeks, as a part of a much larger exchange of traffic rights between our two governments, this country granted the immediate right to designate a Canadian airline to serve Bangor on a Halifax-Bangor-Portland-Montreal route. If good fortune prevails, and with some promotion of the type you have displayed here, we may soon see the Canadian Maple Leaf of the empenage of aircraft flying in and out of Bangor International Airport on a regular basis. While I would be proud to claim credit for bringing this new service opportunity to Bangor, I must defer in this case to our team of able negotiators and the Canadian representatives who perceived the merits of the idea and acted promptly upon it.

In conclusion, let me say that the past few years have witnessed the achievement of notable milestones in aviation progress in Bangor. First, your new terminal building, a most modern and efficient building, is a reality; in due course the International Arrivals Building will likewise follow. Second, new service authority for flag-stop cargo service has been achieved and an outstanding U.S. carrier is ready to devote its efforts to developing it. Third, there are potential benefits of an advantageous competitive cargo rate flowing from the principles of the Board's decision in the *IATA North Atlantic Cargo Rates Case* and finally, there is the avail-

ability of a new route opportunity for a Canadian carrier to link Bangor with Montreal and Halifax.

That is a record in which you can take great pride. I am glad to have had the opportunity to be around long enough to be of some assistance in its formulation and realization. I know that as far as you are concerned, and I am sure that as far as the Civil Aeronautics Board is concerned, this represents nothing more than a solid beginning of new and greater horizons for air transportation in this part of the country. May success and good fortune continue to attend your ongoing efforts.

SPIRO T. AGNEW

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Star contains two editorials that are particularly thought provoking. I insert them for the interest of those who read the RECORD:

AGNEW: DAMNED LIES AND ENVELOPES
(By Smith Hempstone)

In the end, his name did indeed become a household word.

Spiro T. Agnew, who once helped his immigrant father peddle vegetables in the streets of Baltimore and rose to become the vice president of the United States, who had branded the charges "a pack of damned lies," ended up, after a sordid plea-bargaining session in a motel room, admitting to having cheated on his income taxes.

That lantern jaw, that distinguished grey hair, that erect carriage . . . and all those hundred-dollar bills in plain envelopes delivered by gently sweating contractors expecting just a bit of quid—a bridge here, a tunnel there—for all that greenbacked quo.

Of course, as he put it to the court, his acceptance of money "was part of a long-established pattern of political fund-raising" in Maryland. Everybody does it. Well, everybody does not do it and those who get caught doing it seldom get off as lightly as Agnew. They go to prison.

Sure, it is easy to say that he had not had the advantages of Elliot Richardson, the man who nailed his political hide to the wall. Agnew never got to the Milton Academy, let alone Harvard, and when Felix Frankfurter was looking for a law clerk, it was not Agnew he chose.

Agnew's name and church were wrong (his father shortened the first, Spiro changed the second). He went to all the wrong schools. As Richardson was leaving Frankfurter to join a prestigious Boston law firm, Agnew who had failed as a lawyer and insurance adjuster, was working in a supermarket.

Sure, Baltimore County politics are Byzantine and greasy-palmed and the name of the game is to get yours while you can. Sure, he had money problems—who doesn't?—but did his palm itch so furiously that he just had to scratch all the way into the vice president's office? While he was extolling all the old virtues, was it really necessary for him to indulge in the oldest of all political vices?

The blow is the more severe because, amidst the stench and ugliness of Watergate, Agnew at least appeared to be clean, if only because nobody in the administration ever told him anything about anything.

The public—or at least a considerable portion of it—loved Agnew in a way that it could never love his introverted President. While on occasion he could be unkind or unfair, more frequently he told it like it was, giving hell to people (including the press) who on occasion very much deserved just that. He

was, to the Silent Majority which worshipped him, an alliterative hero who, like them, bounced tennis serves off his partner's head, watched football on television, worried about POWs. And still those plain brown envelopes kept piling up.

In private, Agnew was likable, thoughtful, articulate and far more moderate than in his public sallies. And you remembered that this was the man who in 1968, when it was not easy in a border state, supported open housing and fair employment practices and a heavy investment in the public school system. And all the time, regular as sin, those plain brown envelopes kept coming.

There are those among his supporters who claim that Agnew was hounded out of office by a hostile press, or that he fell victim to some nefarious White House plot. This is not true. No newspaper reporter urged him to cheat on his income tax. No White House aide suggested that there should be something off the top for the boys when contractors did business with the State of Maryland. He may not, as he claimed on television Monday night, have "initiated" the practice. But he participated in it, and those he described as "bribe-brokers" were for many years his closest associates.

Agnew, in short, was the sole author of his own venality. And so the dream becomes a nightmare, for him, for his family, for the supporters he let down. The shades are drawn at the big fieldstone house at the corner of Sunset and Shadow, a house that cost \$190,000, which is a lot of "term papers," as the "bribe-brokers" called those plain brown envelopes stuffed with cash.

And the shades are drawn, too, on the career of Spiro Agnew, the Greek who did not beware of those who came bearing gifts. He is left with Frank Sinatra, a "Dear Ted" letter from the President and his freedom. Those who believed in him have less: their sorrow and a gut-knotting sense of betrayal.

MONEY PLAYER DROPS OUT
(By Frank Getlein)

An awful lot of the public comment on the former vice president's copping a plea and beating the rap last week left the listener with a curious feeling that the people making the comment were talking about someone else.

The words "tragedy" and "tragic" were banded about rather freely, for instance. The only apparent grounds for this application of those noble words are that Spiro Agnew is of Greek descent and the Greeks invented tragedy as a form of dramatic literature.

The Agnew Story—which might well be made into a movie of that name by Frank Sinatra Enterprises, Inc.—is the story of a hopelessly venal local politician whose small-time shakedowns of government contractors eventually became known and drove him from a public office he never was remotely qualified to occupy.

Tragedy as invented by those other Greeks had to do with a great and good man brought to ruin by a tragic flaw in his character. Presumably even Sinatra would not seriously describe Agnew as a great and good man. Being on the take as a contract-letting politician is not a tragic flaw; it's just being a crook.

Even more baffling was the effort on the part of right-wing commentators to salvage the attacks on the press by which Agnew so rapidly and raffishly made his name a household word.

Of these right-wingers, the most extreme has been former Agnew speech-writer William Safire, of the once-hated New York Times, who so lost contact with the daily news as to describe Agnew—even now—as a man who "stood for principle." By that standard, Al Capone and Jimmy Walker stood for principle, too, the principle being the same in all three cases: Get it while the getting is good, it may not be there tomorrow.

Agnew was no more conservative than he was liberal. In fact, he was elected as a liberal to the governorship of Maryland and thus to both the boodle bonanza that has now brought him down and the launching pad to the vice presidency.

As between liberalism and conservatism, he made no choice at all. He went where the money was. On the record, if Joseph Stalin had shown up looking for a state contract, Joseph Stalin would have gotten the state contract, provided only that he reported to the governor's office—and later the vice president's—to drop off the requisite number of "papers," a "paper" in this special usage being one thousand smackers.

The issue of the press is particularly subject to revisionism following the fall of Agnew.

In spite of Safire's fond recollection, the Agnew message on the press never was very clear at the time he was making it. He rarely named names, which is what you do if you are serious about things. Still less did he cite chapter and verse, which is what you do if you hope to indict, as the Justice Department has recently reminded him.

Agnew could have said, this story, published in this newspaper on this date, falsely reported this news and unjustifiably drew these false inferences from its false report.

Right up to the day of his fall, he never did that. He merely wandered on about the nattering nabobs of negativism and the hopeless, hysterical hypochondriacs of history, phrases of which Safire seems proud, for some reason, as their coauthor.

No one even mildly familiar with the American press and American television would maintain for a moment that they are without fault. Indeed, both press and television stand high on the list of American institutions in need of critical examination—though perhaps not quite as high, one may venture to suggest, as the system by which vice presidents are chosen, the system by which state contracts are awarded, and the system by which presidential campaigns for re-election are financed. Since there never was any substance to Agnew's campaign against the press, never any chapter and verse, the message of that campaign does not survive the exposure of its author as a crook.

On the contrary, in view of the total lack of substance, the resolute refusal of Agnew ever to say specifically what he was talking about in the press, the reasonable assumption has to be that he really was talking about his own constant fear that the press might at any moment find out and print what he had been up to in Maryland contract-letting and his consequent prudent determination to discredit that testimony in advance.

THE SALE OF WHEAT TO THE SOVIET UNION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following Washington Report to my constituents:

THE SALE OF WHEAT TO THE SOVIET UNION

Last year's sale of one quarter of the U.S. wheat crop to the Soviet Union was widely hailed as a trading and diplomatic achievement. It was to be a bonanza for the hard-pressed American farmer, a boost for the nation's sagging balance of payments, and a

giant step toward improving Soviet-American relations.

The perspective of several months has changed that rosy assessment. The wheat sale may have been a boon for half a dozen U.S. grain dealers and the Soviets, but it was not much of a deal for the U.S. taxpayer or the farmer. Even Secretary of Treasury George Schultz, the President's top economic advisor, has acknowledged that the U.S. was "burned" in the sale.

The large sale of wheat to the Russians caused a dramatic rise in the price of wheat, cost the U.S. government over \$300 million in subsidies, tied up transportation facilities, left the U.S. with a tight supply of wheat, and drove up prices for bread, meat, poultry and dairy products. The sale did have some beneficial impact on the balance of trade, farm income, and relations with the Soviet Union.

Nonetheless, the Agriculture Department badly mismanaged the sale, converting a potentially good deal into a bad one. Officials ignored early signs that the Soviets would have to purchase massive amounts of U.S. grain. They failed to monitor the purchases of grain by the Soviets from several U.S. grain companies. They failed to move quickly to stop U.S. export subsidies for the grain companies. And, even when the size of the purchase became known, they failed to put more U.S. farm land into production to increase supplies.

The Congress is now trying to determine how a Soviet team of trade experts could buy up 11 million tons of the U.S. wheat crop from several grain companies without the Department of Agriculture, or anyone else, knowing what they were doing, or what impact the sale would have on the cost and supply of the nation's food.

Several conclusions are already apparent: 1. Department of Agriculture officials knew, or should have known, of the amount of grain being sold.

2. The \$300 million subsidy was not necessary to promote the sale because the U.S. was the only source of supply for the Soviet Union.

3. The Russians bought the wheat for an unreasonably low price in view of world conditions, and the probability is that they would have paid a lot more for it.

4. Farmers were not provided timely information, available to others, to help them make market decisions and the denial was costly to them.

5. Consumers have paid higher prices because of the sale.

The question now is what can be done to prevent similar mistakes in the future. The wheat export subsidy program must be comprehensively evaluated, revised and monitored to prohibit excess profits and to assure reasonable subsidy levels. Procedures must be developed for transactions involving huge purchases by other countries. The Congress has recently enacted a law to require grain exporters to file weekly reports of their sales. Farmers must be given accurate and timely information, with appropriate interpretations, to help them with marketing decisions. And, the advantage of agricultural exports must be weighed against their impact on the price and supply of the commodity at home.

At a time of major change in U.S. trade patterns and high prices and limited supplies of food, the wheat sale has made many Americans skeptical toward exports of American agricultural products. In my view, the unfavorable experience of the Soviet wheat sale should not turn us away from foreign trade, but only make us more wary. Trade in agricultural products is a bright spot in the U.S. economy, and, if properly managed, can help us combat inflation, increase jobs, encourage the best use of resources, and promote a peaceful and prosperous world.

THE NEED TO RETURN TO A FREE ENTERPRISE ECONOMY

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more obvious every day that economic controls have been a failure. These controls have shackled our economy and have distorted the operation of our marketplace. We need to get back to a supply and demand economy. I was pleased to join as a cosponsor of a bill to repeal the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970. This repeal would be an important step in returning to a free enterprise economy.

I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Down With National Priorities" by Arthur S. Mode which appeared in the September 1973, issue of *The Freeman*. It states the important lesson of a free enterprise economy based on individual choice over that of a government controlled economy.

The article follows:

DOWN WITH NATIONAL PRIORITIES

(By Arthur S. Mode)

There is a great deal of talk about "re-ordering our national priorities," and insistence that the public must speak up and be heard. Seldom identified is the fact that the concept of "national priorities" refers to objects of government spending. Seldom noted is the fact that consumers, acting privately in a free market place, always have had a choice of priorities. Whenever a person chooses product A over product B, he is ordering his priorities. Only busybodies try to tell their friends what the latter's priorities—tastes, values, preferences—should be. Therefore, the whole notion of setting "national priorities" reduces us, in effect, to a nation of busybodies.

The concept of "national priorities" implies that a choice exists between governmental functions of unequal importance. When government is restricted to its proper functions—the police function, the judicial function, and providing for the defense of the country—there can be no question of "priorities." Each of these functions is equally necessary if the preservation of individual rights is to be more than a slogan. The army, the police, and the courts are all equally indispensable for such protection. To ask citizens to compare in importance these three functions with other government activities—for example, the police function versus the development of a mass transit system—is to miss the difference between the essential and the nonessential, between jobs that *must* be done by government to carry out its purpose and jobs that could just as well be done by private enterprise, with no loss of individual rights (with a gain in fact).

Note that the need for police, judicial, and military services is, by the nature of the adversary, limited. But when the government is funding a whole raft of economic, social, educative, and health programs, where the goals are always, by their nature, unlimited and nebulous (for example, "a decent life for every American"), there can never be enough resources available to fund all of them as much as their backers would like, so some have to be funded less than others. But by what standard should the "mores" be selected? Answer: there can be no reasonable standard for selecting one over the other, because there is no common denominator by

which to measure the relative values of such diverse endeavors as, say, cancer research and the Tennessee Valley Authority. So, arbitrary standards must be used.

One way of picking priorities is to have an autocratic leader, but Americans have traditionally shunned overt totalitarians. A variation of autocracy is unlimited majority rule—democracy—with dictatorial powers wielded by "the 51 per cent" rather than by the individual leader. Again, Americans traditionally have had too much respect for the rights of the minority to permit unlimited majority rule. Another way of selecting is by continual tests of strength between vying special interest groups. This is what we have now. Less politely, we have gang warfare between different groups, each with a vested interest in government funds. Medical researchers lament when "their" funds are threatened. Welfare rights groups lament any diminution of "their" funds. And so it goes. Of course, they do more than lament: they issue frightening forecasts, demonstrate, occupy buildings, start legal suits, and the like. In time, the politically strongest groups get their desires met first. This necessarily leaves many other groups (or nonorganized individuals) with their desires for public funds unmet. Therefore, the initial idea of giving the entire public a voice in setting "national priorities" is doomed to defeat. Some voices will be heeded, others will not. This is inevitable under our present system.

Therefore, I say: down with "national priorities"; up with individual priorities! In the free and competitive market place, all voices can be heard. Each citizen arranges his own preferences, but not his neighbor's. No one has his choices overridden by stronger political pressure groups. For instance, a worker who wants to buy an automobile doesn't have to cancel his order because the mass transit lobby convinced legislators to make mass transit a "national priority," resulting in higher taxes that left the worker with insufficient funds to buy the car.

In that case, the government can devote itself wholly to its three essential functions. It can serve simply as an umbrella, protecting us from the reign of force and fraud, as each of us pursues his own brand of happiness.

FULL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FOR ALL FEDERALLY ELECTED OFFICIALS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, it does not take a great deal of imagination to understand the position in which the Nation's elected officials and political leaders find themselves today. All of us—from the President, to Members of the Congress, and even to the mayor of the smallest American town—are under a deep and dark cloud of suspicion because of the seemingly unending series of events beginning with the Watergate break-in. Simply put, Mr. Speaker, the American people do not trust us any more.

This is not surprising. Have we forgotten the results of a poll conducted a few years ago which showed that out of 20 major professions and occupations, the only group trusted by the American people less than politicians was used car salesmen. Recently, the same poll was

taken again, and the results are not too difficult to understand. Politicians now are trusted the least. We are 20th in the poll.

Regardless of whether or not the public's lack of confidence and trust in us is unwarranted, the fact is that it is there. It goes without saying, therefore, that we have a long road back to regain this lost trust and respect. So I am introducing legislation today which I believe will start us on this tortuous but necessary trip. The bill is designed to promote new and desperately needed trust in the office of the President, that of the Vice President and in the Congress.

Essentially, the bill would require Members of the Congress, the President, the Vice President, and candidates for these offices to make an annual public disclosure of their personal Federal income tax returns for the preceding 3 years. This would be required by the end of April, well before any election. In addition these officeholders and candidates for office would be required to file a sworn statement outlining all other income they received, including the source, nature, and amount of such income. They would also be required to file an annual statement describing the value of all their tangible real and personal property, the amount and source of their outstanding loans, and the extent of their participation in any business venture.

Mr. Speaker, it has always been my view that one of the primary reasons we now find ourselves so deeply distrusted by the people is the influence large campaign contributors have on elections and on elected officials themselves. My bill would seek to lessen this influence. I feel we must insist on the type of disclosure required under this bill if we are to regain the public's trust and confidence. Voters are entitled to know not only who finances the campaign but from whom the candidate receives income and to whom the candidate owes money.

I realize that these requirements are a major and disconcerting intrusion on the privacy of candidates and elected officials. But elected officials do the business of the public. They are public people and if the burdens and obligations of public office are too burdensome and irritating, they should remain private citizens and not seek or hold public office.

Earlier I mentioned that as Members of the Congress and as part of the political community in general, we have a great deal to do and a great distance to travel in rebuilding America's confidence in us. The bill I am introducing today will not do this by itself. But it is a beginning and I hope that the several States will also enact similar legislation in an effort to build the credibility of elected officials and the political process at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that it is up to the Congress to establish leadership in the area of campaign and political reform. I believe it up to the Congress to lead us back. I believe that in enacting this bill, the Congress will be taking the necessary first step in what promises to be a journey of a thousand miles.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the bill follows:

H.R. 11001

A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress by providing for public disclosure of Federal income tax returns by the President and Vice President and Members of Congress and candidates for each such office, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Elective Officeholders Disclosure of Income and Assets Act".

SEC. 2. (a) Each Member of Congress who reports his income to the Federal Government for income tax purposes on a calendar year basis shall file with the Secretary of the Senate of the United States or the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, as the case may be, by the 30th day of April of each year, a certified copy of his Federal income tax return for the preceding three calendar years. If he does not report his income to the Federal Government for income tax purposes on a calendar year basis, but rather on the basis of a different taxable year he shall file said certified copy of his Federal income tax return with said officials within fifteen days of the time he files said return with the Internal Revenue Service. Each candidate for Congress of the United States shall file his Federal income tax return for the preceding three years with the same official of the appropriate House within 15 days of his qualifying as a candidate for such office.

(b) Each President and Vice President of the United States who reports his income to the Federal Government for income tax purposes on a calendar year basis shall file with the Secretary of the Treasury by the 30th day of April of each year, a certified copy of his Federal income tax return for the preceding three calendar years. If the President or Vice President does not report his income to the Federal Government for income tax purposes on a calendar year basis, but rather on the basis of a different taxable year, he shall file such certified copy of his Federal income tax return with the Secretary of the Treasury within fifteen days of the time he files such return with the Internal Revenue Service. Each candidate for the office of President and Vice President shall file his Federal income tax return for the preceding three years with the Secretary of the Treasury within fifteen days of his qualifying as a candidate for such office.

SEC. 3. If any such Member of Congress or the President or Vice President has received any additional income from any source during said calendar year or other taxable year which is not reported on said Federal income tax return, he shall file a separate sworn statement of such additional income at the same time and in the same manner as he files the certified copy of his income tax return provided for in section 2. Such separate sworn statement shall identify the source, nature, and amount of such additional income received, listing each source and the amount received from such source separately.

SEC. 4. (a) (1) Each Member of Congress shall file with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, as the case may be, by the sixtieth day beginning after the date of enactment of this Act and at one year intervals thereafter, a statement containing the information described in subsection (b). Each candidate for Congress shall file the same information with the same official of the appropriate House within fifteen days of his qualifying as a candidate for such office.

(2) Each President and Vice President of the United States shall file, by the sixtieth day beginning after the date of enactment

of this Act and at one year intervals thereafter, a statement containing the information described in subsection (b). Each candidate for the office of President and Vice President shall file the same information with the Secretary of the Treasury within fifteen days of his qualifying as a candidate for such office.

(b) Each individual referred to in subsection (a) shall include the following information in any statement filed under such subsection:

- (1) the value of his home or homes;
- (2) the value of any other real property of his;
- (3) the value of any motor vehicle of his;
- (4) the value of any life insurance policy he holds and the name of the insurer;
- (5) the amount of money he has invested in any retirement fund and an identification of the fund;
- (6) the amount of money he holds in any account or deposit with any bank, mutual savings bank, savings and loan company, or credit union, or any other financial institution; and the name of any such institution;
- (7) the current market value of any stocks and bonds he holds and the name of the company issuing any such stocks and bonds, and the name of the broker from whom they were purchased;
- (8) the current market value of any funds invested in any regulated investment company, and the name of the company;
- (9) participation of any kind by him in any regulated investment company, business partnership, real estate investment trust, or other company;
- (10) the amount and terms of any loans he has outstanding;
- (11) any other miscellaneous tangible property owned by him;
- (12) and any other financial information about him which the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, considers necessary in order to carry out this Act.

(c) The Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury may promulgate rules in order to carry out this Act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall—

(a) maintain documents filed under sections 2 and 4 in such manner that they shall be available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours; and

(b) preserve such documents for public inspection during the term or terms of office and during the period of his candidacy, for such office, of the individual filing the same and for two years thereafter.

SEC. 6. Whoever knowingly and willfully violates any of the provisions of section 2, 3, or 4 of this Act shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

DANGERS FACE CHILDREN ON HALLOWEEN NIGHT

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks from tonight on Halloween, millions of children across America will venture forth for the traditional tricks and treats. Unfortunately, a number of these children will be injured in accidents that

could possibly be avoided. The Consumer Product Safety Commission has just issued some very sound advice to parents as to precautions that can be taken to protect their children.

I intend to send the Commission's warnings to the media in my district so that my constituents can be alerted to the possible dangers awaiting their children. I would also like to share them with my colleagues at this point by inserting them in the RECORD.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION ADVISES PARENTS TO TAKE CARE ON HALLOWEEN

WASHINGTON, D.C. (October 19).—Little goblins and witches, pirates and princesses may be interested only in Halloween tricks and treats, but the Consumer Product Safety Commission urges parents to follow special precautions to insure a safe Halloween.

Costumes are a major concern. Whether purchased or made at home, they should be fire resistant. In stores, look for "Flameproof" labels on costumes, masks, beards and wigs. If making a costume, avoid flimsy materials and outfits with big, baggy sleeves or billowing skirts.

Costumes should be short enough so that children won't trip on them. Also, they should be light or bright enough to make them clearly visible to motorists on dimly lighted residential streets. Even witches can wear reflective tape sewn onto their gowns or carry flashlights.

Masks or other disguises should not restrict vision or breathing. Plastic bags over faces can cause suffocation. A natural mask of cosmetics or charcoal applied directly to the skin is usually safest.

Halloween wouldn't be right without pumpkins, but don't set a candle-light pumpkin on a doorstep where children's costumes might brush against it. Indoors, be sure it is not near curtains or other furnishings that could burn.

Children should never be allowed to carry candles or any other open flame, even if it is inside a pumpkin.

The Commission also advises parents to follow these safety guidelines:

Young children out trick-or-treating should always be accompanied by a responsible older person and should be kept in constant sight;

Tell youngsters to avoid running across lawns or backyards because they can trip over lawn ornaments or run into clotheslines that are almost invisible in the dark;

Remind children of everyday safety rules, such as not dashing out between parked cars;

Children should not eat any of the treats they collect until they have been carefully examined by an adult. Pins, razor blades, slivers of glass, drugs, and poison have been found in treats passed out by real life ghouls.

Finally, if you are driving on Halloween, take special care. Watch out for trick-or-treaters who will be too busy to watch out for you.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission is an independent Federal regulatory agency created by Congress to reduce unreasonable risks of injury associated with consumer products.

RURAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks before the House on January 29

of this year, I strongly urged the passage of H.R. 2107, a bill to reinstate the rural environmental assistance program. As you know, this program had been arbitrarily terminated by the administration late last December.

Now, both the House and Senate have funded a new rural environmental assistance program for 1974 as part of the agriculture, environmental and consumer protection appropriations. I have reason to believe the Secretary of Agriculture is fully prepared to field a REAP program for 1974. But the question is, what kind of program will it be? Under the current administration, various restrictions initiated by the Agriculture Department have seriously hindered the implementation of the program as Congress intended. Much of the local county ASCS committees' authority has been eroded by dictums from Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is time to let this program do its work by untying the hands of the local farmer-elected committeemen and county ASCS officials. The conferees report on H.R. 8619 clearly states that the county committees are to maintain the authority to determine local practices under REAP and that they should not be dismissed "arbitrarily" in the due course of discharging their duties. In this regard, I have sent a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture urging that the intent of this Congress be carried out. I would like permission to include the text of that letter in the RECORD at this time.

HON. EARL L. BUTZ,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The present Administration has firmly committed itself to the job of cleaning up our nation's environment. Great progress is being made. There is, of course, much more to be done. The Rural Environmental Assistance Program (REAP) represents a truly economical and time-tested conservation program. I know of no other program in which the tax payers' dollar is better spent to clean up the environment since it is the only pollution abatement program in which the federal dollar is matched at a 50-50, or higher, ratio by participating farmers.

REAP can significantly reduce the problems of deteriorating water quality at the major source—our agricultural areas. We all know that soil is the greatest single pollutant of our nation's waters. According to USDA estimates, we lose some 4 billion tons of soil each year to the waterways. This cannot continue. Proven practices in REAP can curb these losses but only if the farmers have the authority and the adequate funds to do the job.

There is no one better qualified to clean up the rural environment than the farmer. He was an ecologist even before the word became popular. The farmer is close to the soil and the water and can recognize the measures that are needed to conserve them. Elected farmers at the county level serve as the local administrators for REAP. They determine the needs for various environmental controls in the local areas.

In support of this system, the House and Senate Conference Report of H.R. 8619, The Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriations, again reiterated Congress' intent that practices carried out under REAP should be decided at the local level and without undue pressure from other governmental agencies. The following language from the Conference Report is included as reference: "County ASCS committees shall retain the authority to select and approve cost sharing practices, including the application of minerals or other materials where

such committees find such practices essential to land development or preservation. The Conferees direct that state and county ASCS committeemen should not be arbitrarily dismissed."

Mr. Secretary, we are only stewards of the land keeping it in trust for future generations. I urge you to do everything in your power to make the full amount of appropriated REAP funds available to the county committees as soon as possible so that they can get on with the business of conserving our soil and cleaning up our environment as necessary in each county throughout the country.

Respectfully yours,

BILL GUNTER,
Member of Congress.

**RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE:
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS REVIEW
ORGANIZATIONS AND THE
POLITICAL DOCTORS**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has been playing an increasing role in health care for Americans in recent years. This has at least in part contributed to the sharp rise in medical costs. Today, we will look at yet another Federal program that seriously endangers the traditional doctor-patient relationship, and one which will undoubtedly help drive the cost of medical treatment even higher.

Beginning the first day of January 1974, a new Federal bureaucracy dealing with medical care will begin operation. The program that these new health, education, and welfare employees will administer was enacted into law on the last day of the 92d Congress last October. The law, a part of the Social Security Act, establishes a network of Professional Standards Review Organizations which were originally sold to Congress on the idea that they would save the taxpayers money by having a Federal agency check on doctors to make sure that they do not charge too much for the medical services they give to patients under medicare or medicaid. This also includes patients whose medical bills are paid by social security funds. This covers millions of patients and gives PSRO control over a high percentage of all doctors.

By setting up the criteria by which doctors could bill the Government for medical services to poor and old people, Congress was told, PSRO would save the taxpayers money. I have never seen a Federal program ever undertaken that actually saved the taxpayers money. Any money that is saved by the various programs, especially those of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, goes to pay the salaries of Federal bureaucrats to administer the programs. Since the Government got into medical health care delivery with medicare and medicaid and other Federal health programs, the costs of medical care have skyrocketed. These costs may not have been paid directly by the patients receiving the treatment, but the taxpayer has picked up the tab in higher taxes. The

private patient pays a double tax—once in taxes and once in higher medical costs.

This year alone, federally funded medical programs will cost the U.S. taxpayer more than \$24 billion. By 1975, the PSRO program will cost you and me, and all the millions of other taxpayers, an additional \$66 million a year. Unfortunately, none of these millions of dollars go toward making more and better health care available to the people. The sole purpose of this vast new Federal spending program is to fund the operations of the new bureaucracy established by PSRO.

These funds are to be used to ration and restrict the amount of health care you and your family can receive.

Let us look at some of the restrictions this new law places upon health care delivery by doctors.

PSRO inspectors are supposed to keep doctors from prescribing medical care and services which the Government agents consider medically unnecessary. In the past, the doctor in charge of the case has always decided what medicines, in what amounts would be given his patient. It was the doctor who decided, based on his years of training and experience, whether a patient would need to go to the hospital for treatment. The doctor decided whether his patient required surgery or some other form of treatment in order to correct his ailment. And, of course, the doctor should be the one to make final decisions affecting the health of the patients in his care, because he alone knows the full confidential medical history of the patient he is treating.

Under the proposed PSRO regulations going into effect in January, all this is changed.

The PSRO examiner—who may not be a medical doctor—can second-guess a doctor's professional judgment in a case. The doctor can be penalized for making what the examiner considers to be an unnecessary treatment decision by denying him payment for the services rendered. PSRO bureaucrats can actually overrule a doctor's decision—ordering him not to perform an operation he feels is necessary, to change the medicines he has prescribed, or to hospitalize or not hospitalize a patient, in fact, to even change doctors. These are broad and sweeping new powers that the Government has never had in the past, and should never have.

Doctors will be forced to practice medicine under regulations established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In order to see that the—quote—"appropriate professional standards" are followed by the doctors, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will establish the rules and regulations to determine what procedures are suitable. Once these "norms" are established for all medical treatment, then fixed rates to be charged for the treatment will follow. It is rather evident that the whole idea would be unenforceable under today's system of protecting the privacy of medical records. Without complete access to your medical records, a PSRO inspector could not determine if your doctor had performed unneces-

sary medical treatment. So, under the new law, a PSRO examiner is authorized to inspect your traditionally privileged and confidential medical records.

The principle of private and confidential medical records will be totally destroyed. Your doctor will be forced to reveal these records to the inspectors. If he is to be paid for the services he performs, then he will have to abide by the guidelines set by HEW. In effect, your doctor will be working for the Government, not necessarily for the best interest of you, the patient. Medical doctors will become essentially political doctors.

If you do not receive medical care under some form of governmental assistance, your medical records can still be invaded for inspection by the PSRO. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare must secure medical information from existing records in order to establish the "norms." This simply means that the medical records of every individual in the United States must be made available to the Government. At the present time, your rights of privacy are protected by law and established tradition. If the new law goes into effect, the PSRO examiner can search through a doctor's files and records without needing a search warrant, court order, or other authority to make such a search.

It suggests computerizing the names of patients receiving treatment under Federal health programs, in order to catalog their ailments and prescribed treatment so that HEW officials in Washington would have a convenient, permanent reference for future followup. The social experimentation of the HEW crowd would be greatly facilitated by such records.

The overall result can only be a destruction of the time honored patient-doctor relationship. Our physicians will be forced into working for the bureaucrats at HEW, rather than for the full health benefit of their patients. So another field of our daily lives is threatened with Federal control.

We should not think that once your records are computerized by HEW that they will still have the same privacy of protection that your doctor now gives them. The new law clearly tells us otherwise. Disclosures can be made in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary. We read in section 1106 of the Social Security Act at paragraph B:

Requests for information, disclosure of which is authorized by regulations prescribed pursuant to sub-section (a) of this section and requests for services, may, subject to such limitations as may be prescribed by the Secretary to avoid undue interference with his function under this act, be compiled with if the agency, person, or organization making the request agrees to pay for the information or services requested in such amounts.

The law has already made provisions for disclosures of the information to agencies, organizations, and individuals as long as they agree to pay for the information. It is highly possible that any citizen could have some fact in his or her medical history that they would not want to become a matter of public record. Few Americans knowingly like to serve as guinea pigs.

Treating medical disorders by a HEW

regulation book, rather than by a medical textbook, is in itself a dangerous situation. It is impossible to establish "norms" for equal medical treatment that will be applicable to all individuals. This is a system that will force physicians to practice medicine by the law of averages. It will force doctors to practice in a climate of fear. Rather than prescribing tests, diagnosis, and treatment they feel necessary on individual patients as exceptions to the general rule they will be forced to follow HEW guidelines and conform to established "norms."

PSRO establishes a virtual bureaucratic dictatorship over the medical profession. It not only denies the individual citizen the right to select his own private physician, it infringes if not prohibits the medical professionals from practicing medicine in accordance with their training and experience.

I am so concerned about the effects of PSRO on both doctors and patients alike, that I have introduced my bill, H.R. 9375. This bill actually provides for the repeal of the PSRO provisions in the social security law. Big government has already gotten too far into the field of medicine.

Once PSRO starts operating, it will be beyond the control of the people it victimized, as well as the Congress that created it. It must be stopped now, before it is too late to undo the damage it will cause.

When I go to the doctor, I want him to treat me without some HEW politician looking over his shoulder. Do you not?

GARDNER, MASS., AND THE NORTHEAST RAIL CRISIS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on a number of previous occasions I have addressed the House of Representatives on the critical importance of legislative measures to restructure the six bankrupt Northeast railroads. The need for congressional action grows more urgent, as on October 12 the bankruptcy judge in the railroad proceedings, Judge Fullam, stated that by the end of this month he would reach a decision on proposals to liquidate Penn Central and terminate its service.

It is quite possible that the judge may decide to allow Penn Central to continue operations for a short while, but Members of Congress should not mistake such a decision as being a solution to the deep-seated problems that afflict the ailing railroads. Without substantial congressional action in the very near future there will be little recourse for the bankrupt railroads other than to terminate service. The result will be economic havoc, from which no part of the country will escape.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is now working its way through H.R. 9142, the rail legislation authored by my distinguished colleagues, Dick SHoup and Brock ADAMS.

I am hopeful that the committee will complete its deliberations on this bill within the very near future so that the full House will have an opportunity to endorse it before the middle of November.

I have spoken before on the pervasive economic impact of termination of rail service. On this occasion I would like to demonstrate another example of the importance of rail service to the New England communities, and by extension to the rest of the Nation.

I have recently received the results of a study on rail service conducted by the Chamber of Commerce in Gardner, Mass. I wish to commend the Gardner Chamber of Commerce, its executive vice president, Nick Rudziak, and the many other individuals and firms who participated in the preparation of this significant study.

Of the 30 firms in the Gardner area which responded to the study, 27 use rail service, principally from the bankrupt Boston & Maine Railroad, and also from Penn Central. Only four of the firms use piggy-back service, although the study indicates a higher potential usage if facilities were more readily available. Figures obtained by the study show that the 27 firms using rail service utilize about 3,060 inbound and 3,340 outbound freight cars annually, for a total annual freight car traffic of more than 6,440. Sixteen of the firms have total freight usage of 50 cars a year or more, eight firms use over 200 cars a year, and seven firms use more than 400 cars a year.

Eighty-five percent of the firms using rail service must use it for over one-quarter of their annual freight volume. Nineteen firms depend exclusively on rail service for moving more than half their volume, and seven firms require rail service for 90 percent or more of their freight, according to the study.

The study suggests that termination of rail service would result in a loss of at least 1,722 jobs among the firms responding, possibly many more. Eight firms stated that cessation of rail service would probably cause them to shut down or relocate. Gardner, Mass., can hardly afford an economic disaster of the proportions that would be caused by rail shutdown. One company wrote in response to the survey:

Gardner would become a ghost town without freight service. We are constantly being wooed by other areas offering freight service plus sidings. What a hell of a situation here in central Massachusetts.

Significantly, 63 percent of the firms stated that they expected increases in rail freight volume of 10 percent or more within the next 5 years. Eleven firms anticipated growth in rail freight volume of 25 percent or more, and eight firms expected their freight volume to jump by more than 50 percent.

But many of these same firms criticized the poor service offered by the bankrupt railroads. Twelve firms specifically singled out poor service, and more than one firm had dropped rail service entirely as a result of service problems. This survey demonstrates that freight service needs substantial improvement.

But it is not possible to expect the bankrupt railroads to make these necessary improvements on their own. They

simply do not have the necessary resources. But this study shows that there is cause for hope that a restructured rail system can be economically viable. But successful Northeast railroads will depend on an infusion of at least \$600 million over the next few years so as to improve facilities and better service. This \$600 million will not be secured without Government guarantees of the sort included in H.R. 9142.

Continued and improved rail service is vital to our Nation. The example of Gardner, Mass., is one that is doubtless duplicated in other cities and towns across the Nation. Can we afford to make a "ghost town" out of the hundreds and hundreds of communities that, like Gardner, depend on rail service for their economic health? We cannot. We must enact comprehensive legislation to breathe a new life into the troubled Northeast railroads. We must enact H.R. 9142.

PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE IN INCOME AND TAX-SHELTER INVESTMENTS

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the dialogue for tax reform in this country continues unabated. And well it should, because there is little doubt that tax reform is a continuing necessity.

But as the country struggles for a solution, perspective and a full airing of views is essential. In a pragmatic, non-nonsense manner Edward S. Abbott, young and eminently successful president of Western Pacific Corp., of San Francisco, deals with reforms which may affect income and tax-shelter real estates investments. He is eminently qualified since he knows the business intimately; has had Capitol Hill experience; has dealt with corporate mergers and acquisitions; is a lawyer; and has also received his masters degree in business from Stanford University Graduate School of Business. I am sure our colleagues will be interested in his views.

THE LIMITATION ON ARTIFICIAL ACCOUNTING LOSSES: ITS ECONOMIC IMPACT ON REAL ESTATE CONSTRUCTION

On April 30th of this year Secretary of the Treasury George Shultz came before the House Ways and Means Committee and presented the Administration's Proposals for Tax Change. Although these are only proposals which, of course, will be amended and rewritten during the legislative process, shouts of protest were heard from the many quarters where such legislation would have a negative impact.

The proposals were made in three categories: Minimum Tax, Limitation of Artificial Accounting Losses, and Tax Simplifications. This article will concentrate its analysis on the Limitation of Artificial Accounting Losses (LAL) provision and the economic impact of such a provision upon the construction market should it be enacted. Neither the minimum tax provision nor the tax simplification ideas will be dealt with here.

The initial departure point for the analysis of any section or proposed section of the tax law is the realization that tax law,

like all legislation, is a child of its time and place. Usually there are very sound political and economic reasons for the passage of a law, should one look beneath the surface. The second realization that one must take note of is that the trend in our society, and therefore in the law, has been to move away from so-called property rights and privileges toward equality and fairness.

Discussions about the meaning of the words "equality" and "fairness" go on endlessly. Such an exercise by us would be academic, since the legislature and judiciary are continually in the process of redefining these terms. It is enough to say that in the civil rights movement, in the trend toward corporate democracy, and in the neo-populist stance of many politicians (who merely try to reflect what they believe to be their constituents' attitudes), fairness and equality are the watchwords. This general trend has acted as a backdrop for the denunciation of tax privilege every election year. Not intending to be cynical, it is understandable that politicians find it easy in such a milieu to lambaste the few rich individuals who have been given tax privilege as a product of other times and places . . . especially so, since siding with the working man who has no tax privilege and is bearing his full tax burden (while the rich pay few taxes or none at all) can result in more votes. This reality causes concern, consternation and the resulting statements each election year denouncing those 200 millionaires who are said to have paid no income taxes.

What all this indicates is that the tax proposals of April 30, 1973 were also a product of their time and place. More specifically, the proposals state: "Enactment of the proposed limitation on artificial accounting losses will eliminate abuses associated with tax shelters, while preserving the basic tax accounting and accelerated deduction provisions now in the law, of which some are necessary to reflect income clearly in normal situations and others are intended tax incentives which should be preserved." What this means is that it is time to close some of those loopholes which have helped the rich avoid taxes.

The term "artificial loss" would be a new concept in the code. On a preliminary basis, one has trouble dealing with what an artificial loss is, since the definition of "artificial" is: "1. made by human work of art; opposed to natural. 2. made in imitation of something natural; simulated; as, artificial teeth. 3. unnatural or affected; as, an artificial smile."

However, the LAL proposal comes to our aid by defining what an "artificial loss" is. In the case of real estate, other than HUD 236 projects, the following are considered artificial losses: accelerated depreciation in excess of straight line, the amount of amortization for rehabilitation housing in excess of straight line depreciation, and the amount of deductible construction period (pre-opening) costs. These costs include interest; state, local and foreign taxes; other management, brokerage and legal fees; insurance; advertising; and transfer and recording fees. According to the proposal, limitation of such losses will be instituted when ". . . (i) the accelerated deductions for the taxable year exceed, (ii) the associated net related income for the taxable year."

The result this will have is that a so-called "artificial loss" will not be allowed as a deduction against ordinary income in the taxable year and will be required to be deferred. The amount of a deferred artificial accounting loss will be added to a Deferred Loss Account to be taken as a deduction in a succeeding taxable year against the first net related income (in excess of that year's accelerated deductions) or to be taken into account upon sale or other disposition of the property to which the deferred loss is attributable."

Thus, this proviso against "artificial losses" would prohibit all losses in excess of related

income from being applied against an investor's (usually limited partner's) outside ordinary income. There should be little doubt, then, that should this proposal pass, the 200 millionaires would be unable to take many of those deductions which were previously taken and (unless they come up with a better idea) they will have to pay their fair share of taxes. If this is the goal of society, then the legislation should be passed and the body politic can breathe a sigh of relief, since it will have righted another wrong and brought the "bad guys" to justice.

However, quite obviously the framers of the code as it now stands did have some reasons for the tax privileges which were granted. The code is indeed a child of its time and place. The same neopopulist voices, of course, will be raised and state that the privileged bought these favored tax results, and to some extent this is true. The rich—those who could benefit most from such provisions—had the resources and self-interest to petition, lobby, and cajole Congress to grant tax privileges. Yet, perhaps there were some less tainted reasons for Congress to act in this seemingly biased manner.

It seems to us that there may in fact be such reasons, and these reasons must be viewed as part of the realities of our economic system. Congress must have realized that people develop and construct buildings not in order to house people and to provide office space for them but rather because these builders believe they can make a profit by doing so. Now, there are many ways in which an individual can make a profit; putting up buildings is only one of those ways. It would appear that, given a free market (that is, without Congressional interference), the resources of time, talent, labor and capital would flow into the construction of buildings only if those people who might wish to become involved felt this area provided the best comparative rewards for the lowest related risks. It can hardly be said that real estate construction is low on the risk scale, especially when one is cognizant of real property's relatively low liquidity, its traditionally high leverage, and the enormity of the problems during construction and rent-up. This being so, resources would not flow into this area unless the rewards were correspondingly high.

The initial question then becomes: "Would resources flow into this area in a free market?" The answer is undoubtedly "Yes", but only at a level at which the anticipated profits corresponded to the risks absorbed. Without tax benefits, construction and ownership profits can come from only one source—the difference between total rents and total expenses. It would then appear that resources would not flow into this area unless rents were high enough to offset all expenses and still yield a return in cash which would be considered high enough to compensate for the expenditure of needed resources and provide a profit. Thus, should rents be too low, new construction would not take place and this would cause, over time, lower new supply and, assuming a growing demand, over time, higher rents. An example of this was the housing market in New York City when rent control was in effect. Rents were held down and therefore new construction was limited and there was a shortage of housing. Rents of course rose when the controls were lifted. The higher rents would, over time, induce some new construction. To repeat, construction would only take place when rents grew to a level high enough to compensate the builder for resources used and risk absorbed. Again, this is so because builders build for profit, not because people need housing at a particular time and at a particular price.

With this as background, another reality of the construction business should be understood. During the construction period there are no rents and therefore no income. This means that in an entirely free market (without Congressional intervention), a

builder would have to charge high enough rents when the building is completed and rentable to compensate him for his loss of returns during the construction phase.

It can now be seen that tax incentives have a meaningful place economically. The tax law as it is now written provides that certain costs of putting up a structure can be deducted immediately. Further, the law provides that some future profits in the form of cash can be tax-free—or virtually so—since depreciation deductions can cover those profits.

From the investor's point of view this means that during the construction phase, when there is no cash return, he still receives a benefit in the form of tax deductions which save him taxes, and he therefore does have a return on his investment. No rational investor would commit the dollars necessary to build a building unless he either received some market rate of return immediately (either in the form of cash or tax deductions) or he felt quite certain that future returns would be high enough to offset any initial construction-phase lack of cash returns.

In future years the investor always wants the highest cash return. Under the present law he is willing to take a lower cash return (which means he charges lower than potential market rents) since his cash return (covered by depreciation) is virtually tax-free.

What this results in is that the tenant, whether he is a working man renting an apartment or a business tycoon in a giant highrise, benefits from lower than potential rents. The rents are lower since the owner's returns (including tax benefits) are adequate compensation for his risk absorption. Further, the rents are lower since other builders will be willing to come into the market with their products at this rent and return level if they see a demand. The tenant, then, is getting a flow-through benefit from the investor's tax advantage.

With all this behind us, Congressional thinking begins to become economically more understandable. It appears that Congress wished to induce construction and therefore push resources into this area. This was done because it was felt that housing and office space at a subsidized rental was needed. We say "subsidized" here because, as we can see from the above analysis, without the tax incentives builders would have to charge higher rents in both the short- and long-run and the resulting rental prices would be higher than they are with the extra benefit of tax deductions.

These, then, are the economic ramifications of the present tax system. Capital and other resources move into real estate because the returns in tax savings, cash, and growth induce them to do so. It is apparent that should other areas offer higher rewards with equal risks, these resources would flow to those areas, since resources move toward where they can yield the highest relative rate of return after taxes, not to where some in society think they should.

What is Congress to do? On the one hand, the time and place call loudly for reform and equality. His constituents write him letters complaining about the rich man on the hill who doesn't pay any taxes because of his "tax shelter." On the other hand, the Congressman must realize that a curtailment of the tax deduction incentives in this area will cause at least some resources to go into other areas. This must result in higher rents for his constituents, both as a product of the need for higher cash return (since there would do no tax incentives) and a lower new supply of rentable property in the market.

It would appear that the goal of tax policy should be to induce exactly that much building so that market availability and rents will be at some particular level. There are two problems here: the first is deciding at what level the rents and availability should be

pegged. Is it public policy that there should be lower or higher rents, more or less availability of space? Is more construction or less needed? The second problem is that building a model to differentiate what tax moves will induce what level of rents and availabilities is a very difficult task, since tax consequences are only one variable; some others include interest rates, short-run land costs, and micro-factors such as local growth.

At any rate, Congress would be opening itself up to short-run mass satisfaction and possible long-run voter rebellion if it merely did away with the tax inducements without a thorough understanding of the results such an action would have in terms of short- and long-run economics.

Rather than dealing in pell mell fashion with this issue, Congress should determine its objectives, both economically and socially, and then institute a study to determine how various changes in the law will affect these objectives.

SOFTNESS OF KISSINGER EMERGES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last week the Washington Post headlined an article "Kissinger Sees Threat to Détente if Moscow Is Prodded." Unfortunately, the headline tells most of the story in Kissinger's approach to the Soviet Union. This view has as a basic assumption that if we are nice enough to the Soviets they will be so delighted that they will act responsible in world affairs and become a partner with the United States in seeking a more peaceful world. This theory prescribes the United States giving various concessions to the Soviet Union—most-favored-nation status, more credits subsidized by the American taxpayer, and others.

Concessions do not buy peace, not prodding the Soviet Union does not buy peace. Only one thing buys the respect necessary from the Soviet Union for a better and more secure world. And that one thing is strength. American strength has been and will continue to be the only guarantor of our own freedoms and any chance of a world freer from war.

On October 9, Henry Kissinger asked the following question:

How hard can we press without provoking the Soviet leadership into returning to practices in its foreign policy that increase international tension?

We must ask where the Soviet Union has retreated from positions that have increased international tension. Have the Soviets stopped supplying North Vietnam in its war of aggression against South Vietnam? Has the Soviet Union stopped supplying the most advanced weapons to countries in the Middle East? Have the Soviets stopped fanning the flames of war in the Middle East? Have the Soviets stopped supplying military hardware and building military installations in Cuba? The answer to all these questions is no. Sometimes it is easier to engage in self-delusion. But very seldom is it wise. Sometimes it is easier to mistake wishes for facts. But very seldom is it useful.

Kissinger's policy seems to be that either the Soviet Union negotiate with us or we will give in anyway. It is time to recognize something that Kissinger and others seem to be forgetting—the wise course for the United States is not to seek to buy the Soviet Union with concessions. Too often the Soviet Communists, like the German Nazis, have viewed such a policy as weakness.

The headline that I mentioned at the beginning was mistaken, as are Kissinger's views. Détente will never have a chance until the Soviet Union is prodded. There is no détente until the Soviet Union starts making some meaningful concessions to the United States and to the free world.

HOW MANY TIMES?

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, George Putman is a distinguished Los Angeles news commentator who has had some important comments this month about the Middle East. These are views which I believe should be considered by all Members of Congress and, accordingly, I have asked that they be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HOW MANY TIMES?

(By George Putman)

It is this reporter's opinion that the freedom loving people of the world can learn much from the brave people of Israel. The behavior of that nation, its leaders, and its people, in the face of overwhelming odds, has gained the awe and respect of all men; and most of all, Israel's enemies. If Israel is to survive, it will be because of the resolution, courage, determination, pride, and the will of its people to risk all, including their very lives, to guarantee that survival.

After coming into being on the fourteenth of May, 1948, Israel was all but abandoned by the United Nations, which helped to give it being. Israel, left alone to defend itself against the armed forces of six Arab countries. Again and again, the borders of Israel have been invaded. But Israel is determined to live, and any nation that is determined to live, and will pay the necessary price, will live.

Israel was attacked in 1948. She forced Egypt to sign an armistice on the twenty-fourth of February, 1949. The cost to Israel was very heavy. But she kept her freedom.

1956 brought another crisis, in which the Egyptians committed nearly two hundred acts of aggression. The Israeli forces battled fiercely, and again her precious freedom was secured.

And then in June, 1967, Israel was again forced to fight with her back to the wall. And in six days, achieved a fantastic victory over the Arabs, against overwhelming odds.

But the most vicious blow came on the holiest of Jewish Holy Days, Yom Kippur. And again, tiny Israel was forced to fight for her very survival; a renewal of the story of David and Goliath. And again, Israel, threatened thousands of times since she became a state, has learned that she can rely upon only her own people to defend herself against an enemy that is determined to destroy her.

The Arabs can lose hundreds of battles and yet survive. Tiny Israel cannot lose even a single battle, or she will die.

It is a miracle that the tiny State of Israel, surrounded by enemies, has managed to survive for twenty-five years. It will be a miracle indeed if she is able to survive another twenty-five years.

But it is this reporter's firm conviction that the miracle of Israel, born in pain and torture, tried by unceasing fire and bloodshed—that the great miracle of Israel will continue to live.

WHO IS THE REAL ENEMY?

(By George Putman)

Israeli Premier Golda Meir told this reporter that in evaluating the continuing struggle in the Middle East, one must keep in mind the fact that the Soviet Union constantly serves as attorney, adviser, and manipulator of the Arabs; that one should be constantly aware that the Kremlin is selfishly concerned with control of the Mediterranean and the Middle East oil; that Russia is constantly fishing in troubled waters and will urge peaceful solutions only when and where it serves Mother Russia's cause.

It is a fact that whenever violence has come to the Middle East, the Kremlin has quickly accused the Israelis of being singularly guilty of aggression. But instead of exposing the Soviet Union as the world's trouble maker, our government chooses instead, to straddle the fence; or it would appear to play both ends against the middle. We supply both warring factions with weapons of war, and then, as in 1967, when the trouble comes, our State Department issues a wishy-washy statement that, and I quote, "We will maintain strict neutrality in thought, word, and deed;" thus, inviting the Kremlin to indulge in unrestricted, self-serving adventure.

My friend, let's face it; the United States has one true friend in all of the Middle East, and that friend asks very little from us. That friend standing alone, surrounded on all sides by enemies, her back to the sea—that friend is Israel. Her enemies have threatened again and again to push her into the sea and to commit a genocide on every man, woman, and child.

Now the point I make is this—that with Russia's help, with the Communists' help, this could happen if the United States refuses to take firm, strong action to guarantee the very survival of the brave people of Israel.

Russia needs us desperately; her economy is sagging; her food supplies are in a desperate state. Russia needs us. Therefore, we have an advantage, if only we will use it properly.

Now, the Russians understand one word; America once showed it. Israel now has it. It was part of our heritage and our tradition. It may not be a pleasant word, but it is damned meaningful.

And that word is—guts!

JUDGE THEM BY WHAT THEY DO, NOT WHAT THEY SAY

(By George Putman)

It is this reporter's opinion that as we travel hand in hand with the Soviet Union, down the primrose path to détente, that we judge them, not by what they say, but what they do.

And listen, as example, to this statement by Nixon and Brezhnev following their meeting in the Kremlin in May of 1972: "The USA and the USSR need to make every effort to remove the threat of war, with a special responsibility to do everything in their power so that conflicts or situations will not arise which would increase international tensions."

Well, let's look at the record. In the tragic crisis in the Middle East, the Soviet Union has exhorted Algeria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Iraq to join the battle against Israel, and to drive the Israelis into the sea. Now I ask you, is this an example of the Soviet inclination

to reduce international tensions, as professed in the May, 1972, declaration?

No! And this again is a vicious, bald-faced escalation of war through Soviet chicanery, deceit, conspiracy, and fraud. And to compound this deceit, the Soviet Union is rushing planeloads of the weapons of war with which to carry out their promise to destroy Israel for all time.

The United States and its leaders, instead of pussyfooting and lightly warning the Soviets that their warlike actions might interfere with the ongoing détente, should now stand tall as leader of the free world. I think the United States should tell the Kremlin we know their game, and we are determined to put a stop to it.

It is time to tell the Soviets and the world that the Kremlin couldn't care less about any of the people involved, and least of all, the Arabs. It is time to tell the world that we know Russia wants control of the Mediterranean passage through the Suez Canal and control of the Middle East oil.

It is time to tell the world that Communism, be it that spawned in Moscow or Peking, is at the very root of most of the world's troubles, and that there can never be peace in the world until Communist Russia and Communist China bring to a halt their never ending worldwide aggression.

It's time the United States and our leaders begin to emulate the roughest, toughest, bravest nation in the Middle East, if not the world—and I mean the State of Israel.

And it is time our leaders show the same strength of courage and purpose as does the American born Jewish grandmother from Milwaukee, Golda Meir, who says, "If America does not remain strong, then we will all go down together."

She knows, as you and I should know, that only the strong survive, and that therein lies the survival of the whole free world.

ANTI-ISRAEL UNITED NATIONS

(By George Putnam)

It is this reporter's opinion that the brave State of Israel took a terrible gamble in order to prove to the world, once and for all, that they are not the aggressors in the Middle East.

Israeli intelligence reported a large build-up of Arab troops, tanks, mechanized units, ground-to-ground and ground-to-air missiles, along Israel's borders with Syria and Egypt. But Israel, recognizing this threat to her very survival, went about observance of the holiest of Jewish Holy Days. And then, it came. Israel suffered her own Pearl Harbor, stabbed in the back while at prayer.

Israel knew the terrible risk and the cost in lives and weapons of war. Israel knew that the damage could be irreparable, yet Israel determined to take that chance.

The reaction at the United Nations—predictable. As always, the twelve members of the Soviet bloc—the eighteen in the Arab bloc; the forty-one in the African bloc; and the seventy-five so-called non-aligned bloc members, adopted their consistent anti-Israel position, and the resulting hostility has fed on itself.

One Western delegate, commenting on the atmosphere in the packed Security Council chamber, said, "At times I felt I was in the middle of a lynch mob. Almost everybody sitting there wanted to hear bad things about Israel. There was no one present who would identify the Arabs as the aggressors."

Nor was there any resolution ever, at any time, adopted, condemning the Arab nations for their transgressions. Except for the United States and Israel, no one—no one has even mentioned the reports of the United Nations observer team as evidence that Egypt and Syria initiated the fighting.

And the Soviet Union could not restrain itself, having tasted Israeli blood in the Middle East, to call upon all of the Arab nations

to join Syria and Egypt in the total destruction of Israel.

And underlying this entire farce is the anti-Jewishness of the Soviet Union. It was Yakob Milik who sarcastically referred to the Jews as "the chosen people," and the size of Jewish noses. He could not contain himself when he shouted, "The Israelis are like savage, barbaric tribes, annihilating, destroying, and trying to remove from the surface of the earth cities, villages, cultural heritage, and entire civilizations."

It is well that all this be put on the record at this time, and remembered. Because whenever the uneven contest shifts in favor of Israel, as it has; as it does; as it always will, it is the gangsters in the Kremlin who then run to the United Nations, with their tail between their legs, to cry for peace and a return to the status quo—the status quo they are so determined to destroy.

Remember, Israel—remember your friends, and remember your enemies. Never forget those who preach détente, peace, understanding; meanwhile, plunging the dagger deep in your heart.

FBI DIRECTOR KELLEY SPEAKS TO NATIONAL NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, all ages of civilization have had to contend with the imperfections of man, and because of these human frailties, societies have had to devise systems of laws to protect the growth and development of mankind.

In our country, founded on the cherished and tested principles of individual rights and freedoms, it is always encouraging to me when those charged with enforcing the laws under which we live take an open stance for truth and justice. For instance, the forthright statements and actions of the new FBI Director, Clarence M. Kelley, as he charts the course the FBI will pursue under his leadership are noteworthy as well as reassuring.

In this regard, I commend to my colleague a recent address, "An Alliance for Truth," by Mr. Kelley before the National Newspaper Association at Hot Springs, Ark. Mr. Kelley's remarks outline some of the progressive steps the FBI will take to strengthen its relationship with the press to better serve the country.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Kelley's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

AN ALLIANCE FOR TRUTH

(Speech by Hon. Clarence M. Kelley)

I am indeed honored to be your guest today and most appreciative of this opportunity to speak to you in behalf of the men and women of the FBI.

The news media and law enforcement are kindred professions, allied in a compelling mutual endeavor—to serve the American people by seeking out and revealing the truth.

Our two professions serve the people best when our relationship is complementary rather than conflicting.

You have a legitimate need for information about crime and law enforcement activi-

ties. We operate more effectively against crime when we are able, through the media, to inform the public about our objectives, our problems and our accomplishments.

Truthfully, I can say my relationship with the press during the 33 years I have served in law enforcement has been congenial and gratifying.

Perhaps this is because our relationship always has been completely honest.

I have never deliberately misled a representative of the news media, and I have never been victimized by distorted reporting.

My press policy always has been one of "open stance"—one of complete candor and willingness to answer press inquiries, recognizing the right of the press in our democratic society to obtain information for the enlightenment of the public.

This shall continue to be my policy as Director of the FBI.

Now I am aware that in the past the FBI has had something less than a wide open press policy. I intend no criticism of that policy in my remarks today.

But times change. And I wish to assure you that as a matter of policy, henceforth, the FBI will respond openly to news media inquiries insofar as we are permitted to do so by mandates of law and ethics.

There is, I believe, much misinformation abroad today regarding the FBI.

I have been astonished by the impression some people have that the FBI is engaged in elaborate clandestine operations infringing on constitutional rights of the citizenry.

I am dismayed by allegations that cloak and dagger tactics of the FBI threaten to make it a Gestapo—a menace to American freedom.

I feel we must convey to the American people the truth about what the FBI does, and by what authority the FBI does it.

It is time to raise the shade so that the public may judge what motivates the men and women of the FBI . . . so that the public may appraise our work.

We hope the news media will be our ally in this endeavor.

We must recognize that there are bounds to what we can disclose—bounds prescribed by law, judicial procedure and propriety.

The U.S. Supreme Court held in a 1966 decision that prejudicial pretrial publicity in the form of extrajudicial statements by witnesses, police and other criminal justice practitioners may prevent a fair trial.

We will not abridge a person's right to due process of law. We will not capriciously lay waste a person's reputation. We cannot damage an investigation or jeopardize a case to be tried in court. Nor can we compromise confidential relationships vital to our investigative mission.

Also, we must observe restrictions imposed by the Department of Justice.

These are considerations we cannot ignore.

But let me add emphatically that we will not take sanctuary in a self-serving "no comment" when we err and the heat is on.

Obviously, in a democracy a government agency such as the FBI has an obligation to account to the public in the discharge of its responsibilities.

And we shall do so.

We are an organization of human beings, and human beings are notoriously imperfect. We will make mistakes, though we try our utmost to avoid them.

But when we are wrong, we shall admit it. And we shall expect to take our lumps in the press. We ask only for objectiveness and accuracy, and the opportunity to tell our side of the story.

I believe that lack of communication between an agency such as ours and the press can result in relatively minor incidents being blown all out of proportion.

An unfortunate example of this occurred last August in Little Rock.

One of our Agents killed a large dog while participating in the arrest of a bank robbery suspect for whom a warrant had been issued.

The Agent had been assigned a position at the rear of a residence in which the suspect was thought to be located. A vehicle believed to have been in the suspect's possession was parked in front of the residence, and the Agents had obtained information that the suspect was in the residence.

The dog suddenly emerged from a shed and lunged at the Agent, who having no avenue to retreat, fired two shots, killing the dog to protect himself from injury. The dog was chained, but the Agent was well within the dog's range with no opportunity to elude the animal.

As it turned out, the bank robbery suspect was arrested in the driveway of a residence directly across the street.

Perhaps we were too guarded in our initial response to local press inquiries. At any rate, the incident made the wire services. I saw a two-column headline in a metropolitan newspaper that proclaimed:

"FBI Agent Slays Dog."

The fact that we had arrested a potentially dangerous bank robbery fugitive became incidental. We were cast in the role of callous dog killers.

I believe that unfortunate incident points up the necessity for dialogue between a law enforcement agency such as the FBI and the press—at the local level as well as the national level.

And we are taking initiatives to establish this dialogue.

Our intention is to make the FBI more responsive to news media inquiries. Our aim is to facilitate your work, not to impede it. What steps are we taking to accomplish this?

We have been in touch with the Special Agents in Charge of our field offices and we are working out the details of a more relaxed press policy.

Special Agents in Charge of FBI field offices now have more freedom to respond to news media questions.

Beginning next month, these field executives and other Bureau officials will be undergoing management training courses that will include suggestions for developing closer working relationships with the news media.

We shall make an effort to admit representatives of the press to crime scene areas as quickly as possible for photographs and interviews.

But we must insure that processing of crime scenes for evidence is completed. And we must reserve the right to interview witnesses first.

Often a problem during aircraft hijackings is answering press inquiries while trying to insure the safety of passengers and apprehend the hijackers.

We must always give passenger safety highest priority, and I am sure that is the way you would want it.

But we propose to set aside an area for newsmen at the airport in such cases and to assign an FBI skyjacking expert to brief them. Reporters will be kept abreast of developments or will be advised where they can go to obtain the latest and most accurate information.

I am certain there are other ways in which we can make information more accessible to the news media in given situations. Whenever possible, we shall do so.

We would encourage you to contact us when you need information.

If a critic tosses a harpoon in our direction and you wish to know whether it has hit its mark, we will give you a factual answer—within the bounds I have mentioned.

Ordinarily, we will welcome the opportunity to show you the other side of the coin.

Occasionally, a salvo of criticism directed at the FBI is utterly groundless, yet the initial barrage lights up the skies so spec-

tacularly the public may be indelibly impressed by the display.

A case in point is the allegation that the FBI uses agents provocateurs as a clandestine investigative expedient. As the British statesman Benjamin Disraeli once said, "This shows how much easier it is to be critical than to be correct."

Permit me to state emphatically that under no circumstances does the FBI use provocateurs.

Do we have informants? Certainly. We would be remiss as an investigative agency if we shunned them. But we keep check on them. We do everything within our power to assure that they don't develop into agents provocateurs. The services of informants are terminated if they display a tendency toward over-zealousness.

How do we determine the reliability of informants?

Our Agents are held strictly accountable for supervision of informants assigned to them. Any dereliction in this respect could lead to discontinuing the informant's services and disciplinary action against the Agent.

One of the primary measures of an informant's reliability is the quality of his information. This is subject to constant evaluation and cross-checking.

If an informant says that stolen property is being fenced out of a certain warehouse, or that a certain individual transports heroin in the spare tire of his automobile, these are facts easily verified or discounted.

Field supervisors regularly review informants' files to evaluate their performance. Additionally, supervisors at FBI Headquarters in Washington review their efforts. During inspections of field offices, supervisory personnel from FBI Headquarters evaluate each informant.

In periodic reports of contacts with informants assigned to him, the Agent must certify as to the informants' reliability and make recommendations as to retaining them.

I hope that clears up the myth of FBI agents provocateurs.

Occasionally, there are times when a bit of misinformation will find its way into print because of a simple misunderstanding between lawman and reporter.

I can recall one such instance in which a rural residence had been extensively damaged by vandals while the occupants were away on vacation.

A young reporter from the local newspaper eagerly tagged after the veteran undersheriff as he made his crime scene examination. Occasionally, the lawman would make a cryptic observation and the reporter would scribble it in his notebook.

The undersheriff paused outside a window, stooped and scrutinized some peculiar impressions in the dirt. "Look's like the varmints were a 'draggin' something," the lawman muttered.

The next edition of the reporter's newspaper carried a story quoting the undersheriff as saying the terrible damage at the residence was caused by "a dragon-like varmint."

Those things happen.

But obviously the more open the channels of communication are between newsmen and law enforcement officers the less possibility there is for misunderstanding.

In the event disclosure of certain information would obviously be contrary to the public interest—or an abridgement of the constitutional rights of an individual—we intend to explain to the inquiring journalist the reasons we must decline to disclose this information.

Certainly a reporter is entitled to more than a terse "no comment" in such instances, and we hope such instances will be rare.

I might mention briefly the FBI position regarding leaked information. I would be

less than candid if I did not state that we abhor leaks. Not because leaked information might embarrass the FBI, but because when information is made public outside of channels, we have no way of protecting individuals' reputations or constitutional rights. Also, an important investigation may be damaged.

Now I am referring to the leaking of secret or sensitive data, as opposed to background briefings for newsmen, which I consider a matter of courtesy.

We would not presume to counsel you regarding your use of leaked information. Ours is not a censorship role. Your judgment should, and must, prevail.

Unquestionably, the news media serve their communities by publishing crime news. An atmosphere of public ignorance and misinformation is an ideal atmosphere for crime and corruption.

The criminal justice system—indeed the public—owes a debt of gratitude to responsible journalists for their coverage of crime.

News accounts of speedy solutions of crime and the apprehension of criminals may well act as deterrents to crime.

But, perhaps even more importantly, when good police work is chronicled for your subscribers, it surely enhances police-community relations.

The effectiveness of law enforcement agencies is most certainly affected by community support. And the value of effective law enforcement to the community is self evident.

When an FBI Agent or a policeman knocks upon a citizen's door seeking information relating to a crime in your community, how will the lawman be received?

Will the citizen slam the door in the lawman's face?

Will the citizen merely be wary and suspicious?

Or will the citizen cooperate fully, realizing the vital responsibility the lawman has to try to keep the community a safe place in which to live? Realizing, too, the lawman may forfeit his life in the effort?

The articles and editorials you publish are a contributing factor.

The days have long since passed when the legendary marshal of the Old West strode the streets of a wild cowtown—a tall, solitary man of formidable prowess with a six-shooter—keeping the peace through intimidating reputation.

Keeping the peace has become somewhat more complicated.

No law enforcement agency, no matter how well trained, no matter how well motivated and dedicated, can unilaterally conquer crime. It's a community project.

We in law enforcement bear the primary responsibility to be sure, but our effectiveness is certain to be strengthened if the press is our ally.

We in law enforcement cannot expect to have editorial roses strewn in our path for simply doing our job. Neither can we expect the press to look the other way when we blunder.

All we can legitimately expect is objectivity, accuracy and an opportunity for explanation.

In your profession, I know you must believe, as I do, that there is great power in truth . . . that truth is capable of action . . . that truth can make things happen.

Because of our overriding responsibility to the American people to discover and reveal the truth, it is vital that both the press and law enforcement perform with integrity, thoroughness and impartiality.

When we compromise our integrity to achieve a goal, when we sacrifice thoroughness for experience, when we permit personal bias to sully our work, then we break faith with the American people.

And sooner or later we will be discovered. We of the FBI recognize and wholeheartedly uphold the right and need of the

people to be fully and accurately informed of our performance and policies.

We uphold the First Amendment right of the news media.

And we pledge ourselves to truth . . . truth regarding our operations . . . truth in reporting our investigations.

We are prepared to accept the people's verdict.

CONGRESSIONAL PHONE POLL RESULTS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, as in the past, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the results of the latest "congressional telephone poll" conducted among more than 3,400 residents of the 20th District of Pennsylvania.

I have used this poll several times in the past 2 years to obtain a quick cross-section of opinion among our people on topical issues of the day. It is impartial and completely voluntary. The participants have given us written authorization to call them on any question. Because of their cooperation and interest in their Government, the poll has proven to be remarkably accurate when compared to the results of national polls taken by professionals over a longer period of time and among a greater number of people.

In the most recent survey, I sought to obtain the opinion of our people on the question of forced busing of students to achieve racial balance in school districts. The returns left no doubt about the majority's opinion. Of 3,438 people contacted, 5.9 percent approved of forced busing in this respect; 78.6 percent did not approve of it; and 15.5 percent indicated no opinion or interest in the question.

I would like to emphasize that many participants took the time to explain the reason for their position on the issue, as they did not want their opinion to be misconstrued—to be labeled racists because they objected to forced busing. Instead, these people felt the money spent on busing was being wasted; that it could be put to better use by improving the quality of the educational staff, neighborhood school building, and equipment. Others pointed out they made financial sacrifices and assumed long-term mortgages, in order to enroll their children in a better school.

Accordingly, if their children were to be bused to another district—perhaps the very one from which the family moved—their attempts to provide their children with a good education would be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD at this time the results of this "phone poll."

THE RESULTS

For, 202.
Against, 2,704.
No opinion, 532.
Contacted, 3,438.

THE BENEFITS OF COMPUTERS VERSUS INVASION OF PRIVACY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the great wave of technological advances in recent years moved us into an age of computers. Computers are of known beneficial use to mankind by providing instant information with maximum efficiency.

Unfortunately, the benefits of the computer in data storage and research can be used, under the guise of efficiency, against the common good. The area of crime control is one area where maximum efficiency can, if not checked, replace civil liberties and basic human privacy.

I am referring, specifically, to crime files that register names and actions of persons who have had any kind of contact with law enforcement officials. One such example is the National Crime Information Center which is run by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I feel that it is important that the FBI compile pertinent data that makes for effective crime control. However, when people without criminal records are recorded for noncriminal acts, suspicion, or for political beliefs, it then becomes a direct violation of privacy and civil liberties.

In Massachusetts, we are fortunate to have members of the State legislature and a Governor who recognize the problem and are willing to stand up and fight impending, although subtle, invasion of privacy.

On October 4, 1973, Gov. Francis W. Sargent addressed a gathering at the Boston University Student Union Building Conference Auditorium on the subject of the computer and civil liberties. I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of his remarks:

ADDRESS BY GOV. FRANCIS W. SARGENT

I think we can all agree that in the last two decades a new force has swept across our society till today it dominates every phase of our lives.

I speak, of course, of the computer.

The effects of this new technology reach everywhere. . . . into business . . . into industry . . . and most importantly into government.

Now let me be clear on one thing. I do not oppose this new technology by itself. What I do fear is the computer run wild . . . a technology which instead of serving, ends up controlling.

And further, I fear the new ethic which has arrived with the computer. Technical efficiency now reigns supreme in our society. The greatest value for the dollar.

Yet efficiency cannot be our only goal. We must also seek to protect individual liberties and rights . . . we must continue to deal with citizens as individuals, not as numbers on a card.

Some may say that the danger is hypothetical . . . that the computer presents little, if any, threat to the right of a citizen to be considered and treated as an individual.

Well, as the Governor of this state, I can assure you that such confidence is misplaced. For we in Massachusetts have felt the edge

of technology's sword . . . we know what it's like to try to curb the computer . . . and we have seen the depersonalization that so easily can occur.

For the last few months, Massachusetts has been battling the federal government to limit the extent to which the computer invades the privacy of our citizens. Specifically, this state has refused to join a national system for the collection and dissemination of personal criminal records.

Administered by the FBI, this National Crime Information Center is designed to include the criminal history systems of each state.

The Massachusetts system has been ready for some time. Yet we have refused to link up with the federal NCIC.

We have taken this position because it has become clear that although we have established important safeguards on our criminal history system, the FBI has left its own system virtually uncontrolled.

We have said that only convictions would be recorded. But the federal system also includes arrests not followed by conviction.

We have said that access would be limited essentially to law enforcement agencies. But the federal system allows much wider access. Agencies not connected to law enforcement—even private credit companies—are permitted to see and use these confidential records.

We have established an independent watchdog committee to protect the privacy of the individual. But the federal government has no similar body.

And we have given the individual the right to see his file and correct it if it is wrong. But the federal government permits no such privilege. In fact, they have not even developed the means.

When the vast deficiencies of the federal system became clear, this state had only one legitimate option.

The moment we joined the national system, our information would flow into their data bank and our safeguards would be rendered meaningless.

Therefore, on June 13th, I refused to allow Massachusetts to join with the federal system.

And the sword fell.

The Justice Department brought suit against us in federal court to force our hand.

Washington threatened to freeze thirty million dollars in Small Business Administration loans if we did not yield.

The Defense Department announced that they would hold back twenty-four hundred jobs unless it had access to our files.

Still I refused.

In fact, I joined a counter suit to force the federal government to establish safeguards similar to our own.

A week ago, Massachusetts emerged victorious from this confrontation. At that time, the Justice Department announced that it was dropping its suit against us.

And so for the moment the privacy of the citizens of this state is protected—at least when it concerns criminal records.

Unfortunately, however, the federal government has not limited its computer operations to criminal histories. It has also attempted to employ this new technology in the battle against drug abuse.

In 1972, the federal government set about to create a national information system to gather data on drug abuse. It came to be known as CODAP.

Theoretically, the idea of CODAP was and is sound. For better information is vital for the effective management, research and evaluation of programs.

In practice, however, the government failed to create the necessary safeguards. It asked each drug treatment facility to provide identifying information on each person receiving treatment for drug problems . . . information to be fed into the CODAP computers.

The patient's name was not requested. Rather an identity code was devised that included the patient's sex, race, date of birth, zip code, and the first two letters of his mother's maiden and surname.

We were told that through this code, the patient's confidentiality could be protected.

On the surface this sounded excellent. But then Massachusetts investigated, and we quickly learned that when CODAP records are combined with other computer records, identities are very quickly discovered.

In fact, we found that the CODAP code was actually more exact than an individual's name.

In a given geographical area, for example, individual clients could be determined with up to ninety-eight percent accuracy.

So once again, I refused to let this state join a national information system.

As with NCIC, the federal government has backed down in CODAP. Massachusetts can continue to receive federal funds, even though we will not deliver the requested information.

These then are the two major battles that we have fought to protect the individual . . . to curb the advance of the computer and of its ethic: efficiency over everything else.

But though we have won two significant victories, the basic dangers remain. If we are to meet them, we must learn the lessons of NCIC and of CODAP.

To begin with, we must understand that NCIC's and CODAP's occur because too often public officials overlook the social implications of their programs.

Too often they are blinded by technical advancements . . . new designs . . . greater capabilities. Too often officials lose sight of the true purpose of social technology . . . aid to the individual.

We must understand that we do not protect the public safety by depriving individuals of their rights as citizens.

And we do not help a drug abuser by branding him for life . . . by undermining his faith in our treatment facilities.

Yet that is what NCIC threatens . . . that is what CODAP threatens. These programs are still too many examples of how the technology of computers can change the very meaning of man as an individual.

NCICs and CODAPs can let us consider a person—not as a unique individual with potentials for good and evil—but as the sum total of printouts supplied by interlocking personal data banks.

This is efficiency with all it can mean. Machine over man . . . system over individual.

Let us be clear though, the computer itself is not the danger . . . it is the ethic of the computer . . . the idea that man can be dealt with in the aggregate . . . that there are only groups out there . . . not individuals, men and women who need society's help.

The computer itself cannot do damage. But it leads too easily to dehumanized solutions to social problems.

Consider for example the new approaches we are witnessing in several states to deal with drug abuse . . . programs that consider the abuser not as one who needs help but as one who is a public enemy . . . one who is to be labeled and then forgotten.

However, drug abusers cannot be wished away. They must be dealt with one way or the other. If we choose to ignore their individuality . . . if we choose to toss them into the criminal justice system, we will not solve the problem.

In fact, all we will do is overburden our criminal justice system.

The dehumanized approach, the efficient approach cannot work. The regressive legislation we have seen in several states can only compound the problem.

Recent experience has shown that pushers are not becoming less common, they are only becoming more careful. In one state, for example, arrests have actually fallen seventy-

five percent. Additionally, because of this regressive approach, the police are facing increased dangers when making an arrest. The reason is clear. A drug offender will not hesitate to shoot an officer if he has already earned mandatory life imprisonment for the abuse alone.

Further, the courts, already backlogged, will soon become truly jammed. Flexibility in the handling of cases will end as all defendants demand long, expensive jury trials.

And finally, our prisons will overflow with inmates having little at stake in maintaining order. Attica will be endlessly multiplied.

Such is and will always be the result of a dehumanized approach to the drug abuse problem. Such is the inevitable result of an ethic that ranks efficiency over the individuality of man.

These then are my concerns. We embark upon a dangerous course when we rush head long into programs like NCIC or CADAP which threaten to undermine the rights of privacy of the individual.

Once we allow ourselves, for whatever reasons, to look beyond the individual as the measure of our social programs, we risk the development of so-called "solutions" . . . solutions which can only corrupt our society.

This is the real challenge we face as we attempt to use technology to solve our social problems. We can no longer abdicate our responsibilities. We can no longer let our desire for efficiency so overwhelm us that we forget that the goal of technology is to help man, not to enslave him.

In Massachusetts, we have discovered that the danger is not imaginary . . . but that it is real. And we have discovered how difficult it is to do battle against it.

It is a knowledge not limited to those in government. The citizens, too, realize the threat.

I'd like to read a letter I received from one frightened citizen.

"A scary thing happened to me last Spring. A relative of mine got a job as a deputy sheriff. One bored night on dispatcher duty, he ran his entire family through the National Crime Information Center. Ten out of eleven of us were listed.

"His mother was listed because when she was 18, neighbors complained of a noisy sorority party. (No arrests.)

"His stepfather, a respected businessman, was listed because he complained to the police that he had received a bad check.

"Ten out of eleven of us! No criminal record. But we are on the files of the NCIC!

"P.S., I'll probably be listed again for writing this letter."

This is the danger we must confront. It is danger we cannot afford to overlook.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MAYBEE, MICH.

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in celebrating the 100th anniversary of Maybee, Mich., a village with a proud history of accomplishment. The earliest settlers maintained a fierce independence and passion for achievement that is readily evident in the modern-day residents of Maybee.

Named after Abram Maybee—a prominent local businessman and farmer—who was one of the founders of this town. The village prospered and grew as its residents passed along their spirit of enthusiasm, determination, and coopera-

tion. Those qualities were cited by President Nixon who said in a message to Maybee, "America needs these qualities as it looks to the future."

Maybee is today proudly looking to its past. Its history is detailed in an extraordinary 112-page book with pictures and text that show how it was transformed from a pioneer type existence to a thriving village strengthened by German immigrants and their descendants. An industrious people, they came from Baden, Mecklenburg-Scherin, Alsace Lorraine and other parts of Germany.

As has occurred in so many American towns and cities, their village grew with the arrival of the railroad. By the early 1900's cattle were being shipped by rail along with cheese, milk, tomatoes, grain, and probably brick and tile. Commerce meant progress and new businesses, but the village has retained the qualities that attracted the first settlers.

I am proud to represent the citizens of Maybee and I congratulate them on their 100th anniversary. I know that the village of Maybee will continue to play a vital role in the growth and development of southeastern Michigan. The people of Maybee deserve to be commended on their past accomplishments and achievements and I give them my best wishes as they strive toward new goals.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS BENEFIT ACT

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the tragic case of Ted Buckley, a 26-year-old prison guard with a non-English-speaking wife and three young children, who was brutally murdered in the line of duty. The plight of this man's family exemplifies the need for prompt enactment of the Public Safety Officers Benefit Act of 1973 (H.R. 12), which would provide relief for the families of those who have given their lives to protect ours.

H.R. 12, introduced by Congressman PETER ROBINO, narrowly failed enactment by the 92d Congress. Conferees had agreed to a compromise version of the bill on October 17, 1972. However, passage was prevented by the final adjournment of the Congress 2 days after the conference agreement. The Senate version of the Public Safety Officers Benefit Act of 1973 (S. 15) would make the legislation retroactive to the original October 17, 1972, date, but the House bill does not so provide. I feel that it would be grossly unjust to let the fortuitous circumstances preventing the earlier passage of this legislation deprive the families of persons like Ted Buckley of desperately needed survivor benefits. I sincerely hope that the House Judiciary Committee will see fit to make H.R. 12 retroactive to the original October 17, 1972, date.

Following is a copy of a letter I re-

ceived from Ted Buckley's brother, Mr. William P. Buckley, deputy district attorney of Denver, Colo., written on behalf of his sister-in-law:

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
Denver, August 6, 1973.

Mrs. PAT SCHROEDER,
Representative, Longworth House Office
Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SCHROEDER: On June 22, 1973, my younger brother, Theodore J. Buckley, aged 26, was murdered while on duty as a prison guard at the Arizona State Prison, Florence, Arizona. This event occurred during an inmate uprising in Cellblock 3 and resulted in the death of Ted and one other guard.

Ted suffered a brutal, painful and pointless death at a time when he had many personal plans for the future. Ted was stabbed countless times and beaten with a pipe wrench. His body was then stripped of all personal possessions including his wedding band, watch, wallet and car keys—none of which was ever recovered.

I am writing on behalf of his widow, Sun Cha Buckley, who speaks very little English—and cannot read or write the language—and his three children, aged two, three and four. Ted met his Korean wife while serving with the United States Army. He joined the Army in June, 1966 and served in Korea, Germany and Yuma, Arizona. He spent six and one-half years as a military policeman and was discharged in December, 1972. He had hoped to continue a career in law enforcement and joined the staff of the Arizona State Prison in January, 1973.

His family is entitled to Social Security and Industrial Commission benefits; however, these allowances are insufficient to meet more than minimal needs and the benefits will be drastically reduced when each of the children attains the age of 18. Since the widow's income will be reduced drastically in less than 18 years, no lending institution will finance the purpose of a house for her without collateral. With her language barrier and three small dependents, she is hardly employable.

I am therefore deeply concerned with the status and eventual outcome of the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act of 1973. Senate Bill 15 provides a retroactive date of October 17, 1972; however, the House version of the same Bill—H.R. 12—does not so provide. If passed, with a retroactive date prior to June 22, 1973, this grant would allow for educational planning for both the widow and children and would also provide her with needed income after the children have reached majority.

I believe that Ted's case brings to realization the dire need for the passage of the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act of 1973 and hope the plight of his family will provide for the members of Congress sufficient personalization and incentive to vote for passage, with a retroactive date as provided in Senate Bill 15.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. BUCKLEY,
Deputy District Attorney.

A MAN WHO CARED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in early August we suffered a great loss when Dr. George Wiley died in a tragic boating accident. Those of us who knew him could not believe the cruelty of fate that would snuff out the life of a man of such power, vision, and energy. George in

many ways seemed larger than life, a man who lived to struggle for the principles in which he believed and who seemed to derive strength from the process of overcoming the many obstacles he faced.

In many ways George was an anomaly, or at least a contradiction. A Ph. D. in chemistry, a former college professor and a male, he nonetheless became the leader of the National Welfare Rights Organization, which was and is predominantly composed of poor, uneducated, female welfare recipients. He was able to represent the National Welfare Rights Organization as ably in the foundation board rooms and in the Halls of Congress as he was able to lead its demonstrations in the streets. He could appear at the height of his charismatic powers at a street rally, then move into sophisticated policy discussions within the corridors of power, once again becoming the professor in total command of his subject.

It is, however, not as welfare rights activist and leader that George is most missed. He is missed most by those of us who knew him. We know him as a friend, as a man on whom we could depend, and as a man whose dedicated commitment to his principles challenged us to be more committed and dedicated to our own.

A column by James Wechsler in the New York Post captured, I think, the essence of George Wiley's impact upon us. The article follows:

A MAN WHO CARED
(By James A. Wechsler)

It was early in August, a few days after my vacation had begun, that a radio newscast brought the report that Dr. George Wiley had vanished after falling off a boat from which he was fishing with his two young sons in Chesapeake Bay. His body was recovered three days later.

Although I cannot pretend any prolonged or intimate association with him, I had the sense of losing someone I had known very well. The circumstances of his death, of course, were peculiarly ghastly because one can imagine this gentle crusader torn by thoughts of the anguish of his kids as he vainly battled the tides.

I thought sadly, too, of a meeting we were supposed to have had in late spring when he felt obligated to postpone and our agreement to get together immediately after Labor Day. Even when one differed with him, Wiley was invariably a reasonable, gracious and inspiring figure, and our few long conversations were warm, valued interludes.

Perhaps I have too readily assumed that George Wiley's name will be familiar to all who read. The gifted son of a lower-middle-class black family, he was graduated with honors from Rhode Island University and received a doctorate in organic chemistry at Cornell in 1957.

Soon thereafter he began a teaching career at UCLT and then moved on to Syracuse. But he soon became involved in the civil rights upsurge and served for several years as associate director of the Congress of Racial Equality under Jim Farmer. Then, in 1966 he moved into the area to which he devoted nearly all the years that remained to him—the enlisting of welfare recipients into the National Welfare Rights Organization.

In an era when the stereotype of "welfare bums and chiselers" was becoming a bipartisan political war-cry, Wiley was seeking to affirm the dignity and self-respect of those multitudes to whom relief was not a chosen way of life. Commenting on the start of his movement, The Daily News derisively ob-

served that "most people assumed this was some kind of joke."

But Wiley was neither clown nor exhibitionist. He did forsake conventional academic dress for a dashiki and jeans, as if to underline his commitment to a missionary existence, and at times his public utterances were deemed "extreme"—especially when he later challenged the Nixon-Moynihan Family Assistance Plan as inadequate and in some aspects regressive.

Nevertheless his persistence and dedication were an important measure responsible for NWRO's successes in winning minimal protection for welfare clients whose valid grievances were obscured by anti-welfare agitation.

Throughout these endeavors Wiley was striving not only to organize the friendless and defenseless but to project them to the rest of the country as human beings—neither all saints nor sinners—rather than as a faceless mass.

By late last year, however, he became convinced that the hostile political climate required a broader base of operation; in effect he felt that those on welfare and the "working poor" were being fatally polarized despite a common stake in economic reform.

So he stepped down as executive director of NWRO and announced the creation of a Movement for Economic Justice that would strive to build a new coalition including senior citizens along with consumer health and housing groups. He could not know how little time was left for him.

This tardy retrospect can offer only a glimpse of this burly, decent man who so ardently embraced the causes of people indiscriminately maligned.

But late as the words are, they have some local timeliness in view of the memorial service and march scheduled for tomorrow. Those to whom his life meant much will assemble at noon at Mariners Temple (at Oliver and Henry Sts. on the Lower East Side) and, after a ceremony there, parade past the federal and state buildings to 250 Church St., where the city's Social Services agency is housed.

Shortly before writing these lines, I read an essay by Pat Moynihan in the current Saturday Review/World called "A Country in Need of Praise." In it Moynihan clings to the thesis that the Nixon years have been harshly underestimated; after all, "mass violence" came to an end. Without reviving an awkward phrase, he seems to be saying that "benign neglect" has been richly vindicated.

George Wiley would have cried out in anger at such commentary of complacency. While it is possible to debate the wisdom of his strategy in opposing the limited FAP plan, one recalls with pain how Moynihan subsequently sought to blame Wiley—rather than Richard Nixon's lack of leadership and conviction—for the total debacle that ensued.

To Moynihan, the large Nixon triumph has been "to bring to a close a particular unappreciated period of disorder." To George Wiley, those would have been fighting words. He had no patience for those who rationalize the torment of others, and he cast his lot with the loneliest. Such a man does not pass our way very often.

OPPOSITION TO THE NOMINATION OF GERALD FORD AS VICE PRESIDENT

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to its constitutional responsibilities, the

Congress will soon begin proceedings for the confirmation of the Vice-Presidential nomination of President Nixon. The events which have made them necessary, and the proceedings themselves, are unprecedented in our Nation's history. The task of selecting a new Vice President requires our most exacting consideration.

Among those who have recently given a great deal of their attention to the matter of selecting a new Vice President is my colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON. At this time I would like to share with you some of his thoughts about the President's recent nomination for that high office:

IN OPPOSITION TO THE NOMINATION OF
GERALD FORD AS VICE PRESIDENT
(Statement by the Honorable
MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON)

The President, in nominating Gerald Ford as Vice President, has lost a unique opportunity to restore some of the confidence of the American people in government. Mr. Nixon could have and should have nominated a person of greater stature, and broader experience, who is free of the onus of narrow partisanship.

While I fully recognize and have said that a President should be given broad leeway in his choice of a Vice President, it seems to me that the events of this year culminating in the resignation of Vice President Agnew should have prompted the President to choose a man of the highest quality. He did not.

Given events of the 20th Century, there is a greater probability that our new Vice President may become President than has been the case with other nominees and the new Vice President must be a man with the statesmanship needed to lead the nation should it become necessary. Congressman Ford simply does not come up to these standards.

My objections to the choice of the House Republican leader are based in large measure on my observations of him during my four years in Congress.

These negative feelings are not based on personal animosity, but on my observation of Mr. Ford's limited intellectual qualities; his total and active support of the Nixon foreign policy of the Vietnam war; his staunch defense of the President's domestic program which has resulted in 35 to 40 vetoes in such areas as health, social security, education and housing; and his blanket defense—regardless of merit—of Administration figures involved in the Watergate inquiry. In all these areas, Mr. Ford has shown that he is not the kind of person who should serve as Vice President.

These factors demonstrate that President Nixon made the selection based on the narrowest of considerations—to appease the Congress, to appease Republican Party interests, and to find a person who is not a threat because of future political ambitions.

In these times, the American people deserve something more than the rather dreary selections which have so often characterized the President's appointments to sensitive judicial and executive branch posts.

With 210 million people in this nation and the immense reservoir of talent they offer, the President, by selecting Gerald Ford, has demonstrated the major flaw in his character and Presidency—his inability to find and promote excellence. Instead, the President has preferred to surround himself with a collection of people best noted for their mediocrity.

The President owed it to the people, his party and himself to make a better choice for Vice President.

The American people have no direct voice in the Vice Presidential selection process. This lack of a referendum gives Congress an

added responsibility at this time. Members of Congress must give the people their best and most candid assessment of the nominee for Vice President.

In the exercise of those responsibilities, I intend to vote against Gerald Ford for Vice President.

MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL—NO. 34

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the complete text of a letter Mr. William Baker wrote in response to my gun control inserts:

SOUTHBIDGE, MASS.,
October 1, 1973.

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I know you must be a busy man, and I know I may be wasting your time and mine, but being 71 yrs. old and retired and reading the Congressional Record a lot and knowing your fight against hand guns I thought I would at least get it off my mind.

I don't own a hand gun and never did, but I think you're wasting your time fighting for "Cloud 13"—to-night is a beautiful night as I write to you and I don't dare go for a walk which I would like to do because it's not safe anymore after dark, and it's not because of hand-guns, but of what we have walking the streets and nothing is done about it. I am attaching some news items from to-night's Worcester Evening Gazette—you will notice that by far it's not "Guns" so on the basis of your apparent thinking don't you think we should "Outlaw #1—Knives, 2, Matches—10 people died a few weeks ago by a fire set. 3, Stones man killed in Spencer hit over the head with a Rock., 4, Ax. 5, Sticks & Clubs, 6—cut off arms so they can't choke or strangle and beat you up. Frankly, I could go on for hours but this is just ridiculous. Why don't you do something about getting some laws through with teeth and get these people, like drug peddlers, in jail for life or better still do like Russia and send them to Siberia or San Clemente, where they can just disappear, why don't you do something about the situation in Northern Ireland for instance and last but not least the enclosed article about the "Destitute Hospital Boarders found Dead in Wheelchairs" and fellows like you worry about hand guns.

Get some real "Laws" to Protect the Innocent People and not Protection for the Misfits at the expense of the Old and helpless. Thanks for hearing me out, I'll now go back to my living room window and look out at "No Mans Land" where the S.O.B. have taken over.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM A. BAKER, Sr.

Although I disagree with Mr. Baker on the need for gun control in our society, I would like to stress the validity of the other points he raised. Mr. Baker's basic concerns are certainly legitimate and the issues cannot be ignored. At the same time, gun control cannot be excluded from the list of policies essential to solving many of the fundamental problems we face as a Nation.

After handguns, knives are responsible for the second largest percent of murders; matches were responsible for the fire that decimated 30 blocks of Chelsea, Mass.; 8 percent of the homicides in the

United States are caused by hands, fists, and feet. In addition, unfortunately, Mr. Baker is correct in saying that old people are only negligently protected by the laws of this country.

Letters from concerned citizens do not usually solve our problems. But if Congress has the guts to make laws to protect our citizens, the problem will be half solved. The first step we can take is to implement gun control legislation. Handguns kill more than 10,000 people every year. Joan Marie Nevitt was one of them. The following article is from the New Jersey Courier News of September 25, 1973:

DAD OF FOUR GETS LIFE FOR WIFE'S MURDER

MOUNT HOLLY, N.J.—A father of four children has been convicted for the first degree murder of his wife, whose body was found buried under their Mariton home three months after her death last Oct. 19.

A jury of six men and six women deliberated four hours before finding Arthur P. Nevitt Jr. guilty of shooting his wife, Joan Marie, 40.

Superior Court Judge W. Thomas McGann immediately sentenced Nevitt to life imprisonment.

Nevitt had maintained during the two-week trial that he accidentally shot his wife and couldn't remember burying her.

Nevitt's 16-year-old daughter Barbara wept openly when the verdict was read, and a woman who had custody of three of his children cried out "Oh, God."

John L. Madden, first assistant Burlington County prosecutor, said the verdict was "just."

A motion by Andrew J. Rodnite, county public defender, for a delay in sentencing was denied by Judge McGann, who pointed out that a life sentence was mandatory.

THE HISTORY AND TRADITION OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Naval Reserve has a long and loyal tradition of service to the cause of American seapower. In the September issue of the Naval publication "All Hands," Jerry Wolff writes interesting and informatively of that tradition as follows:

THE HISTORY AND TRADITION OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

(By Jerry Wolff)

Back in World War II, they called them "90-day wonders"—young Naval Reservists like Ensigns Herbert C. Jones and Francis C. Flaherty. They had earned their commissions through wartime three-month training programs.

Herb Jones had been in the Naval Reserve since 1935, when he enlisted at the age of 17. He was 22 when he reported for active duty in the summer of 1940. Francis Flaherty enlisted in the Reserves in July 1940, at the age of 21.

Jones graduated with the first V-7 midshipman class to complete training on board the old USS *Illinois* (later renamed *Prairie State*), a floating armory long used for Reserve training at New York City. He was commissioned in November 1940 and assigned to USS *California* (BB 44). Flaherty took his midshipman training at Northwestern University; he was appointed an ensign in De-

cember 1940 and assigned to USS *Oklahoma* (BB 37).

When Pearl Harbor was attacked on 7 Dec. 1941, *California* and *Oklahoma* were both in battleship row. Ensign Jones was just about to relieve the officer of the deck as the first wave of Japanese planes swooped in, hitting *California* with a torpedo and a bomb. Fuel spurted from the ship's ruptured tanks and burst into flame. Jones dove into a hatchway and slipped and slid along the oily decks to rescue an injured man before being temporarily overcome by smoke and fumes. When he came to, he saw an antiaircraft battery without a leader, staggered to his feet and took command, firing the guns at the second wave of Japanese planes until all the ammunition was gone. The ammunition hoist had been knocked out, so he ordered some volunteers to pass ammunition by hand up to the battery.

The shells had just begun to reach the guns when a bomb hit *California* amidships and Ensign Jones was mortally wounded. Two of his men started to carry him to safety but he ordered them to leave him so they could save themselves before the magazines went off. He died shortly afterward.

On *Oklahoma*, Ensign Flaherty's battle station was in one of the forward gun turrets. His ship took three torpedo hits almost immediately after the first Japanese bombs fell and, as *Oklahoma* began to capsize, two more torpedoes struck home. The word was passed to "Abandon ship," but the emergency lights had been knocked out and the men in Flaherty's turret crew were losing their way in the darkness as water poured into the turret and their world turned upside down. Flaherty grabbed a flashlight and kept it pointed at the ladder while his crew scrambled to safety. They made it, but he didn't have time to get out. He went down with the ship.

Naval Reservists Jones and Flaherty, both of whom were posthumously awarded Medals of Honor, represent an American tradition that goes back to colonial times. They were ordinary citizens who became extraordinary Navy men when their country needed them.

That tradition goes back nearly 300 years. Even before the United States became a nation, fishermen and merchant seamen from the English colonies in America played an important part in the long series of wars that England and France fought with each other in North America in the century preceding the Revolution. These early "naval reservists" participated in several large, combined military-naval operations against French settlements in Canada, including expeditions against Quebec in 1690 and 1759, and against Louisbourg in 1745 and 1757-58.

Although America had no Navy of its own when the Revolution began, all 13 of the original colonies had strong maritime ties and there were many men in our then small population who followed the sea for a living. There were also several thousand American-owned ships, many of them already armed for protection against pirates.

Many of these ships were taken over by the various state navies or the Continental Navy, but far the greater number were commissioned by the states or the Continental Congress to operate as privateers—privately owned ships, manned by civilian crews, which were authorized to cruise against British shipping.

Since the crews of the privateers shared in the prize money from the ships and cargoes they captured, most experienced seamen preferred privateering to service in the low-paying Continental or state navies. As a result, more than 2000 ships and over 70,000 men were engaged in privateering, while the peak strength of the Continental Navy was probably never more than 3000 men. The cargoes the privateers captured were an important source of arms and supplies for the

American Army, and the effectiveness of the privateers was soon reflected in soaring insurance rates on British shipping and supply problems for the British Army.

In the war of 1812, many American seafaring men again went to war as civilians in the crews of privateers and, once again, the privateers caused serious problems for Great Britain. One good example was the action fought by Captain Samuel Chester Reid and the 90-man crew of his brig *General Armstrong* at Fayal in the Azores.

Captain Reid, who had first gone to sea at the age of 11, had served for a while in the U.S. Navy as an acting midshipman under Commodore Thomas Truxtun in the West Indies during the naval war with France. As a privateer, he was on his fifth cruise in *General Armstrong* when he put in at Fayal on 26 Sep 1814.

About sunset of the same day, three large British warships arrived—the 18-gun *Carnation*, the 74-gun *Plantagenet* and the 38-gun *Rota*. On board they carried some 2000 troops who were supposed to become part of an invasion force then being assembled in the West Indies to attack New Orleans.

Captain Reid, whose guns consisted of just six nine-pounders and an old 42-pounder named "Long Tom," sensed trouble, even though Fayal was a neutral port. He moved his ship in close to shore, where the big British ships would not be able to come alongside, and he made preparations for repelling boarders.

Before long the British ships began lowering armed boats, and at about dusk, four of them, filled with men, drew within hailing distance. Reid warned them to stand off, but they kept coming, and the American ship loosed a storm of grapeshot. The British answered with small arms and swivel guns mounted on two of the boats, then withdrew.

Around midnight the British attacked again—but with more heavily armed craft and a much larger force. Reid figured they had at least 12 boats and some 400 men. This time the battle lasted 40 minutes before the would-be boarders were again driven off.

Next morning, one of the British ships got within range and opened up with her big guns. Reid returned her fire, but he knew further resistance would be useless, so he attempted to scuttle his ship and took his men ashore. As soon as he and his men were gone, British boarding parties took over and set fire to the troublesome little American ship, but they had paid dearly for their victory—120 British dead and another 180 wounded. Reid's losses were only two dead and seven wounded.

Incidentally, Captain Reid's service to his country did not end there. In 1818 he came up with a plan for the system we now follow to represent new states on the American flag. At that time, the U.S. flag had 15 stars and 15 stripes, a design which had been in use since 1795, after the 14th and 15th states had joined the Union. It was Captain Reid's idea to go back to the present 13 stripes, honoring the 13 original colonies, but to add a new star to the blue field whenever a new state entered the union.

By the time the Civil War began, 34 states had been admitted to the Union, and the nation had spanned the continent. As more and more settlers moved inland and westward from the original 13 seaboard states, the percentage of seafaring men in the total population became smaller and smaller, which presented a real manpower problem when the Union Navy began expanding in 1861. Although President Thomas Jefferson had suggested the establishment of a naval militia as early as 1805 nothing had come of the idea, and when war broke out there was no naval reserve of any sort. Many men who did have experience at sea had been lured into the Army by enlistment bonuses.

To meet the need for officers, a sort of Naval Reserve—the Volunteer Navy of the United States—was established by an Act of 24 Jul 1861, which authorized the temporary appointment of acting lieutenants, paymasters, assistant surgeons, masters and master's mates to serve during the "insurrection," as officers on "such vessels as may be deemed necessary for the temporary increase of the Navy." A total of about 7500 volunteer officers served during that war.

Most of these officers came from the merchant service, but there were others who were sadly lacking in seagoing experience. As one naval historian puts it:

"Many of the inexperienced officers acquainted themselves with credit, zeal and fidelity, but unfortunately not all of them were fitted for the naval service. This was especially true of the engineer corps. One of the acting engineers, for instance, was a village schoolmaster from the up-country of New Hampshire, whose knowledge of marine engineering had been gained from a picture of a condensing engine in a textbook on natural philosophy common in the schools of New England. He introduced into the service one of his favorite pupils, whose knowledge of engineering was, if possible, even more rudimentary."

The need for enlisted men was so great that Admiral David D. Porter later referred to the early years of the Civil War as a time "when there was no naval militia to draw from, and Union ships lay unmanned while Confederate ships were sweeping Northern commerce from the oceans." Congress finally tried to meet the situation by authorizing the Navy to draft all seamen who had entered the land service.

Despite the lessons of the Civil War, the Navy saw little need for a Naval Militia or Naval Reserve in the peacetime postwar years. However, in 1873 a group of former naval officers got together to advance a plan for a Reserve Corps composed of ex-naval officers from the Civil War who could be called to active duty in the event of war. Gradually, through the 1870s and '80s, the interest in forming some sort of naval reserve grew and, finally, on 17 May 1888, the governor of Massachusetts approved an act establishing a naval battalion as part of the state militia. New York, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island followed in 1889, and before long other seacoast and Great Lakes states also saw the need for such units. By 1897, 16 states had a naval militia in one form or another.

The first Federal financial aid to the movement came in 1891, when Congress passed a Naval Appropriation Act including \$25,000 earmarked for arming and equipping naval militia. The Office of Naval Militia was set up in the Navy Department to administer the program and ships, material and equipment were lent to the units.

By 1894, the movement had reached the point where the Secretary of the Navy was given authority to lend each state having a naval militia one of the Navy's older ships, as well as equipment, to "promote drills and instructions."

In 1898, the year of the Spanish-American War, the militiamen proved themselves an important body of trained personnel. Governors of the various states granted officers and enlisted men leaves of absence so they could serve with the Regular Navy.

Within six hours after it received notification, the First Naval Battalion of New York reported for duty—fully armed and equipped—on the auxiliary cruiser USS *Yankee*. Twenty hours after it was called, the Massachusetts unit arrived on board the auxiliary cruiser USS *Prairie* at New York.

The militia units were able to furnish 4216 of the 10,375 additional men taken into the Navy at the war's outbreak. By the time the Spanish-American War was over, 19

states were maintaining militia organizations, with a total strength of 492 officers and 6300 enlisted men.

The value and efficiency of the members of the naval militia had been so thoroughly demonstrated during the war that the Navy Department recommended the creation of a national Naval Reserve, but it took a while to iron out the details. The first major step was not taken until the Naval Militia Act of February 1914, which required all naval militia states to organize their units to conform to a plan prescribed by the Navy Department. A Division of Militia Affairs was established in the Navy Department in April 1914 to assume the work of the old Office of Naval Militia. Then, on 3 Mar 1915, Congress passed the legislation which first established a Federal Naval Reserve—to be composed of enlisted men who had seen service in the Regular Navy. The response was limited, and on 29 Aug 1916, with World War I already underway in Europe, Congress passed an act establishing a new Naval Reserve Force and federalizing the Naval Militia.

During the First World War, about 30,000 Reserve officers and 300,000 enlisted Reservists served on active duty. Among them were 12,000 women Reservists who worked as "yeomanettes" in Navy and Marine Corps offices and a group of flying enthusiasts from Yale University who had bought their own plane, learned to fly at their own expense and volunteered their services to the Navy before the United States had entered the war. This First Yale Unit pioneered the modern Naval Air Reserve.

The World War I Naval Reserve also produced four recipients of the Medal of Honor, 315 officers and enlisted men who earned the Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism in combat, the Navy's only air ace of the war, the first naval aviator to be credited with the destruction of a German submarine and the first Navy pilot to shoot down an enemy aircraft.

Following the war, the Naval Reserve began to move closer to its present form of organization during the late 1920s and the 1930s.

By 1938 the drilling Naval Reserve numbered about 11,380 officers and enlisted men. About 19,500 others had signed up for the Volunteer Reserve, which was not required to drill, and the Merchant Marine Reserve had about 6000 officers and enlisted members.

The World War II mobilization of the Naval Reserve on a voluntary basis began the following year, and by 12 June 1941, all members not in a deferred status had been called to active duty. By the end of the war, there were some 300,000 officers and 2.5 million enlisted men on active duty. More than three-fourths of them were Reservists.

When the war ended in 1945, many of these veterans joined Naval Reserve units back home. Hundreds of Naval Reserve training centers and other, smaller facilities were established to provide training in almost every phase of naval activity. Quarters were found in private, public and municipal buildings of every description—universities, city halls, fire stations and, in some cases, even jails. The World War II veterans were joined by younger, nonrated men who wanted to learn something about the Navy before they received orders to active duty.

In the nearly three decades which have passed since 1945, the Naval Reserve has continued to serve with distinction in times of crisis. During the Korea conflict over 130,000 Reservists from air and surface units answered the call to arms, and better than one out of four of the Navymen on active duty were Reservists. In one typical month of air operations in Korea, three-fourths of the 8000 combat sorties flown were by Naval Reserve aviators. Again, during the Berlin Crisis

of 1961, 40 Naval Reserve ships were called to active duty along with their crews, and 18 Air Reserve squadrons were activated.

Although there was no large-scale mobilization of the Naval Reserve during the conflict in Vietnam, six Naval Air Reserve squadrons and two Reserve Seabee battalions were mobilized in 1968 to serve for a year on active duty. In addition, many of the Navymen on active duty in Vietnam have been young Reservists in various officer programs or the 2x6 enlisted program, which calls for two years of active duty during a six-year Reserve enlistment. As of 1967, almost one out of seven Navymen on active duty were Reservists, and today the figure is about one out of 10.

The first naval officer to be awarded the Medal of Honor for action in Vietnam was a Naval Reservist—Lieutenant Vincent R. Capodanno of the Chaplain Corps. He was killed on 4 Sep 1967 while trying to help a wounded hospital corpsman directly in the line of fire of an enemy machinegun only 15 yards away.

In the 1970s more and more emphasis is being placed on the Naval Reserve as a key element in national defense under the Total Force Concept and, with the elimination of the draft and reductions in the size of the active duty Navy, America is banking heavily on a strong and effective Naval Reserve as a readily available back-up force for the full-time Navy. Judging from past performances, if that back-up force is ever needed in an emergency, you can safely bet that many of the "ordinary" citizens in our part-time Navy will turn out to be extraordinary full-time Navymen when the chips are really down.

PENDING CONSIDERATION OF THE TRADE BILL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in considering proposed changes in our trade policy with the Soviet Union, we must keep foremost in our minds the vital strategic interests of the United States and actual changes in Soviet society.

The most-favored-nation principle is not a right that ought to be lightly extended to any nation in the world simply as a manifestation of their existence. Instead, the opportunity to trade with the United States under the most favorable arrangements should only be granted when it can clearly be demonstrated that certain basic presuppositions of the most-favored-nation status are fulfilled and, moreover, that no conflict exists with the vital interest of this country. In short, a nation must adhere to all the basic requirements of international economic exchange in order to qualify for MFN status and also, it must be clearly demonstrated that no further transfer of American technical expertise is exported that may return, as in Vietnam, in the form of American casualties.

Quite clearly the argument presented by the administration supporting the granting of MFN status to the Soviet Union is but a part, though a vitally important part, of the general policy of détente pursued in recent years. One may find echoes of this policy in former Pres-

ident Johnson's efforts to "build bridges of understanding" to the Communist nations. With the expansion of contact and agreements under President Nixon with the Soviet Union and particularly with the beginning of diplomatic communication with Red China, the policy of what was previously called "peaceful coexistence" has proceeded at an extraordinarily rapid pace.

But if recent events are any indication, then it appears that an inverse relationship apparently exists between the euphoric rhetoric surrounding détente and the concrete actions transpiring in the real world. Soviet dissidents have cautioned Americans about the fraudulent nature of the current negotiations with the Soviets, while even Kremlin leaders themselves have admitted the totally pragmatic character of their desire for trade with the United States.

The famous Russian nuclear physicist, Andrei Sakharov, after specifically being told not to talk to Western journalists, warned them that détente would become "very dangerous" if democratization did not take place within Soviet society to free the leadership from their isolation. "What is necessary is to liquidate society's ideological obsession." That obsession is apparent in the pronouncements of many party leaders.

Just last month, as reported by the New York Times on September 17, Leonid Brezhnev informed Communist Party leaders from Eastern Europe that détente only represented a tactical maneuver to permit the Soviet bloc to use Western technological assistance in order to establish superior strength in the next 12 to 15 years. Being much more blunt, Vladimir N. Yagodka, Moscow city party official in charge of propaganda, has analogized that there is nothing wrong with signing a pact with the devil "if you are certain you can cheat the devil."

The United States has already bailed the Soviet Union out of one of their worst annual agricultural disasters with the huge shipment of wheat this past year. While American grain, general foodstuffs, transportation, and other prices have skyrocketed as a consequence of the deal, Russians are purchasing bread for as little as 16 kopeks—23 cents—for a 2-pound loaf.

Absolutely no justification exists for an American extension of credit and trade privileges to the Soviet Union, especially when, as they readily admit, they will only purchase materials and copy techniques in order to more effectively struggle against us in the future. There is even less justification for present U.S. credits to the Soviet Union—credits to an American taxpayer.

Without even waiting for the future, the Kremlin leadership has clearly demonstrated in the past year their truly selfish and cynical attitudes toward détente. While the United States withdrew which are being subsidized by the American forces from Vietnam and made extraordinary concessions to bring about a peace settlement, the Soviets continued supplying their Asian allies with the means of conducting further warfare. In the days preceding this discussion, the

same actions have appeared in the Middle East.

Yesterday, the State Department announced that the Soviet Union has thus far sent 280 flights from Moscow to Cairo and Damascus carrying 4,000 tons of military hardware since the beginning of the latest Middle East war. Just last night, CBS, reported positive identification of Soviet advisors serving with the Syrian army, and also noted increasing indications that Russian pilots are manning some of the Syrian Mig fighters. Even prior to these revelations, the general conduct of the Russians in the coming of the war contain many ominous signs that agreements supposedly made last year in Moscow with President Nixon are not being fulfilled. The Kremlin has issued a statement that they will cooperate in order to limit the current fighting—by that they may mean limiting it at the moment to the crushing of Israel with Russian arms.

The current actions speak much more eloquently than any official pronouncements do on the real attitude of the Soviet Union toward cooperating with the United States in order to bring about a "generation of peace." While the Soviets have consistently placed their own self-interest and revolutionary ideology in the position of primary consideration in governing their decisionmaking, we have often ignored our own vital interests in order not to upset an allegedly existing détente.

With the trade measure currently under discussion, we must begin once again to concern ourselves with our own well-being, both now and in the distant future. Even the proponents of the measure agree that the principle benefits accrue to the Soviet Union. As Harvard professor, Abram Bergson, a specialist on the Soviet economy, testified in July before the Senate-House Economic Committee:

It is fairly evident, I think, that the U.S.S.R. has more to gain than we from the new commercial relationship.

If the past is any indication, the Soviets will receive vitally needed foodstuffs and modern machinery from us; we will receive additional IOU's and promises of natural gas supplies in another decade.

We do not fear competition from the Russians, but as long as they remain in an adversary position to civilized conduct throughout the world, no possible reasons exist for strengthening them as they pursue their malevolent designs, both at home and abroad.

THE NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE SUPPORTS THE COMMUNITY AN- TICRIME ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1973

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, the National Urban League, represented by the able and articulate new director of its Washington Bureau, Ronald H. Brown, strongly supported the

Community Anticrime Act of 1973, H.R. 9175, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Crime of the House Judiciary Committee.

Because this bill, which was introduced by my brother from Detroit, Congressman JOHN CONYERS, is such an important effort to provide a vehicle by which the Federal Government can assist communities in obtaining citizen involvement in the effort to fight the causes of crime, and because Mr. Brown's testimony was so impressive in support of this measure, I place his testimony in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

TESTIMONY BY RONALD H. BROWN

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the National Urban League, I wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity to address this subcommittee on the vital issue of participation of the community in crime prevention.

The National Urban League is an interracial non-profit, non-partisan community service organization which uses the tools of social work, economics, law, and other disciplines to secure equal opportunities in all sectors of our society for black Americans and other minorities. We have a 63-year history of service.

On the local level, the National Urban League has 101 affiliates located in 34 states and the District of Columbia.

Local affiliates serve as advocates of black and other minorities within their own localities, implementing programs determined by local communities to meet their needs. The National Office of the Urban League movement channels funds to the affiliates for operation of national demonstration projects designed to find unique solutions and answers to critical issues of national concern.

The skilled professional staff of more than 2,000 persons of the National Urban League and affiliates offices are supplemented by a cadre of some 25,000 volunteers.

The National Urban League has a particular interest in the issue of community participation in crime prevention because of the impact of crime on the black community. Black people are four times as likely as white people to be robbed, twice as likely to be assaulted, and four times as likely to be raped. Crime is a deadly reality that drains the energies and vitality of our neighborhoods and fills its streets with dread.

While the basic causes of crime, namely poverty, racism and economic exploitation need to be resolved before meaningful change can occur, some effort has to be directed toward providing symptomatic relief for the victims of crime. People must feel safe to be in or leave their houses and to develop and maintain their own economic security, i.e., traveling to and from jobs or to participate in training and/or social programs.

The criminal justice system is intended to be the bulwark against crime. Yet suspicion, fear and disrespect of that system abounds within the ghettos of this nation. We must ask ourselves why these attitudes and feelings get acted out against the policeman who represents the first line of defense against crime. A young black facing the uncertainty of arrest often prefers to conduct "court" on the streets with the arresting officer than face the uncertainty of arrest. Then other citizens may choose to relegate their role to that of indifferent observer. The policeman's job is thus made more difficult as he is often viewed with contempt by those he is sworn to protect.

The conflict between police and community is further exacerbated by the fact that the policeman is compelled to enforce private morality that masquerades as law; these are called victimless crimes. The black community is acutely aware of the inherent contra-

diction of the criminal justice system acting as moral arbitrator, when they view the sentencing patterns of poor people as compared to the affluent. Three out of four car thieves are committed to prison for an average of three years; of those convicted of securities fraud, only 16% are sentenced to jail, and then for an average term of one year.

We recognize that too often the black community has not participated in any significant degree in the design, development and implementation of Criminal Justice Programs. This fact is illustrated in the very limited participation of blacks and other minorities in the National Commission of Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. If the federal government through this proposed legislation is going to require as in Section 103 Subheading (b)1 satisfactory assurances that applicants for grants involve the disadvantaged and black, it must first demonstrate its willingness to so involve minorities on such prestigious and important planning bodies.

In designing programs to deal with the problems of crime, the National Urban League has sought through its Administration of Justice Programs the direct participation of the black community in a broad range of activities within the criminal justice field.

In the area of increased minority participation in the various police departments, over the past year our Law Enforcement Recruitment Project in cooperation with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) was responsible for the recruitment of 3,600 minority police officers in three major impact cities. That program has expanded to three additional cities this year.

In the area of Corrections—the National Urban League conducted a pilot demonstration project at Rikers Island, a New York City Detention Center, in cooperation with the New York City Department of Corrections. Using ex-offenders in concert with minority professionals the League was responsible for providing over 1,800 man hours of in-service training for correctional officers, including the high ranking officers within that system. The result has been the establishment of the first Correction Officers Academy.

At the community level, National Urban League's Community Assistance Project is a pilot project in Chester, Pennsylvania. The Project has realized successes in pre-trial diversion. The community-based staff, including ex-offenders resolves family disputes and neighborhood conflicts through arbitration. Thus, local police are removed from the moral arbiter role.

Since 50% of all police homicides occur as a result of such intervention this activity is of utmost importance.

The Community Assistance Project also sponsors parolees, offers bail and investigative service for defendants as well as victims of crimes to insure that justice will be served for both parties.

These experiences of working cooperatively with the Criminal Justice System provides a background against which we make the following recommendations on House Bill 9175.

We heartedly endorse the intent of this Bill and applaud the efforts to render technical and financial support for the community's efforts to help themselves. For too many years the pathology within the poor and black community has been stressed, as opposed to offering support to the strengths that we of the National Urban League know exist.

We believe that the establishment of a community structure to coordinate all citizen programs should offer the necessary information and technical assistance including fiscal management aid and evaluation of program results to citizen groups. Such services can better be offered by established non-profit agencies (minority organizations

where appropriate) who along with proven management capability have also a demonstrated sensitivity to the particular circumstances faced by citizen groups.

Therefore, the National Urban League recommends the following:

(1) Title I—Section 102—Sub-heading (b) 8 provides for "the establishment of community structures to coordinate all citizen programs." This responsibility should be removed from that of local government and be placed under the auspice of non-profit organizations—under Title II, Grants to Non-profit Private Agencies.

(2) On the issue of consumer participation: (Section 103—Sub-heading (b) paragraph (1) that provides for assurance of the involvement of disadvantaged and minority groups in the justice system. This section should be strengthened to make participation mandatory with the details of this requirement specifically stated.

(3) Under Title II, Grants to Non-profit Private Agencies:

(a) This section should also include grants to communities to conduct pre-trial diversion to resolve . . .

(b) Programs that directly involve youth in the planning, development, and implementation of activities geared to reduce juvenile crime and discouraging and/or preventing delinquent behavior must be included. This is of particular importance when we consider in that 1971, 45% of all arrest for major crimes were of youngsters under 18 years of age. Youth must be involved. The National Urban League has demonstrated its commitment to this principle when instituting a policy requiring all boards of directors of its affiliates, as well as the National board to be composed of 25% of youth.

Although the National Urban League is a well established non-profit agency with a 63-year history of service, it recognizes that many neighborhood groups who are performing well, but who lack a formal organizational structure may be excluded from participation in this program. We, therefore recommend in:

Section 203—Sub-heading (a), that such groups that lack a formal structure with proven record, be allowed to apply for a grant with the provision that they have a sponsor who is a private, non-profit organization. This non-profit sponsor will have administrative responsibility for no more than one year, or until such time that the citizen group is able to satisfy the director that they meet the minimum standard outlined within the legislation for non-profit organization.

Mr. Chairman—We feel that House Bill 9175, is one of the most significant pieces of legislation in the fight against crime, for it holds the promise of not only providing financial assistance for citizen involvement, but it can also lend credence to the necessity of that involvement.

We urge your support of this legislation and pledge the National Urban League's commitment in carrying its purpose.

I thank you again for your attention.

THE ARENA STAGE CO.

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of the recently passed legislation to authorize the extension of the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities, I take great pleasure in welcoming back to the United States the Arena Stage Co. of Washington, D.C.

This group, founded and directed by Zelda Fichandler and her husband, Tom,

has just completed an international good will tour of several European cities presenting performances of the American classics, "Our Town" and "Inherit the Wind."

As a recipient of support from the endowment, this organization has given the Washington public the benefit of creative contemporary theater at reasonable prices. I applaud the members of the Arena Stage Co. and thank them for giving thousands of foreign citizens a view of the best of American theater.

CONSUMER CREDIT HEARINGS RESUMING OCTOBER 29 WILL COVER AGRICULTURAL CREDIT, SEX DISCRIMINATION AND NUMEROUS OTHER ISSUES

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, from the numbers of calls the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency has been receiving from the offices of Members of Congress seeking information in order to respond to constituents' correspondence on consumer credit matters, it is clear that there is widespread public interest in the operations of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968 and in many pending proposals for changes and improvements in truth in lending and other titles of that landmark law.

Many Members have received letters urging elimination of agricultural credit from the coverage of the Truth in Lending Act. There is also particular interest in the subject of discrimination in the extension of credit by reason of sex or marital status. The discrimination issue was brought to national attention for the first time in May 1972, when the National Commission on Consumer Finance, created by title IV of the 1968 act, held hearings on the problems encountered by women in obtaining credit in their own names or in having their earnings taken into consideration by real estate lending institutions in determining a family's financial eligibility for a mortgage in buying a home.

EFFECTS OF SOME STATE LAWS

As the member of the National Commission who proposed the sex discrimination hearings in 1972, and as the only one of the six congressional Members of the nine-member Commission who heard all of the testimony during the 2 full days of the hearings, I found that a thoroughly convincing case was made by the witnesses that discrimination against women was at that time widespread throughout the credit industry. Much of it was based on plain, ordinary stupidity by credit office personnel rigidly applying standards of creditworthiness based on outmoded concepts of women's role in the economy. But it was also established that some of the discriminatory practices were based, whether legitimately or not, on State laws still in effect, or recently repealed or modified, which, as the Commission later reported, "hinder

the admission of creditworthy women to the credit society."

Mentioned particularly were State laws dealing with alimony, support, dower, and curtesy, community property, and, in the case of usury laws in many States, provisions which prohibit a creditor from establishing separate accounts for husbands and wives if the State has a graduated ceiling on maximum finance rates with the rate decreasing as the credit balance increases.

As a result of the hearings of the National Commission on Consumer Finance, many major creditors who had been identified in our hearings as maintaining archaic and indefensible policies in refusing credit to women in their own names, not taking into account a woman's own creditworthiness in rejecting her application, immediately began to restudy and revise their policies. Noting this quick reversal of position on the part of many banks, finance companies, department stores, credit card companies, et cetera, the Commission recommended immediate action in the State legislatures to analyze any of their still-existing laws which led creditors to believe they assumed special risks in extending credit to married or previously married women in their own names.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY ON SEX DISCRIMINATION

In the meantime, however, many bills have been introduced in the Congress calling for a Federal prohibition against discrimination in the extension of credit by reason of sex and marital status. Such a provision recently passed the Senate without hearings as title III of S. 2101, a bill dealing also with credit billing practices and with technical changes in truth in lending.

My Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs began hearings in July on the general subject of consumer credit regulation, including the 85 recommendations of the National Commission on Consumer Finance for far-reaching changes in the consumer credit industry and in Federal and State regulatory practices. We are also covering in our hearings the operations of the various titles of the Consumer Credit Protection Act: Title I, Truth in Lending; Title II, Extortion; Title III, Garnishment; and Title VI, the Fair Credit Reporting Act—Title IV created the National Commission whose work ended at the start of this year; title V is a miscellaneous title dealing primarily with grammatical usages, severability, and effective dates.

In all of our consumer credit hearings so far this year—with the Federal Trade Commission on the operations of and needed changes in the Fair Credit Reporting Act; with the FTC and the Federal Reserve on the operations of and needed changes in truth in lending; and with former Chairman of the National Commission on Consumer Finance, Ira M. Millstein, on the recommendations of that panel—we have been going into the sex and marital status discrimination issue with all witnesses. We will continue to do so in further hearings to begin later on this month, on October 29.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE LEGISLATION

Out of our hearings, I hope we can come forward with effective and work-

able legislation which deals with all of the significant problems consumers face in the informed and effective utilization of credit, and which meets and solves legitimate problems the credit industry has encountered under existing laws.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, many Members are receiving complaints from lenders and credit sellers in the rural areas about the agricultural coverage of truth in lending. We intend to hear both sides of that issue, too, along with all other issues in the consumer credit field.

For the information of Members of the House, and to assist them further in answering constituents' inquiries about consumer credit issues, I submit as part of my remarks the press release issued by the subcommittee yesterday on the nature and scope of the next series of hearings beginning October 29.

The press release referred to is as follows:

**CONSUMER CREDIT HEARINGS RESUME
OCTOBER 29**

Chairman Leonor K. Sullivan of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, House Committee on Banking and Currency, announced today the resumption beginning October 29, 1973, of Subcommittee hearings on consumer credit issues, including the question of discrimination against women in extensions of credit, coverage of agricultural transactions under the Truth in Lending Act, the recommendations of the National Commission on Consumer Finance, proposed changes in the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and related subjects.

Both morning and afternoon sessions have been scheduled so far for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, October 29, 30, and 31, and Tuesday, November 6, in the main hearing room of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Room 2128 Rayburn House Office Building. Further hearings are contemplated later in November.

"There is tremendous interest in the subject of prohibiting discrimination in credit by reason of sex or marital status," Mrs. Sullivan declared, "and this is an issue we will go into with all of our witnesses from Federal regulatory agencies having jurisdiction over Truth in Lending enforcement, as well as with all witnesses from the private sector."

"As the member of the National Commission on Consumer Finance who instigated the two days of hearings on sex and marital status discrimination by that Commission in May, 1972, which led in turn to the introduction of scores of bills on this subject, I am anxious to develop the feasibility of a Federal anti-discrimination law, such as has been passed by the Senate, in view of the Commission's findings that state laws dealing with alimony, support, dower and curtesy, community property, and certain aspects of usury statutes hinder admission of credit-worthy women to the credit society."

Mrs. Sullivan added that the Subcommittee will also be covering the whole range of issues involving creditor remedies and debtor defenses—such as garnishment, confession of judgment notes, repossession, deficiency judgments, security interest in property, default, holder-in-due course, wage assignments, balloon payments, cosigner agreements, etc.—cited as often abusive by the National Commission; also it will go into unfair collection practices, including harassment, inconvenient venue, and "sewer service"; and into such issues raised by the National Commission as door-to-door sales "cooling off periods", rebates for pre-payment of installment contracts, credit insurance, and others. Class action suits and agriculture credit will also be discussed.

"A major purpose of the hearings will be

to develop information looking toward the introduction this year or early next year of an omnibus bill to carry out many of the 85 recommendations of the National Commission and to resolve many technical issues which have arisen through the operations of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968," the Chairman said.

"We began this series of hearings in July with testimony from the Federal Trade Commission on the Fair Credit Reporting Act of 1970 (which became Title VI of the Consumer Credit Protection Act); from the FTC and the Federal Reserve Board on Truth in Lending issues; and from the former Chairman of the National Commission on Consumer Finance, Ira M. Millstein. These three hearings provided us with many significant proposals for improvements in the basic consumer credit laws from the standpoint of protection of consumers as well as fairness to the credit industry."

"The new series of hearings beginning October 29 will build on that foundation. While we are not as yet taking up specific bills, we will be covering all of the issues contained in S. 2101 as passed by the Senate and in the many bills introduced in the House dealing with many different aspects of consumer credit regulation."

The list of witnesses for each of the four days of hearings so far scheduled will be announced later.

VETERANS DAY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 22, this Nation will celebrate Veterans Day—a day set aside to honor the many men and women who have served loyally and bravely in our Armed Forces.

This year, Veterans Day is particularly meaningful. We have concluded our involvement in Vietnam, and people throughout our Nation and the world are starting to believe that the notion of a world without war can be transformed into reality. Hence, today we pay special tribute to our veterans. The men and women of this Nation, I am proud to say, have been willing to go anywhere in the world to defend the fundamental concepts of human dignity and decency during the history of our Nation.

Today, we the Congress of the United States, must make a pledge—a promise to those who have served our country that we in turn will give them our total support. The Congress must continue to help veterans find jobs, to provide housing and adequate educational benefits, and to guarantee hospital and disability benefits.

We must do our best to assure these individuals that their benefits will not be curtailed by inflation or undercut by increases in social security or other benefits.

As a member of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and Training, I will continue to assist our veterans in any way I can. Personally, I feel fortunate to be in a position whereby I can help this Nation say thank you to this special group of citizens.

I am well aware of the fact that many of our veterans and veterans' organizations wish that the day of celebration be returned to its original date of November 11. As a result, I have introduced legislation to this effect. However, in reality, the celebration of Veterans Day is only symbolic at best—the real challenge, and obligation of each Member of Congress, is to work hard and to work together to see that our veterans are remembered thru our legislative efforts.

**SAVINGS AND LOAN CONVERSION:
THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
BOARD INDICATES DIRECTION**

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, recently the Federal Home Loan Bank Board issued interim regulations on mutual to stock conversions of Savings and Loans. The new rules are intended to govern until the conversion moratorium we mandated earlier this year expires on June 30, 1974.

The regulations signal a significant shift in the Board's policy on conversions. The Board has apparently abandoned the "windfall" conversion formula which it had previously advanced and which might well have caused significant fund shifts. The Board has decided to instead explore the use of conversions as a means of significantly strengthening their capital position. Given the financial pressure they are experiencing at this juncture and may well face in the future, I think it well that the use of stock conversions as a means to the end of a stronger home mortgage lending industry warrant our careful study. In furtherance of that objective, I wish to include the comments and reference to regulations appearing in the Federal Register of September 6, 1973, at this point:

Since December 5, 1963, the Board has maintained a moratorium on conversions of all FSLIC-insured institutions, both Federally chartered and State chartered, from the mutual to stock form. Hence, since that date § 546.6 and 563.22-1 have been without substantive effect. In addition, the Board has long been of the view that § 546.5 and 563.22-1 are totally inadequate to govern mutual to stock conversions and prescribe standards for such conversions, which, if generally followed, would produce seriously improper results. On January 3, 1973 the Board proposed to revoke § 546.5 and 563.22-1 and to adopt a new Part 563b of the rules and regulations for Insurance of Accounts, designed to govern mutual to stock conversions by both Federally chartered and State chartered FSLIC-insured associations. On March 9, 1973, the Board briefly extended the comment period on its January 3 proposals and announced that the Board intended to issue revised proposed regulations.

On August 16, 1973, the President signed into law Pub. L. 93-100, section 4 of which added a new subsection (j) to section 402 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1725). New subsection (j) provides as follows:

"(j) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), until June 30, 1974, the Corporation shall

not approve, under regulations adopted pursuant to this title or section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, by order or otherwise, a conversion from the mutual to the stock form of organization involving or to involve an insured institution, including approval of any application for such conversion pending on the date of enactment of this subsection, except that this sentence shall not be deemed to limit now or hereafter the authority of the Corporation to approve conversions in supervisory cases. The Corporation may by rule, regulation, or otherwise and under such civil penalties (which shall be cumulative to any other remedies) as it may prescribe, take whatever action it deems necessary or appropriate to implement or enforce this subsection.

"(2) After December 31, 1973, the Corporation may approve any study application filed prior to May 22, 1973, pursuant to regulations in effect and adopted pursuant to this title or section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933."

In a companion resolution, Resolution No. 73-1243, dated August 27, 1973, the Board revises § 546.5 so that it is a temporary regulation designed to implement said section 402(j). For the same purpose, the Board hereby revises said § 563.22-1 to read as set forth below, effective August 27, 1973.

The purpose of this preamble is two-fold: to explain in greater detail the nature of the Board's actions as described in the previous paragraph and to state in general terms the Board's future plans with respect to further revisions of, and final adoption of, proposed Part 563b. The preamble to the companion resolution will consist of a cross-reference to this preamble.

In general terms, section 402(j) imposes two statutory moratoria on mutual to stock conversions involving or to involve any institution whose accounts are insured by the FSLIC (with the exception of supervisory cases). The one moratorium extends through December 31, 1973, and applies to certain study applications. The other moratorium extends until June 30, 1974, and applies to all other mutual to stock conversions within the Board's jurisdiction. Section 402(j) explicitly recognizes the Board's jurisdiction, as operating head of the FSLIC, over all mutual to stock conversions involving or to involve any insured institution.

The longer moratorium contained in section 402(j) (1) is implemented by paragraph (a) in both new § 546.5 and new § 563.22-1. The shorter moratorium contained in section 402(j) (3) is implemented by paragraph (b) in both new § 546.5 and new § 563.22-1.

The authority to impose civil penalties, which was granted to the Corporation by the second sentence of section 402(j) (1), is implemented by paragraph (c) in both new § 546.5 and new § 563.22-1. The full meaning of the former paragraph (c) is specified by reference to the latter paragraph (c).

Paragraph (d) of § 546.5 and paragraphs (d) and (e) of § 563.22-1 contain definitions of terms. Such paragraphs are adopted pursuant to the grant of implementing and enforcement authority contained in the second sentence of section 402(j) (1) and pursuant to existing authority under section 5(a) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 and section 402(a) of Title IV of the National Housing Act. The term "study application" is defined by paragraph (c) of § 563.22-1 to refer solely to the five study applications filed with the Board and the Corporation between July 26, 1972, and September 22, 1972. The term "convert" is defined by paragraph (d) of § 563.22-1. However, certain prohibited activities included within the term may occur if authorized in writing by the Corporation.

The Board received a very heavy volume of public comment on its January 3, 1973,

proposals during and following the comment period thereon. On March 12 and 13, 1973, two days of public hearings were held on the proposals, resulting in an 800 page transcript. During May 1973 extensive testimony on the subject of conversions was taken by the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Then Acting Board Chairman Kamp testified at those hearings and the Board presented lengthy written materials to the Subcommittee both during and following the hearings.

Following a review of the views and information obtained and produced as a result of the activities described above and otherwise available, the Board directed the preparation of a comprehensive, in-depth analysis of the basic issues involved in mutual to stock conversion plans, along with a full description of the advantages and disadvantages of all options open to the Board. This further analysis was designed to ensure that all significant aspects of the information available to the Board were taken into full account. Following careful consideration of the analysis presented, the Board has reached a number of determinations. With respect to the timing of the Board's future actions in the area of mutual to stock conversions, the Board presently intends to adhere to the following schedule.

1. By the latter part of October 1973 the staff is to present to the Board a draft of revised proposed conversion regulations.

2. By mid-November 1973 revised proposed conversion regulations are to be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER with a comment period ending December 31, 1973.

3. Subsequent to such publication the five study applicants will be able to revise their applications on the basis of the revised proposed regulations and to file such revised applications with the Board which will process them to the extent practicable consistent with preparation of final conversion regulations.

4. By approximately January 31, 1974, final conversion regulations are expected to be adopted.

5. Between the date of adoption of final conversion regulations and June 30, 1974, preliminary and final approval may be given to any revised conversion applications received from study applicants, if appropriate.

6. During such period, other applicants may file conversion applications which may, in the Board's discretion and subject to the limitations of its resources, be processed and to which preliminary approval may be given, if appropriate. Following June 30, 1974, final approval may be given to these other applications, if appropriate.

7. Following June 30, 1974, further applications received will be processed in accordance with regulations then in effect.

With respect to the substance of the revised proposed regulations, the Board's principal determination is that they must contain substantially greater disincentives to shifts of funds among associations and other financial institutions than were contained in the January 3, 1973, proposals. The Board has come to the view that, in today's economic, technological and social environment, the financial and managerial stability of the system of FSLIC insured institutions will be unacceptably threatened unless the so-called "windfall" aspect of mutual to stock conversions is virtually eliminated. The Board acts as the exclusive chartering, supervisory and insuring authority for all Federal savings and loan associations and as the exclusive insuring authority for State chartered associations holding most of the assets of such associations. In those capacities the Board has a weighty statutory responsibility regarding the stability, safety and soundness of the system of FSLIC in-

sured institutions and must give great emphasis to these factors in determining the equity of conversion standards, controls and procedures to be effective on a national basis.

Further, the Board is concerned that a conversion involving a "windfall" distribution of capital stock to accountholders without payment would subject associations preferring to remain mutual to executive pressure to convert without proper regard to whether a conversion of a particular association will better able it to serve the thrift and home financing needs of its community. It is of major concern to the Board that the act of conversion be a matter of free choice and that any conversion regulation not contain provisions whose effect might be to force an association to convert regardless of considerations of public or economic benefit.

In order to avoid these and other problems, the Board presently intends to issue revised proposed regulations requiring that all eligible accountholders as of a distribution record date have an opportunity on a pro rata basis to purchase all the capital stock of the converting institution at its full pro forma market value (less any underwriting discounts or commissions); that those eligible accountholders who do not purchase will not receive any distribution of capital stock or cash; and that the capital stock not purchased must be sold to the public, who may include accountholders, borrowers and management of the converting association. The requirement that the converting association receive the proceeds from the sale of its stock will not be altered in the case of conversion by way of merger or holding company acquisition.

Further, the Board presently intends that the revised proposed regulations will require that the net worth of the converting association as of the date of conversion will be reserved on its books (with no subsequent additions thereto) for the benefit of its accountholders as of the date of conversion payable only in the event of a subsequent full liquidation of the converted association. As those accountholders close their accounts subsequent to conversion, the amount of this reserve account will be reduced pro tanto on the books of the converted association until the reserve account eventually terminates. Such interests in this reserve account would not be affected by any subsequent merger involving the converted association.

It is also intended that the system of time averaging and the treatment of predecessor accounts in the January 3, 1973, proposals will be substantially simplified. An additional intended change would permit plans of conversion to be approved by a vote of a majority of the eligible outstanding votes, unless State law requires a higher percentage.

A further advantage of the above described provisions is that they would directly foster a significant influx of capital into savings and loan associations. This will strengthen the converted associations and will also provide them with an additional source of future capital which can be used to help satisfy the pressing home financing needs of the Nation.

Since the above amendment consists of a temporary regulation to implement the provisions of the new section 402(j) of the National Housing Act, as amended, the Board hereby finds that notice and public procedure thereon are unnecessary under the provisions of 12 CFR 508.11 and 5 U.S.C. 553(b). The Board hereby finds, for the same reason, that publication of the amendment for the 30-day period specified in 12 CFR 508.14 and 5 U.S.C. 553(d) prior to the effective date thereof is also unnecessary. Accordingly, the Board hereby provides that the amendment shall become effective as hereinbefore set forth.

CONGRESS AND WAR

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that the 93d Congress took a historic step when it enacted the War Powers bill. In a commendable display of bipartisanship, members of both Houses worked long and hard to draft legislation which would speak fairly and bring balance to this most volatile issue.

I feel their efforts bore fruit for the result is a workable law which this Nation needs and its citizens want. I have been dismayed, however, with the persistent reports that the President will veto this bill. Following, Mr. Speaker, is an editorial from the Bridgeport, Conn. Post which I believe to be reflective of the views held by a vast majority of our fellow citizens. In its commentary, the Post notes: "We hope Mr. Nixon changes his mind." Mr. Speaker, I hope so, too.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS AND WAR

The War Powers Act forged by compromise between committees of the House and Senate is the kind of measure necessary to redress the imbalance that has developed between the executive and legislative branches in a most crucial matter.

The Constitution, although it makes the President the commander-in-chief of the armed forces, gives Congress the power to declare war. That congressional prerogative has been largely ignored by recent presidents during our Vietnam involvement. Because Congress never passed an official declaration authorizing our military actions in Indochina, they seemed of doubtful legitimacy to many Americans.

The War Powers bill, if passed in its present form, would guard against a recurrence of this situation in the future. The President would have to end the commitment of American troops to foreign combat within 60 days unless Congress authorized the action or issued a declaration of war. The only exception would be if Congress was unable to meet because of an attack on the United States.

The President could request a 30-day extension only if he certified that continued military action was necessary to protect troops during their withdrawal.

During the 60-day time-limit or the 30-day extension, Congress could order the termination of hostilities by passing a concurrent resolution, not subject to presidential veto.

President Richard M. Nixon has stated he would veto any war powers act, like the present one, which causes his power to commit our armed forces to simply expire after a certain date. The President has indicated the only kind of bill he could live with would require Congress to pass cut-off legislation if it wants to bring hostilities to a halt.

We hope Mr. Nixon changes his mind.

When a president sets the war machinery of the United States in motion, the burden of proof should be on him. If he cannot convince Congress his action is right, the conflict ought to be terminated. It should be noted that the bill does not tie the commander-in-chief's hands in the event of an attack on our country. There is no reason why the President cannot consult Congress within 60 days, except in truly exceptional circumstances for which the bill makes provision.

What the bill would do is prevent another prolonged war without the authorization of the people's representatives.

HE'S REPAYING DEBT BY HELPING OTHERS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, having known John Winters since he was a teenager, it is a privilege to share the knowledge of John's award with my colleagues. The story of the award in the following article speaks for itself. But no story can really tell of this unusual young man and his spirit that far transcends his handicap.

John has long been an inspiration to those other young people, also handicapped, with whom he grew up and associated with—the muscular dystrophy victims, those with cerebral palsy like himself, and those afflicted in other ways.

Let us who are more fortunate look to John Winters when we are troubled by our anxieties and hardships and our personal crises. Our problems come and go. John Winters must face his crisis every single day. He has overcome much of his physical handicap. He was never afflicted with the most terrible handicap of all—the handicap of the spirit, and he never shall. Let us learn and take heart from those like John Winters.

The article follows:

HE'S REPAYING DEBT BY HELPING OTHERS

(By Joan Bucks Hansen)

John Winters says he helps those less fortunate than himself because it's the only way to repay those who have helped him over the years.

Winters is a victim of cerebral palsy.

Wednesday, he received the Edward Axilrod Memorial Award for Dade's Employ the Handicapped Committee which spotlights handicapped people "whose accomplishments outweigh their physical limitations."

When the award was announced at the annual Salute to Achievement luncheon, Winters says, "I couldn't believe it."

"I just felt I was doing the work the Lord put me here to—and that's all," Winters said.

Winters, now 28, has been a familiar sight around North Miami for the last seven years, bouncing along in the electric golf cart provided to him by the Miami Shores Kiwanis Club when he was 21.

The golf cart, topped by a yellow striped canopy, orange flags and plexiglass siding to keep the rain out, carries Winters from the southern boundaries of Miami Shores to the north end of North Miami Beach on his daily rounds to work with the handicapped.

His full-time project is GOAL (Get Out And Live), a program which operates out of his home.

His work aims to inspire the cerebral palsied to climb out of their wheelchairs, go places and do things—and find useful work.

"I tell them that life is too precious to sit and do nothing, and that God has a purpose for them."

Winters' electric cart helps provide incentive. When the step is made from wheelchair to crutches, a ride in the cart comes next.

GOAL also gets jobs for severely handicapped people, raises funds and trains them to do clerical work.

GOAL will be two years old Nov. 24 and Winters hopes it soon will be moving into its own office.

The nomination that led to Winters receiving the award this week said, "John Winters has GO-power. Cerebral palsy limits him but little . . . He started working, as a teenager, part-time and invested the rest of his time aiding all good community causes as a volunteer."

"John founded Achievers, bringing new social and recreational opportunities to disabled young people. Recently he established GOAL to bring work, encouragement and services to homebound people."

"John is a leader, the epitome of courage, inspiration and initiative—A man who, in doing for others, proves his own worth and the value of disabled people to a community."

The plaque that Winters received says, "Commendation for meritorious service awarded to John Winters for exceptional accomplishments which have contributed to the public understanding of the employment capabilities of the physically handicapped, this commendation for meritorious service is awarded."

Winters studied psychology and business administration at Miami-Dade Community College. The Miami Shores Kiwanis Club helped.

"They put me through school, bought the golf cart, provided me with what I needed," says Winters.

And two years ago, when his old cart wore out, Kiwanis provided him with a new one.

"I feel that the only way I can ever repay that is to turn around and help those less fortunate than I," John says.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT "MYTH"

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, for many years there has been a great deal of talk about full employment. In fact, some claim that this was the objective of the Employment Act of 1946. However, the elusive goal of full employment has not been achieved because it has not been actively or meaningfully pursued, particularly as the majority of this Nation may be adversely affected. Almost a year ago, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers declared that the idea of a maximum unemployment rate of 4 percent as a national goal had been abandoned and stated that it would be counterproductive to establish any specific unemployment target.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that there is no real desire to attempt to solve the unemployment crisis or to undertake meaningful economic development efforts because to do so, the "experts" claim, would be inflationary. Last winter, for example, Ms. Juanita Kreps, economics professor at Duke and a public member of the New York Stock Exchange's board of directors, wrote that "full employment and wage-price stability seem not to be compatible." She

further declared, in a New York Times article, that prices have risen much faster in low unemployment periods than in high ones.

I am sure that the employed majority of this country would be willing to accept high unemployment—regardless of the damaging effects on blacks, the Spanish-speaking, Indians and other minorities who are out of work—as an irritant or minor annoyance rather than endure high prices. I imagine this attitude would be shared by Mr. Nixon and many of his advisers. Thus, I am beginning to suspect that, while many politicians may talk about full employment, the administration simply dismisses such sentiments as another liberal shibboleth which should not be taken seriously.

My pessimistic attitude, unfortunately, is not unfounded as, from time to time the geniuses in Washington and New York give clear indications they have no intention of resolving the seemingly endless unemployment crisis. Two articles—one appearing in the New York Times last December and the other in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor—reinforce my suspicions and I submit them herewith:

FACING UP TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

(By Juanita M. Kreps)

The call for a reconsideration of the 4 per cent unemployment goal should come as no surprise, given our inability to achieve that objective even in periods of sustained growth and prosperity.

Still, the change in thinking has been swift. A decade ago public policy reluctantly endorsed a 4 per cent interim level as "excessively high," no more than 3 per cent was acceptable as a long-run objective, and the 2 per cent records of Western Europe and Japan were cited as models.

A major reason for the current re-examination lies in the apparent conflict between the goal of full employment and that of price stability. When an increase in wages accompanies a decline in unemployment, economists tend to the gloomy conclusion that inflation is necessary to the maintenance of low unemployment rates; or alternatively that price stability can be maintained only at the cost of significant unemployment.

One is reminded of John Kenneth Galbraith's observation that economics has not quite escaped the name of the dismal science because the name has not been entirely undeserved.

In the first attempt to quantify the wage-unemployment relationship, Prof. A. W. Phillips of the London School of Economics found a fairly consistent inverse relation between wage changes and the percentage of the labor force unemployed in Britain from 1861 to 1957.

More specifically, he found that an annual increase in wages equal to the general increase in productivity, with prices remaining stable, was associated with an unemployment rate of about 2½ per cent. Or stated differently, unemployment rates below 2½ per cent would cause wages to rise faster than productivity and presumably would be accompanied by rising prices.

Since the wage level is both a cause and an effect of the price level, the Phillips relationship does not indicate whether wages push up prices or prices pull up wages. To keep money wages stable, Professor Phillips suggested that the unemployment rate would have to rise to approximately 5½ per cent.

Similar studies of other countries have confirmed the general conclusions reached by Professor Phillips.

For the United States, a 1960 analysis by Paul Samuelson and Robert Solow estimated that an annual price rise of about 4½ per cent would likely accompany the maintenance of a 97 per cent employment rate. Subsequently, others have thought the price rise would be as high as 5½ per cent with 3 per cent unemployment; or that stable prices and a productivity and wage increase of 2½ per cent would be accompanied by substantial unemployment—up to 8½ per cent.

Although estimates of the precise ratio vary, there is clear agreement that some tradeoff exists; full employment and wage-price stability seem not to be compatible.

During the last 25 years in which the United States has witnessed severe unemployment along with serious price inflation, prices have risen much faster in low unemployment periods than in high. Tracking the record from 1946 through 1970, the only periods in which unemployment stayed under 4½ per cent for any length of time (1946 to 1948; 1951 to 1953; 1955 to 1957; and 1965 to 1969) were times of higher-than-average price rises; in fact, the rate of price increase was about four times as fast in years of low unemployment.

Since price stability is also a major objective, the conflict of goals makes today's economic policy decisions more difficult than was envisioned when Congress committed the Federal Government to full employment with the passage of the Employment Act of 1946.

Recent analysis suggests that the full employment objective may be frustrated by still other barriers.

Clearly, the demand for labor depends on the rate of economic growth and job formation and, subject to considerations of price inflation, the growth rate can be accelerated through fiscal policy. But the number of persons seeking jobs depends on the population, its age composition and the propensity of different age-sex groups to enter the labor force. There is now some evidence that the size of the labor force in the nineteen-seventies may be larger than was anticipated and larger than even an accelerated growth rate can be expected to absorb.

Projections of the labor force made by Prof. T. Aldrich Finegan indicate a larger labor force in the immediate future than is generally forecast, the higher growth being due to the fact that favorable employment opportunities induce more persons (particularly women and teenagers) to enter the work force. His high-growth projection shows a labor force increase of 2.5 per cent annually from 1969 to 1974 (his low-growth estimate is 2.2 per cent), in contrast to the recent actual labor force growth of 2.1 per cent.

The upward trend, resulting primarily from his expectation of a continued rise in the labor force activity of women, is explained by a rise in the age at which women marry, a decline in the birth rate and a fall in the proportion of women with young children; improvements in child care facilities; a rise in women's educational attainment and in their earnings; a growth in the service sector, which offers women jobs; a decline in length of the workweek, and a growth of part-time jobs.

The growth in jobs necessary to absorb the larger labor force and hold unemployment at 4.5 per cent is quite high: 7.5 per cent in the period from mid-1971 through the end of 1973, even on the low-growth labor force assumption.

Such employment gains are unprecedented during the last 25 years. Moreover, Professor Finegan notes that structural imbalances will likely aggravate the unemployment problem. Cuts in the ordnance and aerospace industries will continue; employment in the educational field will remain soft; the rate of job growth in state and local governments has slowed; big increases in manufacturing employment are not expected because of present unemployment and unused capacity in that sector.

The difficulties of attaining full employment notwithstanding, any reconsideration of the acceptable level of joblessness must take careful count of the range of unemployment rates already in effect and the impact of these rates on different groups of workers.

The 1971 unemployment rate of 5.9 per cent (the highest annual rate since 1961) obscured much higher rates for teen-agers, for 20-24 year olds and for blacks of all ages. The following rates are reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics:

	White	Negro and other races
Both sexes, 16 and over.....	5.4	9.9
Men, 20 and over.....	4.0	7.2
Women, 20 and over.....	5.3	8.7
Both sexes, 16 to 19.....	15.1	31.8

The year's average of 5 million people without jobs was 900,000 higher than in 1970 and the duration of employment increased significantly, with the long-term unemployed accounting for 24 percent of the total in 1971. Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of last year's unemployment was the sharp rise in the Negro rate—from 8.2 percent in 1970 to 9.9 percent in 1971.

The disproportionate burden of joblessness suggests that attention be directed toward the employment problems of those groups which, even in periods of strong growth, fail to find jobs. Recognizing the special needs of disadvantaged workers, the nation's manpower efforts in recent years have concentrated on the hard-to-employ.

In a series of programs designed to improve the employability of blacks and other minorities, teenagers and the relatively immobile job seeker, manpower policy has aimed at raising educational and skill levels and at broadening the work experience or shifting the geographical location of the jobless. In addition to training efforts, manpower programs have provided part-time jobs to low-income youth both in and out of school and assistance to disadvantaged adults who were on welfare or who were living in areas of heavy unemployment.

Of special importance during the last year, the Emergency Employment Act sought to place unemployed persons in public service jobs which were, in turn, to provide transition to permanent positions. Passed in July, 1971, the act allowed state and local governments maximum freedom in hiring and by the end of that year 140,000 E.E.A. workers were employed.

Since different manpower programs were designed to meet the needs of different groups of persons, the test of their worth varies from one project to the next. Institutional manpower training programs, evaluated on the basis of whether the trainees' subsequent earnings more than offset training costs, have proved their worth with favorable benefit-cost ratios.

The evaluators agree that job training is a socially profitable endeavor. Generally favorable benefit-cost ratios have also been found from evaluation of other training programs, although some unfavorable reports have been made on JOBS (Job Opportunities in the Business Sector), in which private businesses were paid to train disadvantaged workers, and the Work Incentive Program, whose function was to move welfare mothers into paying jobs. It is clear that the greater the educational and skill disadvantage suffered by the trainee, the greater the difficulty of offsetting that disadvantage in the course of a relatively short training program.

But the trainee's chances of finding a job depend ultimately on the state of the job market. Training can upgrade workers and thus enable them to compete for jobs formerly out of their reach; improved market operation can provide better information on

jobs; workers can be relocated and the length of the job search shortened.

Nevertheless, one premise of the manpower legislation was that jobs did exist; the problem lay, we then reasoned, not so much in aggregate unemployment as in a need to improve the competitive position of certain groups of workers and the quality of the over-all labor force. Training programs were recognized as being more facilitative when jobs were expanding and skills were in short supply; witness Western Europe's reliance on manpower measures throughout the postwar era of tight labor markets.

The growth of unemployment in the United States, generated by forces acting on both the demand for and supply of workers, has shifted attention to the primary problem of finding jobs for workers—the trained as well as the untrained. As result, the role of manpower programs in this country has evolved quite differently from the European pattern.

In Western Europe and in Japan unemployment rates have been extremely low throughout the last decade, reflecting not only high rates of growth but also an elaborate system of manpower activities; retraining, relocation and apprenticeship arrangements.

In the United States, the problem of the severely disadvantaged worker in an otherwise highly productive labor force is aggravated by a shortage of jobs and much more diffused and geographically scattered labor markets. Lacking both an apprentice system to phase youth into the labor force, and much of the subsequent job protection afforded by European and Japanese employers, American workers are much less homogeneous and far more vulnerable to job loss.

In our setting, manpower policy ought to aim for training that provides a smoother transition from school to work, since our highest unemployment rates are among youth, and for systematic arrangements that offer re-education and retraining throughout worklife.

Only by the first measure can we help to fill some of the gaps in education and training that exist at the point of entry to the labor force. Only through the second program can the gains of growth be translated, in part, into education and training that will insure confirmed employability.

Manpower goals of this magnitude would call for a greater commitment of resources than we have yet been willing to make. But without programs in education and job training, and in job development, unemployment will surely worsen even as prosperity continues.

The high levels of unemployment that have persisted in recent years can be reduced through fiscal and monetary measures that stimulate job formation. When such measures result in an excessive price rise, public officials must choose the actual tradeoff that is to prevail.

The unemployment rate that we must accept, given the alternatives, may be higher now than a decade ago. Meanwhile, it is the function of manpower programs to improve the terms of the tradeoff—that is, shift the Phillips Curve to the left—by eliminating structural impediments that further weaken job prospects.

HOW TO HAMMER DOWN 5 PERCENT UNEMPLOYMENT RATE?

(By Philip W. McKinsey)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's latest appointee to the Council of Economic Advisers, William J. Fellner, raised some political eyebrows recently in asserting that unemployment could not be forced below 5 percent through fiscal and monetary policy without risking greater inflation.

But a group of leading economists has agreed with that conclusion in a newly re-

leased study by the Joint Economic Committee.

If unemployment is to be brought below the 4.5 percent average of the past 25 years, they agreed, it will have to be done by attacking specific unemployment problems. They suggested such remedies as more job training for teen-agers and cash subsidies for handicapped workers who cannot get the better-paid jobs.

WORD OF CAUTION

Actually, Dr. Fellner did not endorse a 5 percent unemployment rate as unavoidable. He said only that fiscal and monetary policy should not be stretched too tight in the vain hope of getting unemployment below that.

Somewhat surprisingly for a leader of the conservative school, he advocates getting unemployment down by subsidizing employment and training programs. Specifically he supports hiring the unemployed in public-service jobs, a favorite proposal of Democrats in Congress but usually opposed by Republicans.

The difference between 5 percent and 4 percent unemployment as a goal is substantial. Each percentage on the unemployment rate means about one million jobs.

In the study for the congressional committee, Prof. Martin S. Feldstein of Harvard University concluded that reducing unemployment to 3 percent or less is "a feasible target for economic policy" if done through a series of pinpointed job programs.

CONTROVERSIAL SUGGESTION

His most controversial suggestion is making unemployment compensation less attractive so that laid-off workers would have more incentive to take the kind of undesirable jobs that are often unfilled even during times of high unemployment. Most state pay benefits average 50 percent of previous earnings, up to an average \$65 a week. For many workers, he argues, this is comfortable enough to discourage them from getting back into dreary jobs any sooner than they have to. Making jobless pay less attractive could reduce unemployment by more than one percent, he argued.

Five other professors commenting on the Feldstein study disagree with that, however. They point out that only half the unemployed are even covered by unemployment compensation, and assert that most of the unemployed would rather be working than drawing benefits.

COUNSELING INCLUDED

There was more agreement with three other Feldstein proposals:

A special youth-employment service, linked to the schools and designed to help youngsters move into permanent employment. It would include counseling and vocational programs, modeled after a successful British program.

Youth-employment scholarships, temporarily supplementing young workers' earnings in low-paid jobs that include on-the-job training, so that youngsters would avoid the temptation to take jobs that pay better at the start but lead nowhere. This would be combined with a reduced minimum wage for teen-agers (something labor unions fight adamantly) and tax incentives to employers to provide training.

Wage subsidies for workers physically or mentally unable to advance to better jobs. A similar idea has just been approved by the Senate Finance Committee. It voted 11 to 1 in favor of a 10-percent "work bonus" for families earning less than \$4,000 a year. Some 5 million families would be expected to qualify, at a cost to the Treasury of about \$500 million a year.

Prof. Bennett Harrison of Massachusetts Institute of Technology criticizes Professor Feldstein's study for "hardly mentioning" race and sex discrimination as a major cause of high unemployment. Considering that un-

employment is much higher among young, unmarried nonwhites, he suggests that increased government penalties for discrimination in hiring would help, too.

NOMINEES FOR MIDDLE EAST PEACE AWARDS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, as the latest Middle East conflict continues its bloody course, we should take a moment to hail those nations and individuals whose efforts have done so much to make the present situation a reality. Without their unstinting endeavors, matters would not be as serious as they are at this moment in history. So let us tip our hats to the following lovers of peace and advancers of civilization in that particular area of the world.

To Anwar Sadat and his Syrian cohorts, who turned their backs on promising signs of Israeli compromise on the captured territories, choosing instead to start a war while the Jews were at prayer on Yom Kippur.

To the Soviet Union, which armed these nations, allowing them to dash through the powder magazine waving lighted torches. Again to the Soviet Union, for disregarding American requests to soft-pedal rearming the warring Arab States, and instead pouring more weapons in so that more might die and hatreds grow hotter.

To the major oil companies, whose greed and callousness stand in a class by themselves. Obsessed by a desire to squeeze more profits out of their concessions, they have acted increasingly as Arab surrogates here in the United States, seeking by propaganda to portray the Israelis as the real obstacle to compromise.

To the United Nations, which has consistently maintained a double standard toward Israel, looking the other way as Arab terrorists violate all rules of civilized behavior and condemning Israel for her contrary habit of self-defense.

Let us do further honor to the U.N. for electing Iraq to the Security Council on the same night her army was attempting to butcher more Israelis; unsuccessfully. By its recent activities, it has forfeited whatever remaining pretensions to international respect it might have had left in its possession.

To Britain and France, those once respected and strong nations, who now place oil interests and Arab arms purchases ahead of principle, compassion and elementary decency. Surely France must enjoy spending the Libyan oil money that purchased the Mirages now being used against Israel. She is also to be honored for sending a freighter load of modern tanks to Libya and Saudi Arabia on the night of October 11 from the port of Marseilles. And again for training Egyptian pilots carrying Libyan papers, who have since been shot down and captured by the Israelis.

Britain will hold its head high by dint of its recently announced embargo on British arms to all Middle East nations, knowing that Israel above all has need of such British hardware.

To Libya, which freed the terrorists who perpetrated the Austrian kidnapping of several Russian Jews, precipitating Chancellor Kreisky's craven surrender on the maintenance of the Schoenau Castle facilities.

To Sudan, which has freed the terrorists who butchered the American Ambassador to that country in cold blood, so they, too, could participate in the conflict.

To those African nations which have taken this opportunity to sever relations with Israel because she was the victim of a surprise attack while at prayer. Especially to the nation of Zaire, whose President and his bodyguard were trained by Israel, and who, despite being openly derided by the Arabs, came to the U.N. to do his anti-Israel best, taking out a full-page ad in the New York Times to whoop the news from the housetops.

To Idi Amin, President of Uganda, a special peace prize, for his praise of Hitler's acts of genocide toward the Jews, and loud cries of aggression against Israel.

To Yugoslavia, which is a major staging, refueling, and stopover point for the nonstop Russian airlift of fresh supplies of modern weapons to the Arabs. Tito's love of neutralism and world peace are only exceeded by his consistent attempts to harm the Jewish State, in keeping with his hostility toward the Jewish people dating from World War II.

To Norway and Greece, both of whom felt Nazi oppression and should know better, which have announced that no aid to Israel can be sent from or through use of their facilities or territories. Democracy dies yet another death because of such unexpected blows.

To those men and women of perception who know better, yet are standing aside today doing nothing while a tiny Jewish nation of less than 3 million battles heroically against the Arab world, armed to the teeth by the Russians, aided by the U.N. and the oil companies and boycotted by once-proud powers.

Let us now praise and honor these noble individuals, groups, institutions, and nations, who, oblivious to the lessons of 20 centuries, are joining hands today in an international effort to destroy the people who built a little democracy on the ruins of Hitler's ovens and gas chambers.

Surely history will honor them greatly, so let us today hasten to anticipate such laurels. Let it take the form of a plaque with the following symbols: A dagger, a white feather, a jester's hat, a dollar bill, a set of earplugs, a blindfold, and a piece of adhesive tape.

These symbols accurately describe those who will not see, those who will not speak, those obsessed by greed, fools, cowards, and those who strike from behind in stealth.

As for when and how the awards may be presented, I have no suggestion. History, events, plus the Almighty, certainly will insure that they reach their recipients.

CHILD ABUSE

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I was approached by members of the social work staff of Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia and first acquainted with the phenomenon of child abuse.

I was shown slides I could hardly imagine to be real examples of parental, or any other caretaker's, brutality.

Then I became aware of incredible headlines:

Child Dies; Father is Charged . . . Father, Stepmother Held in Girl's Death . . . Man, 22, Guilty of Child Abuse . . . Police Report Southeast Child Was Beaten to Death . . . Slain Baby Bears Two Human Bites . . . Couple Held in Slaying of Baby . . . Boy, 7, Dies of Beating . . . Father Held for Murder . . . Girl Dies, Father Charged.

In 1971, 100 battered children were admitted—and most importantly, diagnosed—at Children's Hospital alone. Five died. In 1972, 90 were admitted and diagnosed; two died. An average of three severely brain damaged children—victims of their caretakers—are institutionalized in the District of Columbia annually. In addition to the tragic human loss, these pathetic babes are maintained at a minimum cost of \$200,000 lifetime care, plus loss of production of income. The medical bills of the injured total hundreds of thousands of dollars each year.

According to the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel, 525 cases of abuse and neglect have been reported in the District between January 1 and September 1 of this year. By year's end, the figure will reach nearly a thousand.

Reliable research has shown that only 1 out of 10 who inflicts physical, emotional, or sexual injury on a child is psychotic or schizophrenic. The other nine are able to be rehabilitated in varying degrees, many successfully. The injuring parties are generally very troubled people who are isolated from society either geographically, economically, or emotionally. They often have little self-esteem, low frustration tolerance, and unrealistic expectations of their children. Child abusers often suffer from the effects of their own background of being excessively punished and insufficiently cared about in their own childhood. They have a marked inability to seek help from others. When faced with difficulties and crises of normal living, they have inadequate methods of coping. Their normal parenting or caretaking instincts break down and they resort to the pattern of abuse or neglect learned from their own parents in early life. And the cycle repeats.

Should we not take a look at those who abuse and neglect children, these often otherwise normal people who, unable to express their frustration in any other manner, wreck the life of a child? And see if we can help?

It is my great hope that H.R. 10959, introduced yesterday by two of my colleagues on the District of Columbia Com-

mittee, FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, DONALD M. FRASER and myself will be a solid first step toward the treatment and prevention of child abuse. The Center for the Prevention of Child Abuse, which the bill establishes, has as its principal purpose to provide a multidisciplinary approach to the problem. The center will utilize a team, for each case, composed of at least a physician, an attorney, and a social worker, and possibly a mental health specialist, an appropriate person from the Department of Human Resources, the Metropolitan Police Department, the courts, the schools, and other lay or professional experts trained in the area of child abuse and neglect. The team will evaluate each child, his brothers and sisters, his parents or caretakers, and prescribe for them the kind of treatment needed to rehabilitate those in need of the special care to be provided with the end goal of creating and maintaining a safe home.

Ambitious? To be sure. Reasonable? I think so. Many of the dollars and human resources now going to patching up broken bodies and ruined minds plus that now being expended on institutional care could better be spent on the prevention and treatment of the causes of child abuse and neglect and rehabilitation of offenders. I believe abused and neglected children need our advocacy.

AMERICA'S FIRST BLACK DIPLOMAT

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in this age of enlightenment regarding the contributions of black Americans in our two century-long history, more and more information is being unearthed about the critical roles played by black statesmen, physicians, scientists, artists, businessmen, and others in shaping our lives. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the article in the August, 1973, Foreign Service Journal, by Nancy Gordon Heintz, on "America's First Black Diplomat," American Minister to Haiti, Ebenezer Don Carlos Bassett. An educator and a diplomat with a wide range of interests, Bassett served with grace in a difficult time and brought honor to his country.

The article follows:

AMERICA'S FIRST BLACK DIPLOMAT

(By Nancy Gordon Heintz)

The first black Chief of Mission in US diplomatic history was appointed on April 29, '69. 1969? Wrong by 100 years—it was 1869.

Nominated by President Grant as American Minister to Haiti, Ebenezer Don Carlos Bassett (once a student at Yale College and in 1869 principal of Philadelphia's prestigious Colored High School) is not only America's first negro diplomat but appears to have been the first black presidential civil appointee in the federal government.

Second oldest republic in the western hemisphere, Haiti in 1869 was nonetheless a land of endless turmoil. Winning control over their third of Hispaniola in 1804 (the only successful slave insurrection in history), the Haitians had slaughtered virtually every

French man, woman, or child remaining in the country. Yet 1804 was but a curtain-raiser to the blood that was to flow. Over fifty plots, coups and revolutions were recorded between 1804 and 1869.

Although Haiti's freedom had been uncontested (and incontestable) since 1804, her independence was not recognized by the great powers of Europe until 1825, while, under the adamant veto of slave-holding southerners on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the United States (despite thriving profits on Haitian coffee, logwood, sugar, rum and molasses) withheld recognition until the outbreak of our Civil War.

On December 3, 1861 Abraham Lincoln recommended recognition of Haiti and Liberia. Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts triumphed over border-state opposition in the Senate on April 23, 1862. On June 5th Lincoln signed a bill for the appointment of commissioners to Haiti and Liberia. Six weeks later Benjamin F. Whidden of New Hampshire became the first US diplomatic representative accredited to Port-au-Prince.

No one knows what inspired Ebenezer Bassett's interest in Haiti. It could well have been pride of race. Whatever prompted him, from the eight tumultuous years Bassett and his family spent there (1869-1877) he clearly gained more understanding for the love of Haiti than many of his successors.

His letters to the Department often refer in frustration to "this peculiar people" or despairingly plead "send a man-of-war" (the security blanket of the diplomats of that gunboat era); but when, in 1877, he leaves Haiti for what he is convinced will be the last time, sadness suffuses his farewell to his friend, President Boisrond-Canal, as he expresses regret that he will probably never again see the President, his many Haitian friends, "... or indeed this beautiful Haiti on whose soil and among whose people I have passed so many happy days."

A surviving picture shows Bassett as a handsome, square-cut man with a receding hairline, and twirling mustaches that would be envied today. Born in Litchfield, Connecticut, on October 16, 1833, he was the son of Ebenezer and Susan Bassett, his father a mulatto and his mother a Pequot Indian. He attended Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, Mass., and graduated with honors from Connecticut State Normal School. Later he studied at Yale College where he seems to have been held in wide respect. No less than 12 Yale professors supported his application for the nomination to Haiti. French was one of his languages, later to be perfected in Haiti where he also mastered Creole—essential to a real understanding of that country and its people.

From 1857 to 1869, Bassett was principal of "The Institute for Colored Youth" in Philadelphia—a Quaker school for "the Education of Colored Youth in School Learning and to prepare them to become teachers." The then mayor of Philadelphia refers to it, under Bassett's management, as "widely known and unquestionably the foremost institution of its kind in the country." In addition to his duties as principal, Bassett taught mathematics, natural sciences and classics.

In 1855, while still in New Haven, Bassett married Eliza Park. Some of his five children, two daughters and three sons, were born in Philadelphia, though it would be pleasant to think that there was at least one Haitian in the family—perhaps the youngest, Frederick Douglass's namesake, who died in childhood.

In 1868 the new administration of U.S. Grant showed itself amenable to opening government service to qualified negroes. Surviving correspondence between Bassett and his friend, Frederick Douglass, discloses that Bassett suggested in 1867 that a negro should represent the United States as American Minister to Haiti. Bassett so proposed to Douglass who in effect rejoined—why not

you? and thereupon proceeded to back him for the post.

The quality of the candidate appears in letters of recommendation to the White House in support of Bassett and still in the National Archives. As a result of these efforts and evidently of the national reputation he already enjoyed as an educator, Bassett was appointed American Minister and sailed for Port-au-Prince, to be joined later by his family.

When Bassett reached Port-au-Prince in June 1869, Sylvain Salnave was fulfilling the often fatal but still much sought-after role of President of the Republic. A New York Herald editorial of that year had called him "... the blackest, ugliest and bravest African of the lot ... the Richard the Third of Hayti, remorseless, cunning, warlike."

In fact Salnave was not black (he was a mulatto), nor for that matter was he ugly, but in manner and appearance to the contrary, handsome. Brave, remorseless, cunning and warlike, however, he surely was—all, unfortunately, essential characteristics for gaining and holding power in 19th century Haiti.

In the summer of 1869 the President was in the field doing just that, and the new American Minister could not present his credentials until September.

For Bassett, after a miserable ten days at sea, the sight of the green *mornes* of Haiti was a welcome one. Among many on the landing to greet the new, and first black, American Minister, was an Episcopal missionary and old friend, the Reverend J. T. Holly, only five years later to become the first black American bishop in the Anglican Church. The sights and sounds of Port-au-Prince were overwhelming and the heat staggering, and Bassett was dismayed to find his first night as Reverend Holly's guest spent "in a hand-to-hand contest with an army of mosquitoes, bedbugs and little gnats."

Yet the next day, riding up to call on his predecessor, Gideon Hollister, he was overwhelmed by the beauty around him—"This is truly a wonderful country," he wrote. "From the mountain tops to the sea the island is one great paradise of flowers and fruits which perfume the air and meet the eye everywhere."

The American Minister's residence was on the Chemin Lalue in Turgeau, uphill from the center of the city. Bassett must have been enchanted by the rambling, many-galleried house that had been built as a summer palace for Haiti's former Emperor Faustin Soulouque. Samuel Hazard, traveller and writer of the day who was to spend some time as the Bassetts' guest, describes it as having superb views in every direction, "... charming in its luxuriant vegetation and with fresh breezes from the neighboring mountains." In the garden there "was a marble bath large enough for swimming with water fresh and cold from the mountain stream" (a luxury which as late as 1963 the American Ambassador to Haiti did not enjoy).¹ Hazard also mentions delightful mountain rides with "Mr. Bassett and his lady."

After assuming charge, under political conditions in a regime that Bassett's British colleague later characterized as "one long revolution," the new Minister was soon to

¹ The bureaucratic struggle to obtain a swimming pool for the American Embassy residence in Port-au-Prince (a city of notoriously temperamental water-supply where every home of any consequence has its "basin") frustrated four ambassadors unable to overcome adamant resistance in Washington until, in 1963, the US Marine Corps engineer advisor in the Naval Mission drew official attention to the grave fire hazards and lack of fire protection in the city and designed a suitable reservoir, complete with diving board and filtration plant (as it later developed), to protect the Residence against conflagration.

voice, and often repeat, the plea for "a ship," and was always pleased to see an American man-of-war on the horizon (though British, French or Spanish colors were a more frequent sight).

Salnave, first of Bassett's four Haitian presidents and one with whom Bassett mentions being on intimate terms, was not destined long to survive.

In December 1869 Salnave, finally overthrown, fled Port-au-Prince stopping breathlessly at the US residence en route. Eventually captured "well into Dominican territory," Salnave was dragged back to the capital and Bassett had his first glimpse of a justice far different from that advocated by the Society of Friends. In a dispatch he reported: "Salnave was brought to the city today. His grave was dug in the Salines, a kind of Potter's field, two days ago ... he was subjected to some sort of drumhead court-martial, lasting a couple of hours, and of course sentenced to be shot immediately. This sentence was carried out amid jeers and insults of the rabble. He faced death in a bold and manly manner. The principal officers who followed him in his flight were put to death in the plains before reaching the city."

After the execution of Salnave, Nissage-Saget (once a barracks tailor) became president, and Bassett was to learn much more about executions, imprisonments, refugees, to say nothing of plots and counterplots, which he came to accept if never approve as the way of life of "this peculiar people."

Haitian politics, polarized then and always on lines of race—elite mulattoes (*mulâtres*) exploiting resentful blacks (*noirs*)—dismayed Bassett. Colored, and proud of it and of his own achievements, Bassett recognized the futile and destructive character of a political tradition which substituted race for party, coups d'état for elections, and relied on betrayal, conspiracy, and racial malevolence as moving forces. Yet he accepted Haiti as it was and pursued the interests of the United States with realism and understanding.

If there ever can be ordinary days in Haiti, what were the everyday concerns of the American Minister in the 1870s?

Grant persistently sought to annex Santo Domingo or at least to obtain a naval base there. With this went diplomatic probes for a coaling station at Haiti's Mole St. Nicolas. Both ideas affronted Haitian nationalism, which left Grant unperturbed but gave his minister endless difficulty.

Claims by American citizens against the Haitian government were tedious, time-consuming and usually to little avail. The great game of "What is my *'cher collègue'* up to?" was, of course a constant factor.²

Perhaps most troublesome was the stream of political refugees seeking asylum, to which Bassett was introduced in 1869 when the legation, in November, was filled with refugees including a Minister of State and his entire family and several generals. A month later Bassett writes Washington that there are more than a thousand (sic) refugees in his residence, "... mostly women and chil-

² What the *chers collègues* were up to, in Bassett's time, amounted to roughly the following. Britain (ably represented by the imperious, condescending and often Machiavellian Sir Spenser St. John) was trying to frustrate extension of US influence in Haiti and Santo Domingo. France was continuing to collect (or try to collect) the crushing indemnities resulting from the Haitian War of Independence and its sequelae of slaughter and confiscation. Spain was hostile because of Haitian support for the Dominican rebellion in the 1860s, while Germany, new-born after 1870, was politically supporting aggressive commercial penetration of Haiti by German merchants and traders. There were hardly any Latin American *chers collègues* as of 1870.

dren all in a state of terror and confusion that beggars description." This was when Port-au-Prince was under siege and being bombarded by rebel forces and when, not for the first time nor the last, the National Palace was ultimately blown skyhigh by random detonation of ammunition and explosives in the President's basement.

Bassett's most distinguished and longest-term uninvited guest was General, later President, Boisrond-Canal. Target of incumbent President Domingue's wrath in May 1875, Boisrond-Canal arrived wounded, in the middle of the night for a five month stay. Under intense pressure to hand over Boisrond-Canal and his younger brother, Bassett had also to cope with a Secretary of State and a Department unenthusiastic, when not outright unsympathetic, to the question of asylum. In one dispatch justifying his action, Bassett speaks of the government as "men maddened by passion, inflamed by rum, and elated by the consciousness of armed power," and adds "... for me to close the door upon the men pursued, would have been for me to deny them their last chance to escape from being brutally put to death before my eyes."

During this period the residence was surrounded by hundreds of government troops with orders to keep up a constant clamor night and day. Rumors circulated on the *telediol* (Haiti's grapevine telegraph) that Bassett had been disavowed by the US government, that the residence no longer enjoyed diplomatic immunity, that the soldiers surrounding it were so excited they were beyond control, and that the government could no longer guarantee the safety of the Bassett family. Yet all ended happily. When he had heard that a US warship was on the way, Domingue relented and the Canals were allowed to embark for Jamaica. After receiving a fervent embrace from his departing guests, Bassett notes: "A rather disagreeable French custom."

For some time Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Bassett enjoyed the respect and friendship of his colleagues. That his popularity was indeed widespread is evidenced by his election, in 1875, to the presidency of the exclusive "Cercle de Port-au-Prince."

Bassett's health was frequently bad. He complains of aches, fever and biliousness—of what the Haitians called "*La mauvaise fièvre*"—perhaps malaria, or dengue, or both. In July 1876 ill health prevented him from attending the inaugural of his former houseguest, now President Boisrond-Canal. In the National Archives there remains a dashing photo of the President wearing a large fedora, inscribed: "A mon ami E. D. Bassett."

Maybe it was ill health (or possibly a new administration in Washington) that caused Bassett to submit his resignation in 1877. That the family returned to New Haven with nostalgia is certain. Like many yet unborn Americans who were to love Haiti in their turn, the Bassetts probably felt that they had been cast out of the Garden of Eden.

Succeeding years never recaptured the magic. From 1879 to 1888, Bassett was Consul-General of Haiti in New York—the Haitian Consulate was then at 22 State Street. He did manage one trip back to Haiti on consultation but his dream to return again as American Minister was never realized.

In 1889 Bassett was back in New Haven and things were not going well. To Frederick Douglass he wrote that circumstances impelled him to seek a Foreign Service appointment and that his preference would be Haiti. Alas, the post had already been offered to and accepted by Douglass himself. The chagrin seeps between the lines of Bassett's generous congratulations. Nevertheless he swallowed his pride and offered his services as Douglass's secretary, at \$850 per annum.

Douglass was over 70, a national figure and a prima donna. In his definitive "Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti" Dr. Rayford Logan states that Bassett was to

all intents and purposes again the American Minister. His position must have been difficult. Intrigue over possible US acquisition of Môle St. Nicolas was again at peak and the American press in uproar. Douglass resigned on July 30, 1891.

Bassett never received his Foreign Service appointment and his last years seem to have been sad ones. The family moved from New Haven to 2121 N. 29th Street, Philadelphia, where America's first black diplomat died poor and obscure. His last letter to Douglass, January 18, 1894, speaks of a heart condition and "an annoying affection of my eyes which are never in good trim." The letter is unhappy for it replies to a dunning note from Douglass asking payment on a loan, but worse, stating that he had "learned" that, while in Haiti, Bassett accepted \$6000 from President Hyppolite to influence Douglass's decisions as minister.

Besides credulity and naiveté in believing any such accusations, Douglass was cruelly unfair to an old and loyal friend. He could not know that the *telediol* would circulate, and many Haitians would credit, the identical rumor about every American chief of mission to this day.

By 1961 the figure named had risen to \$100,000!

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY VISITS UNITED STATES

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 of this year, I introduced a concurrent resolution proposing that the United States retain in safekeeping the Holy Crown of St. Stephen until Hungary is a free nation again.

During the past few years there have been recurring reports that the United States might return the crown to the Communist government of Hungary in an effort to encourage better diplomatic and commercial relations between the two countries. Only recently the Hungarian Government requested that the United States return the crown. On April 28, the Hungarian Prime Minister Jeno Fock appealed to a group of U.S. Senators visiting Hungary to urge the American Government to relinquish the Holy Crown of St. Stephen.

Mr. Speaker, to return the holy crown to the Communist regime in Hungary would only serve to dash the hopes of the oppressed people in Hungary and the hopes of their brothers and sisters, the American-Hungarians in this country, and break trust with them.

I insert in the RECORD at this point, an article expressing the sentiments of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty, an exiled primate of Hungary, on the Holy Crown of St. Stephen.

The article follows:

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY VISITS UNITED STATES
(By Jerry Filteau)

NORTH BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY.—Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty, exiled primate of Hungary, in an exclusive interview with NC News here, spoke of his memoirs, his imprisonment in Hungary, and his wish that St. Stephen's crown, the symbol of authority in Hungary, be preserved for "all Hungarians."

The aging prelate was bent with his 81 years, many in prison or exile, but his voice

was strong and lively, and his piercing blue eyes commanded attention as he spoke.

When asked about the "amnesty" granted by the current "Hungarian government" shortly after his departure to Rome in September, 1971, the Cardinal interrupted the question and, switching from his native Hungarian, he bypassed the interpreter and spoke vehemently in English: "Hungarian 'government' does not exist! There is no constitution, and government is belonging to the constitution!"

The Cardinal spoke of his seven years in solitary confinement before he was freed in the 1956 uprising as "not just imprisonment, but the worst kind of imprisonment, the very worst kind."

The greatest need for Catholics in Hungary today, he said, is "human rights and religious freedom."

Of the need for priests in Hungary, he said, "This is the internal affair of the priests and of the Church. And we do not ask this from the authorities, because they are diminishing rather than increasing the number of priests."

He described the situation in Hungary since he has left as "deteriorated," and said this was also true of the "outside world."

Talking about St. Stephen's crown, the aging prelate spoke passionately of the "one-and-a-half million Hungarians" who for one reason or another live outside the present borders of Hungary.

The crown, which dates back to the year 1000, in the reign of St. Stephen, first king of Hungary, has been held in the United States, reportedly in a military fort, since the end of World War II.

Cardinal Mindszenty confirmed reports that he has written to President Nixon asking the United States not to return the crown to the present Hungarian regime.

The Cardinal thanked "both houses of Congress . . . for what they have done on behalf of Hungary with respect to the crown," a reference to numerous statements by congressmen opposing the return of the crown to Hungary at this time.

He said he has "received several assurances from persons, high officials who were writing on behalf of the President, at his authorization—they may have been from the White House or the State Department—which have expressed the sense that the United States position has not changed as regards the crown."

Originally scheduled to make an extensive tour through the United States this year, the Hungarian primate later cancelled the trip but kept a promise he had made to visit New Brunswick, N.J., for the dedication of St. Ladislaus Roman Catholic Church, a church for Hungarians.

SKYLAB READY TO STUDY COMET

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, science includes studying what is known to understand that which is unknown, but oftentimes along the way unexpected opportunities occur which create a new understanding on the part of man as to his place in the universe and his knowledge of the world in which he lives. John Noble Wilford in a special article to the New York Times of September 28, 1973, describes the Comet Kohoutek's visit in the vicinity of Earth and the opportunity which this presents to the next and last of the Skylab space missions. In addition to the Earth Resources Survey and scien-

tific experiments which Skylab 3 will undertake, an unexpected opportunity to understand better the role of comets in our solar system will occur. We have received an unusual and important dividend in our Skylab program which is well described in Mr. Wilford's article which follows:

SKYLAB 3 READY TO STUDY COMET RETURNING TO VIEW

(By John Noble Wilford)

HOUSTON, September 27.—A comet that could outshine Halley's Comet of 1910 moved into telescopic view this week, following a predicted course that should give the Skylab 3 astronauts an unprecedented opportunity to gather data on such brilliant objects in the sky.

The Kohoutek Comet, named for the astronomer who discovered it last March, had been hidden by the sun since May. But now that the earth has moved along in its orbit, an expert comet observer in Japan was able to begin tracking the fuzzy star-like object Sunday and last night as it came in from somewhere beyond the planet Pluto.

Dr. Brian Marsden of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory at Cambridge, Mass., reported the comet's reacquisition in a telephone interview today, saying:

"It was where we predicted it should be. It is coming in at the right place and is going to pass close to the sun. We should get a pretty spectacular show."

OPTIMUM VIEWING TIME

According to Dr. Marsden, Kohoutek should reach its closest approach to the sun—about 13 million miles—on Dec. 28. At that time the comet would be about 75 million miles from the earth.

But the comet should put on its most brilliant display for observers in the northern hemisphere between Jan. 10 and 15. At that time, Dr. Marsden said, the sky will be dark and moonless right after sunset, the comet will be high in the sky and its fiery tail should have reached its greatest length, stretching a million miles or more behind the head.

Kohoutek should be visible to the unaided eye by Dec. 1.

Observation of the comet will be a primary scientific objective of the Skylab 3 crew. The astronauts are expected to take along a special camera, new filters designed for the comet and an extra amount of film. Most of their observations will be made with the solar telescopes already on the orbiting laboratory.

Skylab is now scheduled for launching Nov. 11 and for a splashdown on Jan. 6. Scientists are urging the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to either delay the launching until Nov. 21 or extend the mission to Jan. 19 to permit more extensive observations.

William C. Schneider, the Skylab program director, said that the matter would be reviewed in the next few weeks.

ASTRONOMERS NOTIFIED

The comet was discovered by Dr. Lohoe Kohoutek, a Czech-born astronomer working at the observatory in Hamburg, West Germany. It was reacquired this week by Tsutomu Seki of Kochi, Japan, a guitar instructor by day and comet observer by night—the discoverer of six comets in the last decade.

Dr. Marsden, who runs a clearing house for reports of new phenomena for the International Astronomical Union, sent cables and telegrams notifying astronomers around the world of the comet's reappearance. The most interested were the astronomers who are making plans for coordinated ground and space observations—Operation Kohoutek, they call it.

Dr. Stephen P. Maran, an astronomer at the Goddard Space Flight Center at Greenbelt, Md., manager of the effort, said today

that observations would be made from high-altitude research airplanes and balloons, five sounding rockets, numerous telescopes, four unmanned spacecraft and the Skylab space station.

Meanwhile, the Skylab 2 astronauts—Capt. Alan L. Bean of the Navy, Maj. Jack R. Lousma of the Marines and Dr. Ow K. Garriott, a civilian scientist—returned to their homes in Houston tonight. Doctors at the Johnson Space Center continue to report their elation over the good physical condition of the three men who spent a record 59½ days in earth orbit.

WHAT A MOTHER'S FAITH CAN DO

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times with struggles throughout the world and at home, we sometimes tend to forget the very personal struggles that occur hour by hour, day by day, in all of our lives. Those struggles that confront individuals sometimes seem beyond human capacity. And yet, because of faith and courage, devotion, and love, the effort is made and obstacles overcome.

One of the most poignant and dramatic examples is the story of 10-year-old Philip Dwyer and his mother, Lisa D. Dwyer of Perrine, Fla. Philip suffered severe brain damage in an auto accident in July of last year. His mother was told by doctors that her son would never walk, talk or move again. Yet Mrs. Dwyer's faith and love and dedicated efforts prevailed, and today Philip is walking and talking.

The attached article which tells the Dwyers' story will serve all of us as a reminder that faith and love, devotion, and personal sacrifice, can accomplish miracles.

The article follows:

WHAT A MOTHER'S FAITH CAN DO

(By Bob Pratt)

A year ago doctors said 10-year-old Philip Dwyer would be a hopeless "vegetable" for the rest of his life, but today he can walk, talk and play—thanks to his mother's love, courage and tireless efforts.

"Philip was definitely a hopeless case as far as his ever becoming a useful citizen again," said Dr. Donald Dooley, a neurosurgeon who operated on the boy in Miami, Fla. "If Philip's mother hadn't had faith in his recovery, he'd be dead or lying in a bed unable to see or hear or talk."

Philip suffered severe brain damage in an auto accident in July 1972 and was unconscious for weeks.

"A pediatrician told me he would never walk, talk or move and should be put in an institution," said Lisa Dwyer, Philip's mother. "But I just knew he would someday be well again."

"I love Philip very, very much. There was no one who could tell me he wouldn't come through. It is so hard to explain these things—you just know."

For weeks after the accident Mrs. Dwyer was allowed to see Philip in the hospital for only five minutes at a time, four times a day. But she spent every second of those minutes working with him.

"I just couldn't let him lie there. I talked to him and moved his bandaged head around. People thought I was crazy working with him while he was still in a coma."

"I kept a radio on near his bed thinking that if he began to hear again it would be better for him to hear music than the frightening sounds of the machines that were keeping him alive."

"Two months after the accident he began to come out of the coma, ever so slowly. But he still couldn't talk or see or swallow or anything. All he could do was grunt."

She taught him to swallow. "We worked every night for weeks, with me touching his throat and him mine as I put crushed ice in his mouth, let it melt and trickle down his throat until he got the idea he could swallow."

Soon Mrs. Dwyer was able to start massaging Philip's paralyzed left side and hospital aides began giving him physical therapy.

"It was about this time that Philip began seeing again," she said. "I lit a cigarette one night and discovered that his eyes looked toward the flame. I moved the match around and his eyes would follow it."

His hearing improved too. The sound of my voice as I walked around the room helping him find me with his eyes."

He was allowed to go home in October—and then the real work began.

Mrs. Dwyer massaged his muscles daily and took him back to the hospital regularly for therapy. In January, an institute that specializes in helping brain-damaged children examined Philip and gave Mrs. Dwyer a strenuous schedule for him—plus hope that he would be well enough to go to school in two years.

Every day since then Mrs. Dwyer has given Philip treatments and exercises that take up the entire morning. Then four times each afternoon and evening she and five volunteer helpers give him "patterning exercises" designed to help the undamaged cells in his brain take over the work of the cells that were destroyed.

Today Philip is walking and talking and can play with other children, feed himself and even throw a basketball.

"He still has a long way to go," Mrs. Dwyer said. "He can't dress himself and he gets tired easily, but he is alert and is constantly asking questions. . . . If I had let them put him in an institution they would have just put a tube down his stomach to feed him and he would have died."

NIXON HOUSING PLANS FOR THE POOR—THE HIDDEN FALLACIES

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago President Nixon sent to Congress his housing message. In it he indicated a departure from existing approaches to the housing problems of the poor. While the message was singularly lacking in specific details or commitments, it nevertheless signaled the administration's intent to switch to housing allowances payable directly to the poor in place of the current numerous programs purporting to serve their needs. On the surface of it, the proposal is attractive through its very simplicity. It would remedy the recipients' inability to obtain decent housing by furnishing, by direct cash grants, the difference between what they can afford to pay and what is needed in the open market to obtain suitable housing. The approach, however, has many pitfalls as those of us with New York City constituents can attest. Since the practice of the New York City Welfare De-

partment has been for some time to add money for rent to individuals' welfare checks, it can be asserted that the administration's proposal is already operative in New York.

In a perceptive article for the New York Times Mr. Lewis H. Spence analyzes the failings of the proposal. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to insert that article here in its entirety. For their consideration I am also inserting the text of two letters presenting the pros and cons, as popularly perceived, of direct housing payments to welfare recipients.

FAILINGS AROUND IN NIXON PLAN FOR HOUSING AID

(By Lewis H. Spence)

Three weeks ago, President Nixon announced a new direction for the nation's housing programs for the poor: the housing-allowance concept. Since then, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has hedged its commitment to the program with a variety of additions, conditions and exceptions. But the future is clear. Housing allowances will provide the rhetoric, if not the substance, of HUD's policy on low-income housing for what remains of this administration.

The housing-allowance concept is disarmingly simple. The poor will receive a cash grant, amounting to the difference between the local market price of appropriate housing and what the family can afford to pay for housing. The grant is accompanied by some limited consumer counseling and follow-up. The rest, according to the time-honored formula that underlies all such notions, will be taken care of by the guiding hand of the free-market system.

While scuttling the whole range of existing low-income housing programs, the Nixon Administration offers this inchoate proposal as an improvement. But even in such rudimentary stages of formulation, the housing-allowance concept presents several serious failings.

What is to insure that units rented under the program are decent, safe and sanitary?

Without safeguards to maintain the quality of units rented by housing-allowance recipients, the funds will prove a windfall to slumlords, and the recipients will become a conduit for subsidies to substandard housing. The problem is particularly acute because of the strong economic and cultural pressures on recipients to lease substandard housing. The dollars saved out of the cash allowance by renting a substandard home can go to food, clothing, entertainment and other family needs.

Compare this to the present Federal Leased Housing Program, which is marked for eventual termination by the Administration. Leased housing allows a local housing authority to rent a private unit at a market rent, and, in essence, sublease it to a low-income person at a reduced rent. All units subsidized under the program are to be inspected annually to insure compliance with local health codes. Without such a mechanism, the housing-allowance program can only perpetuate the slums that public housing was intended to eliminate.

What is to prevent the program from simply speeding rental inflation?

Beyond the normal market pitfalls of rent-gouging and profiteering by select landlords, the program raises the specter of a general rise in rent levels. Especially in the often-tight housing markets of the cities, where so many of the poor live, the housing-allowance program will increase the competition for scarce units of low-income and moderate-income housing.

Families with incomes just above the level eligible for housing assistance will be especially squeezed. New construction of moderate-income housing, to reduce the infla-

tionary effect, depends on Federal subsidies. The administration has curtailed these.

Under the Leased Housing Program, in contrast, rents for subsidized private units are set with the concurrence of the local housing authority. This protects against both rent-gouging and the inflationary effect that would vitiate all benefit to anyone but the landlord.

What assistance can the housing-allowance program offer to increase the production of new or rehabilitated units?

The older Leased Housing Program allows local housing authorities to enter into long-term leases with landlords and potential builders. The obligation then rests with the housing authority to find a suitable low-income tenant for each unit under lease; the landlord is assured of uninterrupted rental income.

This provision has proven a useful incentive and support to new construction and rehabilitation. Some 15 per cent of the 175,000 leased-housing units in the nation are in rehabilitated buildings—a very respectable record for a program that started in 1968.

In contrast, housing-allowance recipients can provide no more long-term assurance to landlords than conventional tenants. The likelihood of improvements or substantial rehabilitation, maintaining the existing housing stock, is proportionately reduced.

What possible improvement can a housing-allowance program offer over the existing Leased Housing Program?

Both programs place low-income persons in private housing, minimizing stigma and fostering an income mix. Both greatly increase the housing choices available to the poor. The housing-allowance approach is, in fact, little more than a leased housing program stripped of its guarantee of standard housing at reasonable rents and devoid of inducements to housing production—an interesting idea, perhaps, but hardly a national program.

Why, then, is the Nixon Administration committed to phasing down existing programs in favor of this ill-defined and ill-conceived proposal?

The administration is responding to all such questions by promising that they will be answered through several experiments under way across the country. First reports are not encouraging, however. Indications are that the initial experiment, conducted in Kansas City and now in the final stages of data analysis, will show a failure to achieve all of these purported objectives of the housing allowance approach.

The President's announcement raises serious and disturbing questions about the criteria being used by the Government in determining its housing policies. Most inexplicable, perhaps, is the President's indication that the first target for implementation of the housing-allowance concept will be the elderly. Why, when the housing construction program for the elderly has been the sole unassailable success in the public-housing field?

Since 1968, when authorizations for housing for the elderly were greatly expanded, HUD has developed considerable expertise in designing housing for the elderly poor that is efficient, attractive, inexpensive and meets the special physical and social needs of the elderly. Rather than resisting this form of public housing, many communities are clamoring for it. Yet this is the program that is first to be scrapped. And the elderly, who are least equipped to deal with the harsh competitive realities of the housing market, are to be the first to be entrusted to the benign hand of the free-market system.

One hopes that some rationale other than naked political cynicism underlies this peculiar priority. But the Department of Housing and Urban Development has come forward with so little of substance to explain its sudden commitment to housing allowances that it is difficult not to perceive political calculations in every aspect of the ad-

ministration's approach to the housing problems of the poor. While the promise of housing allowances supplies the rhetoric, the substance of Federal housing policies is the throttling of existing programs, whether successful or not.

We should, perhaps, concentrate on the substance, and not be distracted by the rhetoric.

WELFARE TENANTS: TWO VIEWS

(The following letters are in response to a Point of View article published Sept. 2 and entitled, "Needed: City Policy on Housing Welfare Recipients." The article, by Martin Hochbaum, a staff member of the American Jewish Congress, argued that the city uses an almost entirely short-term approach in housing welfare tenants. It contended that such tenants should not be concentrated in poverty areas and that the substitution of flat housing grants for the rental payments now included in welfare checks would encourage thrift and flexibility and curb the inflation of rents. Clara Fox is director of the Housing Department of United Neighborhood Houses. Edward Sulzberger is president of the Metropolitan Fair Rent Committee.)

By CLARA FOX

The Point of View article was long overdue, and several of its recommendations are sound and should receive serious consideration.

Unfortunately, one main recommendation—the institution of flat-grant rent payments—would only intensify the problems described in the article.

The rationale for the imposition of flat-grant rent payments is that welfare recipients would be able to use their rent allowances more effectively in the private market to find a place to live.

The fallacy of such thinking is self-evident. Welfare recipients have little or no choices for housing outside the ghettos or impacted poverty areas. If some were fortunate enough to find landlords willing to accept them in decent housing, the restrictiveness of the flat grant would make negotiation impossible.

In fact, the Department of Social Services, anticipating the imposition of a flat grant, is refusing to approve rent levels in some of the newer federally subsidized projects. Thus welfare recipients are being eliminated from opportunities to live in new publicly assisted housing. Without flexibility in rental allowances, private landlords will not rent to welfare recipients or will rent only substandard units.

United Neighborhood Houses has repeatedly recommended that the Department of Social Services utilize the economic impact of the "welfare rent dollar" to force landlords to upgrade the housing they rent to welfare recipients.

Any agency that pours a half billion rental dollars into the housing market must be concerned with the living conditions those payments produce for their clients. The Department of Social Services and the city must assume responsibility for seeing that their clients obtain safe, decent housing.

Most of the city's social and civic agencies oppose the flat grant and have so testified at city and state hearings on the subject. We do need a city policy on welfare housing. But let us not institute a punitive, discriminatory policy that will perpetuate ghettoization and slum living.

By EDWARD SULZBERGER

Several actions could readily be taken to reverse some of the problems of welfare tenancy.

Soon after checks that include a rent allowance are mailed to welfare recipients, a telephone inquiry should be made with the property owner to determine whether the rent has been paid. As an alternative, the Department of Social Services could require presentation of a valid rent receipt for a given

period before it would make any rent allowance for a succeeding period.

Next, rent payments should be made directly to the property owner after the very first instance of nonpayment by a tenant.

When a welfare tenant assumes possession of an apartment, the agency should guarantee to the owner prompt rent payments and reimbursement for vandalism of an apartment.

In addition, there should be verification in every instance of the reason for a change in residence. This should be done before any part of the client's moving cost or any finder's fee is paid.

Welfare recipients are generally unable to obtain open credit from ordinary legitimate business. The single exception is the real estate owner. Since rent is the largest single lump-sum payment to be made on a regular basis, where there is no urgency to make that payment promptly it seems logical to too many tenants to delay it to a point where ultimately it cannot be made.

There is no established system to verify that basic payment is made. There is no penalty extracted for nonpayment, and if eviction is an ultimate result, the system disregards it after delaying as long as possible, and starts over with no one's wrist so much as slapped and with no concern for the client's new landlord.

Nowhere else in the world's economy is such a lax, irresponsible expenditure of public funds recorded, unless it is in the national defense budget. The proportion of the social service agencies budgets that goes to shelter is impossible to establish. But there can be no doubt that it is an area in which major savings could be achieved without harm to anyone while abating the recipients' sense of social responsibility.

GOLDA MEIR'S ADDRESS TO THE NATION

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the full text of Israel Prime Minister Golda Meir's statement to the nation and press conference of October 13, 1973.

Mrs. Meir expresses the hopes and sadness of Israel with clarity and simplicity:

We did everything possible during six years to try to convince our neighbors that bloodshed has never solved any problem between neighbors. Another war only means more dead, bloodshed, destruction, and no solution. And after all is over, there is still only one way—to negotiate . . .

We don't want dead on our side, we have no joy in causing the death of others. But this people, small, surrounded by enemies, has decided to live. This is not a people that can give in . . . We know that giving up means death, destruction of our sovereignty and physical destruction of our entire people. Against that, we will fight with everything we have within us.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this speech and press conference to the attention of my colleagues, not alone for its content but also for its quality, its honesty, and its spirit:

TEXT OF PRIME MINISTER GOLDA MEIR'S ADDRESS TO THE NATION AND PRESS CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 13, 1973.

Citizens of Israel: When I spoke to you a few days ago I said that our situation was far better than it had been on the day I

had to inform the nation that we had once again been attacked by our neighbors.

I am sorry to say that I cannot inform the people today that the war is over and that victory is ours.

Now as then, I have no doubt that victory shall be ours, even though the war is not yet over, even though our sons and daughters, soldiers and officers, both on the northern and the southern fronts are still fighting, are fighting with devotion, courage, ability, with a spirit words cannot describe. I am also happy to be able to say that the people in the rear are not falling behind our sons on the front lines. This nation's spirit is strong and ready to volunteer for any task to a far greater extent than anyone could have foreseen. We are a small people surrounded by hostile neighbors. In this war not only the armies of Egypt and Syria are fighting us, they are supported in various ways, with tanks and airplanes, by countries farther off, like Iraq and Algeria. Jordan too, has joined in with a tank force; other Arab countries are also providing support. Above all, there has been massive aid support by the Soviet Union to Syria and to Egypt by means of airlift.

THE FACTS

We are advancing. Our road is not easy and clear. Our forces were obliged to wage a battle this morning against a tank division that arrived from Iraq. We destroyed the great majority of their tanks and our forces are pushing forward.

These are the facts. I can say our situation is better. There is no doubt in our hearts that we shall be the victors at the end of the War.

Not we started this war—but since we have been attacked, we shall fight until victory. Let us hope not too much time passes before the war ends in Israel's victory.

PRIME MINISTER'S PRESS CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 13, 1973

Israel has again been attacked by its neighbors, and Arab countries far away, including help from Iraq, Algeria, Tunis, and others. Above all, one of the two great powers not only provided Syria, Egypt and Iraq with all war material they could possibly integrate into their armies, but for over six years, they have been training officers and men, teaching them the theory of war, and of attack. The U.S.S.R. did not come to Egypt and Syria to teach them to prepare against attack. They knew very well Israel was not going to attack Egypt or Syria or anyone. Their thoughts, efforts, and billions of dollars worth of tanks, planes, guns, ammunition and teaching were for one purpose only: to prepare for a massive attack on Israel.

We did everything possible during six years to try to convince our neighbors that bloodshed has never solved any problem between neighbors. Another war only means more dead, bloodshed, destruction, and no solution. And after all is over, there is still only one way—to negotiate. Decide there is a sincere will to live in peace, then sit down and negotiate an honorable peace. As in previous wars, this war was forced upon us. We are a very small people. There is no comparison between numbers in our army and the numbers in any of the countries fighting us, certainly no comparison with the massive armies of men of all those that joined in this war against us. We do not have the wealth of ammunition they have. But two things we have that give us an advantage over our neighbors: Hatred for war and death. That we have. Maybe it's essential that the Heads of States in the neighboring countries begin to feel that. When Sadat said war must go on, and that he is prepared to sacrifice a million men, one shudders not only at the thought of a million men giving their lives, but that the Head of a people can make this statement. We don't want dead on our side, we have no joy in causing the death of others.

But this people, small, surrounded by enemies, has decided to live. This is not a people that can give in. This people does not fear tanks and it has no fear of reality. We know that giving up means death, destruction of our sovereignty and physical destruction of our entire people. Against that, we will fight with everything we have within us.

We are confident despite difficulties. We are in a different position today than we were last Saturday or last Sunday. We have known bitter hours. But just as we go to our people and tell them that, so they believe us that there isn't a sign of doubt in our hearts that as bitter as this war is, the end again will be the same as that of other wars. We will win because we must live. Our neighbors are fighting not for their lives, nor for their sovereignty. They are fighting to destroy us. We will not be destroyed. Therefore, the spirit of our men on the front, the spirit of our people in every home, is a spirit of a people that hates war but knows that to live it must win the war that has been forced upon it.

QUESTIONS BY NEWSMEN AND ANSWERS BY THE PRIME MINISTER

Q. Does Israel intend to take Damascus, and if so, how long to occupy it?

A. You don't expect me to bring you the operative plan of what we are going to take, when, how long we stay and what will happen. I cannot do that.

Q. Would Israel agree to a cease-fire on the basis of lines that existed on the 5th of October?

A. There is no sense in speculating on what Israel will agree to or not as long as our neighbors—to this moment to the best of my knowledge, not our neighbor to the south nor our neighbor to the north has indicated any desire whatsoever to stop fighting. When we come to a proposition of a cease-fire we will consider it very, very seriously and decide, because our desire is, under possible conditions to stop the war as quickly as possible.

Q. Is it possible the super-powers are getting more involved in the war?

A. I know of one super-power that has sent in the last two days over 120 planes, carrying ammunition and I suppose rockets and I don't know what else to Syria, Iraq and to Egypt. That is rather some kind of an involvement I would say, but I don't know what else they want to do.

Q. Do you consider the fact that King Hussein is sending troops to defend Damascus as an act of war on his part?

A. Well, I don't think that King Hussein's troops have reached Damascus. They are quite a long distance away, but the fact that King Hussein has seen fit, after what happened in 1967, again to send in tanks and to have his army as he himself, or his government said today, on the Syrian front, I can only say I am sorry, because my predecessor, on the 5th of June 1967, sent a message to King Hussein through General Bull telling him that if he stays out nothing will happen to him. He did not stay out, and I am sure that the King must have the memory, rather a very unpleasant memory of what happened due to the fact that he came in. I am sorry that he has done that. But if any tank stands in our way, we cannot ask for identification whose tank it is. Any tank in our way will be hit.

Q. Have you asked for any material aid from the U.S., and can you reveal what kind?

A. If you people read the statement of Dr. Kissinger yesterday in answer to a question of this kind, he said that there is an ongoing relationship between the U.S. and Israel as far as military material is concerned. So it's ongoing.

Q. Has the possibility been considered or been brought up of renewing the government of national unity in the near future?

A. I have not heard about this, and I do not

know why a government should have to be changed in war time.

Q. In view of the events of last week do you consider the 1967 cease-fire lines as a viable frontier and a safe boundary for Israel?

A. The 1967 cease-fire lines are certainly the best lines that we could have. Every line can be attacked, naturally. But can you imagine what would have happened to us had we moved back to the June 4, 1967 lines, had this attack on us took place, not when we are on the Canal but on those lines? Maybe—I hope at any rate—that people throughout the world that did not exactly go along with us when we said we will not go back to the pre-67 borders, that we must have borders that are safer, more defensible—I hope that they will now realize it is not that we wanted more sand in the Sinai desert, or more land anywhere else, but that we wanted borders that will prevent war. And even if these borders did not prevent war, how much more terrible it would have been for Israel had we consented, at the advice of some of our best friends, to go back where we came from.

Q. Do you regret not having launched a pre-emptive strike?

A. Yes and No. Yes, because had we done that, no doubt that position would have been much better and I can say frankly that probably quite a few lives would have been saved. No, because at least we don't have that argument with the world. It is a sad comment, but the truth. We took that decision with our eyes open. And we hoped to the last minute that maybe, despite what happened to us in 1967 when we tried to get people to prevent that war—we thought maybe this time it would succeed. So it isn't by chance we took this decision. We knew what we were doing. We knew even that we would have to pay for it. But I do not regret, despite all this, that we took that decision.

Q. You said that your forces had been through very bitter hours since Saturday or Sunday. Could you outline a bit more specifically exactly what the military situation is on the two fronts and what progress your forces have made during the weekend.

A. On the Syrian border, the Golan Heights is back, every inch of it, in our hands. The people of the various settlements are back in their settlements. Our forces are across the border and on the road that leads to Damascus. That is quite a change, to be on the Golan Heights or to be on the other side of the border. Of course, there is a battle going on all the time in the north. In the south, there is fighting now, and there probably will be for a few days to come. I wouldn't like to say anything more about the southern front.

Q. Can you tell us more about the implications of Hussein's decision to send his troops into Syria, the implications on your present eastern frontier; the bridges across the Jordan, are they open now? We were told early in the week there wasn't a full mobilization of Jordan coming into the war. Today anybody listening to the radio knows that more troops were mobilized. Was it for this contingency today?

A. We would have been more foolish than we are, if a neighbor so close geographically to us sends part of his troops, even if not too many, to aid a country fighting us, that we shouldn't take into account a possibility that if he does something more from across the borders we should be prepared to meet him. As far as the bridges are concerned, if King Hussein hasn't closed them yet, they are closed today because on the Sabbath they are always closed. On Yom Kippur too.

Q. Your reaction to the British decision to cut off arms to fighting nations?

A. I must say people, decent people, and decent governments, when they come to a point where, if you say it bluntly "A plague on both of your houses" or when you say it more gently, "We are neutral", that is, the one that attacks and the victim of the attack

are exactly in the same position. Somehow, maybe I am not sensitive enough to the feeling of justice and equality, when a government like Great Britain adopts a position of this kind—in addition to being bad for us, it is painful to think that a government can do something of that kind.

Q. Would you say that to them?

A. Maybe I will meet them someday and then I will say it to them.

Q. There is a considerable ghetto of Jews in Syria. What is your knowledge of the situation concerning these Jews, and your intentions?

A. There is no doubt that the Jews in the ghetto in Syria are treated in the most terrible, miserable way. And we certainly will see to it, try at any rate, that when the war is over and whether there is a cease-fire agreement or some other kind of agreement, we will ask these Jews be taken out the same way as we will ask for an exchange of prisoners. *These Jews are prisoners that didn't even fight in the war and we will do everything in our power to see that these Jews are brought out from Syria.*

Q. I know Israel's enemies have been counting on the assumption that supplies are going to run out and that Israel cannot fight a long war. I also know that Israel's friends abroad are concerned about the possibility that supplies may not be sufficient. Could you explain whether these problems are real or imagined.

A. If our neighbors dealt with realities, instead of dreams, maybe there would be peace a long time ago. Israel does not face the danger of lack of supplies. Israel is going to fight this war to the very end as long as our neighbors insist upon it. We can take everything necessary to fight this war until the war is ended with the victory of Israel. There are difficulties, difficulties in supplies, in many other things, but our people can take it. They have been tried before, they are wonderful today more than they ever were before, and we can take all the difficulties and all the hardships. If our neighbors built on that then they have lost the war before they start it.

Q. Assuming a favorable outcome, is there any way you can see now to convert this fighting into the negotiated settlement or any political settlement of the dispute that eluded you in 1967?

A. I am sorry we cannot come out every day or every week with something new. That we have to repeat the same formula which I suppose sounds monotonous to many of you. Yet this is the truth. We didn't ask for the war of 1967. It was forced upon us and we won it. No sooner was the war over than the Israeli government asked the heads of Arab States: Now, let's sit down, as equals, and negotiate a peace treaty. And the answer came back from Khartoum. No recognition, no negotiations, no peace. For six years, like parrots we have been repeating the same thing. We want to live in peace, in cooperation and in friendship. Therefore we say let's sit down, as equals, let's negotiate without any pre-conditions. We have ideas of what the borders should be, you have ideas of what the borders should be. We don't ask you to accept our ideas before we sit down to negotiate, and you can't ask us to accept your ideas before we sit down to negotiate. Now let's sit down and talk. You know what the answer was for 6 years: No negotiations, go back to the 67 borders and then maybe we will negotiate. No real cooperation and recognition of Israel, which means, practically, go back to the 67 borders then or any other borders. That, of course, we couldn't agree to. We have nothing new after this war is over. If we sit down and negotiate we can sign a treaty which will open a new era for the entire area but that depends upon them.

Q. The fact that you have been waiting for the Arab troops to attack, was that a political decision? If so, is that not in contradiction to what the Israel government ear-

lier said that not one soldier's life would be offered for a political decision? And thirdly, will this political decision have any impact or implications on the situation internally in Israel?

A. It was a political decision, I don't think it has any relevance to what you say is the Israel government's policy not to sacrifice lives for political decisions. During a war, several times a day various political decisions have to be taken. In a war, to my great sorrow, people lose lives. Sometimes you take one decision, and you think maybe you can save lives in that way, and it turns out the other way. So there is no guarantee for political decisions to save lives. No, I don't see any implications whatsoever.

Q. Is the immigration of Soviet Jews continuing?

A. Do you mind if I don't answer that?

Q. What do you think of the project of the French mediation?

A. That is because France is very neutral, I suppose. France has even overstepped the claim for neutrality. I want to make myself clear. Mediation that we are prepared to accept and will be ready to accept at any time is either by an individual or a government that decides its aid should be limited to one thing and one thing only, which is a very important step, and that is to help the parties get together. Therefore, it is not arbitration, and no mediator who thinks he knows better than the parties what is good for them. Therefore, when this was attempted in the past, it failed. If it will be attempted in the future, it will fail. It is these two peoples whose sons met in battle over and over and over again, the governments of these two peoples must meet at the negotiating table and not have somebody from faraway whose life and independence and sovereignty are not at stake—it is these peoples in this area that have everything to win and everything to lose. Therefore it is these peoples that must do it. Nothing can save the leaders of the Arab countries from taking this responsibility for the fate of their people in their own hands and not to build ideas and castles in the air—someday Brezhnev can save them, the next day President Nixon before elections or after elections, before the summit meeting, after the summit meeting—all these are gimmicks that did not work in the past, will not work in the future. President Sadat, President Assad, King Hussein and all the others who have so much courage, why do they not have the courage to meet us at the negotiating table? If they are not satisfied they can always get up from the table and leave, but not even to try to sit down with us, in order to come to a peace treaty which will end all wars—that courage they are lacking, that somebody must do for them. Therefore, not France nor any other country can do that for them, and should not take it upon themselves to do it for them. Every country, every government that encourages them not to meet us at the negotiating table, everyone that encourages them in their intransigence and in their hope that somebody, somehow will solve their problems for them, is I think doing a disservice not only to Israel but to the Arabs and to peace.

Q. Do I detect a slightly different tone in your remarks about the events on the southern front? Does Israel categorically rule out a cease-fire which includes Egyptian troops on this side of the Canal?

A. I don't know what tone you have heard before. But what I said is when we hear a suggestion for a cease-fire, the government of Israel, believe me, very seriously and with great responsibility for everything that is concerned, will sit down and deal with it. So far, I don't hear anything about our neighbors being prepared for a cease-fire. We have so many problems on our hands that we don't want to think up problems. When a suggestion for a cease-fire will be a reality, believe me the government of Israel will not

lose many minutes before it will be in session and deal with this problem.

Q. Would you be prepared that the Israel government agrees to return territories seized in 1967 for the price of stopping the bloodshed and for peace?

A. Somebody coming into this room from another planet would think that in 1967 Israel forced a war upon its neighbors in order to take the Sinai Desert, the Western Bank and the Golan Heights. But since we are all from the same planet and you not only write newspapers, you also read newspapers, this wasn't exactly the description of what happened in 1967. Israel refused to go back to the borders of 1967 because these borders were washed away in blood exactly as the 1947 borders were washed away in blood by attack by our neighbors. Exactly as now, in 1967 they washed away the lines in Syria and Jordan and the others and now they have washed away borders. I don't think that will happen after this. Our neighbors cannot take a walk of this kind, with tens of thousands of men, with thousands of tanks, with bombers, kill, destroy, and then say: Well, all right, we didn't do it this time, we will try it again next time, but please give us borders that will be easier for us to cross; so good, we are not.

Q. Do you think the United States can do anything affirmative to hasten the end of this crisis?

A. I believe the United States and the policy it has adopted, for the last two or three years, saying that the U.S. is prepared to give its services to help the parties get together and find a solution for the problem... the U.S. was prepared to aid the parties get together on the Suez arrangement. I think the U.S. has done, probably is doing also this moment, everything possible, and God Bless the U.S. for what it does not do and that is to try and force a solution upon any one of the parties. Therefore, I think the U.S. has certainly done everything for peace.

Q. There has been much speculation in the country about the scale of the casualties. Could you comment on them at all?

A. No, I don't wish to comment on it, but I am sure it won't take long and the figures will be known. I want to tell you one thing. The other day on T.V. I was asked "What is the price for victory that you are talking about?" I said, "I don't know". To me one man dead is a terrible price. This man has a mother, a father, a wife, sisters, brothers, maybe children. I am not ashamed to stand before you, a Prime Minister that, if you wish, is emotional—if you wish, sentimental. With all my heart, for the sake of the Egyptian people, I wish that Sadat would become emotional and sentimental over one dead man. When that moment comes there is peace automatically. There will be more than one man. And it is a terrible price for nothing. Just to satisfy ambitions of leaders who have no hearts. And may I say one more thing. I spoke before about the aid of the Soviet Union to Syria, Egypt and Iraq. As bad and dangerous as it is for Israel, if I at least believed for one moment that this aid the Soviet Union is giving to the Arab countries is because of its love for the Arab people, I would say, it's too bad, they don't like the Jews, but they like the Arabs. But that isn't true. It is for callous interests of the Soviet Union. Therefore, thousands upon thousands of Egyptians and Syrians can be killed and numbers of Israelis can be killed and they don't care. That is the most terrible aspect of the entire situation.

Q. It has been said that the Syrians and the Egyptians are fighting this time with a higher morale and better, among other reasons because they are fighting to get back territories which were theirs before 1967. Do you think this is correct?

A. In the first place, one has to prove that their morale is higher. Maybe it is. In the second place, whether it is for this or for other reasons one guess is as good as another.

Again, you assume that these territories were taken away by a war.

In conclusion, whether they are justified, whether they are good fighters, or bad fighters, to have a war instead of negotiating... Usually peace treaties after wars are concluded in the following way: A war is won, one side wins, the other loses. If the loser is also the attacker, then certainly the winner writes a paper of conditions and asks the other parties to sign on the dotted line. I would like to know if there is a case in history that can be quoted when there was a war, one side attacked, lost, and the other side said "Well. All right, come on, take everything. Nothing happened, only people are dead and there's destruction." I think one of the greatest things that happened after the Second World War is that Chancellor Willy Brandt told his people and then went to Poland and recognized the new border, because—he didn't fight, he was not a Nazi—he said, the German people twice have attacked. They must pay a price.

Q. A few days ago Mr. Yariv said it would not be a short war. You talked about Sinai and said it would last another few days. Is that different...

A. No, I didn't say another few days. With all that has happened to us, we are accustomed to short wars. Believe me, I wouldn't care a bit and neither would Yariv if we were proven wrong. If both say this will not be a short war as the others we have known—I'm not thinking of the War of Liberation... I did not say a couple of days, I don't know. We have been fighting for a week. How many more days I wouldn't dare prophesy.

Q. Would Israel accept a cease-fire while the Egyptians are on this side of the Canal?

A. I have already answered this question. I said when anyone proposes a cease-fire and any of our neighbors, preferably both, are prepared to enter into discussion of a cease-fire agreement, Israel will not lag behind. Within a few minutes we will be at the conference table and making our decision. There is no sense in speculating now, since we have no indication whatsoever that our neighbors are prepared for a cease-fire.

Q. You are obviously confident of victory. How confident? Are you disappointed that it has taken more than Six Days?

A. No, I am not disappointed. I am sorry, but I can't say I am disappointed. Israel has been involved in many wars. It never fought a war under similar conditions. When we have to fight on two fronts, when we have not taken the pre-emptive step, when we knew exactly what a wealth of armament the Arab armies had; from the very beginning, we didn't fool ourselves and we didn't see this as a short war. I am sorry. I wish we had been proven wrong, but this is it.

THE 1973 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since this past July, when the 15th observance of Captive Nations Week was celebrated both here and abroad, reports on the annual event have clearly indicated that broad sections of our citizenry have not forgotten the captive nations. In the euphoric circumstances of tenuous détente the observance proved to be a relatively thumping success.

As further indications of this success, I include in the RECORD the following: First, a proclamation by Governor Docking of Kansas; second, a commentary, "The Captive Nations: Still a Vital Issue" in the GOP Nationalities News;

third, an editorial "America's Generosity and Conscience" in America; and fourth, a report in the China Post "Three Thousand Mark Captive Nations Week":

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

To the People of Kansas, Greetings:

Whereas, Captive Nations Week was inaugurated in 1959 by a Joint Resolution of the United States Congress; and

Whereas, each year, Captive Nations Week has provided a fitting opportunity for the American people to show their solidarity with their captive brethren in East and Central Europe; and

Whereas, twenty-eight years ago, the war in Europe came to an end, but the hopes and expectations that came in the wake of the hard-won victory over the Nazi military machine have yet to be realized, and for the millions of people in Eastern Europe Nazi domination, as well as the USSR, Asia and Cuba have been replaced by Communist rule:

Now, therefore, I, Robert B. Docking, Governor of the State of Kansas, do hereby proclaim the week of July 15th through July 21, 1973, as "Captive Nations Week" in Kansas, and urge all people of the free world to support the aspirations of the people of East-Central Europe, USSR, Asia and Cuba to freedom.

Done at the Capitol in Topeka Under the Great Seal of the State this 5th day of July, A.D., 1973.

By the Governor:

ROBERT B. DOCKING.

[From the GOP Nationalities News, August 1973]

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS: STILL A VITAL ISSUE

As we go to press, it has been almost a month since Captive Nations Week 1973 has come and gone, and little fanfare was given the traditional event in the national media. However, states and localities—especially those high in ethnic population—continue their reverent observance of the spirit of the original proclamation. Many governors and mayors across the country joined President Nixon in officially proclaiming the week and asking all to reflect upon the freedoms and liberties that should be every man's birthright but which are denied to millions of people throughout the world.

Let us not fall into the trap of thinking the captive nations is that group of 20-plus Eastern and Central European nations commonly referred to as "behind the Iron Curtain." To be sure, the peoples of these nations are still very much captives in their own land, living without so much as freedom of speech and thought, e.g., Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn; freedom of the press, e.g., the need for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty; freedom to worship, e.g., Soviet Jewry; and all the other civil rights we enjoy daily and consider automatic to the human condition. Let us remember, however, the peoples of Cuba and of China, North Korea and North Vietnam. What is it that is happening in Southeast Asia if it is not an armed struggle against having Hanoi smother the area with Communism. Are not the Southeast Asian countries in danger of being included on the list of captive nations? Will not the proposed unilateral disarmament of NATO, especially in these times of European economic and social disorder, only give Communism the green light to swallow up parts of Western Europe one by one? A manifestation of U.S. strength throughout the world is needed now more than ever.

We must continue our moves in the areas of cultural and economic policies to assure the peoples of the world of our determination to pursue our commitments to world peace and understanding. At the same time, however, and certainly more importantly, we must maintain our world military strength to demonstrate our deeper commitment to freedom and justice for all peoples and nations.

[From America, June 28, 1973]

AMERICA'S GENEROSITY AND CONSCIENCE

Leonid I. Brezhnev, Communist boss and dictator of the USSR, has left America with what seems to be considerable gains for both his totalitarian rule in the USSR and his image abroad. A number of U.S.-Soviet agreements, in the areas of cultural exchange, oceanography, nuclear arms limitation, air travel, were signed and sealed. All these augur well for the future of mankind.

But Sen. Henry M. Jackson of Washington, almost the sole voice of American conscience, described Brezhnev as a foreign lobbyist in search of American economic aid. He arrived here armed with statistics, facts and other data prepared for him in Moscow. He wined and dined a group of U.S. Senators and lied to them about the internal situation in his country by denying that a "Jewish problem" exists in the Soviet Union and that there are any "restrictions" on emigration from the USSR!

Brezhnev also met with a group of American businessmen who seemed only too eager to hear about the economic advantages that our nation would derive in exchange for U.S. credits and technological equipment and other political considerations. The size or merits of these "benefits" to our economy are not the issues here. Nevertheless, a series of agreements were signed, most of which were arranged during Dr. Henry A. Kissinger's most recent visit to Moscow. These would tie the American economy for decades to Soviet fuel and other deliveries from Siberia, which would give the United States an economic interest in continued Soviet hegemony and domination of Siberia vis-a-vis China.

GENEROSITY WITHOUT CONSCIENCE

For decades the American leadership has displayed boundless generosity to foreign powers for short-lived expediency and material advantages. In the 1930's, the U.S. traded freely with such totalitarian powers as Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. These nations were strengthened militarily by U.S. economic aid and trade to the point that they nearly defeated the Western allies, including the United States.

History has seen that the United States has saved the USSR from destruction by Nazi Germany. But what did we get in return? The "cold war," the enslavement of Central and Eastern Europe, the division of Europe, the invasion by Moscow-supported Communists of South Korea and South Vietnam and the takeover of Cuba.

So, while our generosity was overabundant, perhaps our conscience has not been as strong as it should be, despite the fact that this country, by virtue of its founding principles and its great economic, industrial and military power, is still regarded by the world as a bastion of freedom.

Both President Nixon and Brezhnev may claim that they have improved significantly U.S.-Soviet relations. But what price has been paid? The USSR has gained tremendously in prestige and in whatever economic benefits that will result from the new agreements. Morally, the United States might have lost in terms of its leadership and world significance, something that cannot be purchased by dollars and economic advantage.

THE ISSUE: FREEDOM VS. SLAVERY

Our myopia with regard to the USSR is somewhat appalling, as every keen Kremlinologist must sense. The issue is much larger than the problem of Jewish emigration from the USSR. Even if the Soviet leadership were to allow some 60,000 Jews to leave the USSR, this would not solve the problem of Soviet Jewry, as there still will remain some 3 million Jews who will be subjected to continuous persecution and oppression.

But how about the Ukrainians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Armenians, Byelorussians, Georgians and others, who have large segments of American descendants, greatly concerned over the genocide of their

countries of origin, perpetrated by Brezhnev and his totalitarian government?

Why was Brezhnev carefully shielded from contact with the American people and from the American press? The Nixon Administration well knew that hundreds of thousands of Americans would demonstrate against this "guest" to protest his barbarous policies.

This larger issue was aptly pointed out in "The New York Times" editorial of Sunday, June 24, 1973:

"... In the Soviet Union, the recent change in the tone of official propaganda about this country has been sufficient to make Soviet conservatives worry whether Mr. Brezhnev has forgotten about the 'menace' of American capitalism. But against that positive development must be set the fact that the controls over domestic Soviet dissenters are now the tightest in years, that the persecution of prominent would-be emigres among Soviet Jews continues along with the persecution of Ukrainian and other independent-minded Soviet minority intellectuals. And there is certainly no sign of any intention to weaken the controlling Soviet hand over most of Eastern Europe. . . ."

PLEAS FOR UKRAINIAN, OTHER CAPTIVE NATIONS FELL ON DEAF EARS

For almost two years, the Ukrainian community has been pleading with President Nixon, the State Department and the U.S. Congress for intervention on behalf of Ukrainian intellectuals who had been arrested and sentenced in secret trials to severe terms of incarceration. But these pleas remained largely unanswered for fear of offending the Soviet Russian dictator and genocidist. Nor has the Nixon Administration even so much as hinted at its concern over the oppression of the nations held captive by Moscow.

With the exception of Senator Jacob K. Javits and George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO, and such Congressmen as Edward J. Derwinski and Daniel J. Flood, who possess the courage and wisdom to speak for freedom and against the oppression by Brezhnev and Co., we didn't hear from any other legislators (Republicans or Democrats) during Brezhnev's stay in our country. Yet, many of them have consistently pledged themselves, to support the cause of the captive nations. Apparently, they were overawed and overwhelmed by the charismatic charm of the Nixon-Brezhnev summit meeting.

So Leonid I. Brezhnev returns to Moscow as a victor, supplied with gifts at the expense of the American taxpayer, and ebullient and content that the issues of Ukrainian intellectuals and the captive nations were not raised by President Nixon.

Therefore, the persecution of Ukrainians and others can be expected to continue and to increase. Even as Brezhnev was in the U.S., the "Voice of America" and "Radio Liberty" broadcasts to the USSR were heavily jammed, while the Soviet press warned Soviet citizens to regard foreign visitors with caution and not to disseminate any information about the USSR. This is Soviet reality, which no amount of "cultural exchange" will ever alter.

The struggle for freedom and independence of the captive nations will continue and will never cease until its objective is attained. But some of our leaders might have to live with a less than clear conscience for having wittingly or unwittingly strengthened Brezhnev's despotic hold over these countries.

[From the China Post, July 18, 1973]

THREE THOUSAND MARK CAPTIVE NATIONS' WEEK

More than 3,000 people from all walks of life yesterday morning attended a rally at the Sun Yat-sen Memorial Hall in Taipei to mark Captive Nations' Week.

Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, honorary chairman of the World Anti-Communist League, presided

over the rally which was also attended by U.S. Representative Jack F. Kemp, Chinese government officials and foreign diplomats.

Speaking at the rally, he pointed out that Communism, which is incompatible with human needs, is doomed to failure.

Dr. Ku stressed that nations of the Free World should not sit idly by to wait until the natural collapse of Communist tyranny. Instead, he added, they should intensify their struggle to bring about elimination earlier.

Dr. Ku said the common aspiration of human beings is peace. However, peace as seen by the Communists is another word for "warfare" in its united front campaign.

President Chiang's message was read after Dr. Ku's speech.

Vice President C. K. Yen said the Chinese Communists will never change their expansion policy although they have put on their "peaceful overcoats."

He called on all freedom and justice loving people the world over to work shoulder to shoulder so as to bring hope of peace to the world.

Rep. Kemp said people in the free world will never forget the enslaved people. They will, he added, continue struggling until the enslaved people are freed.

Lee Min, an anti-Communist fighter who fled to freedom from the Communist-controlled mainland of China said people on the mainland who are under the persecution of Communist tyranny have no freedom at all.

Walter P. McCaughy, U.S. ambassador to the Republic of China, also spoke at the rally.

Four messages read at the rally will be sent to President Richard Nixon, President Nguyen Van Thieu, General Non Nol and peoples of Captive Nations.

DRUG ABUSE IN THE SCHOOLS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the investigations of the Select Committee on Crime have shown that every major section of the country has a serious drug problem among its youth. From 1968 to 1971, over 432,000 teenagers were arrested for crimes involving drugs.

The Select Committee has also recommended the Federal Government provide funds for drug education programs, force manufacturers to cut back their production of harmful drugs, and monitor the effectiveness of the radio and television industry's regulation of drug advertisements.

Mr. Speaker, I have written principals and superintendents of schools in my State of California about their views of the committee's recommendations. Their letters relate, as well, the independent efforts they are making to fight the drug abuse problem. Their evaluation and experiences should be of great interest to all Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, selections from these letters follow:

LETTER FROM CLAUDE RETHERFORD, PRINCIPAL, LINDSAY JR. H. S., LINDSAY, CALIF.

It is my policy to work very closely with our local police department and John Beene (chief of police), to try preventative means to prevent drug problems. I shared your letter with Chief Beene and we both concur strongly with item number one of your recommendation for help at our local level.

It is our recommendation that the local police department in-service the teachers who

in turn will instruct the students. Another problem that is of great concern to us is parent involvement to help detect drug abuse by their children.

LETTER FROM JOE RIEDEL, PRINCIPAL, GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, GARDEN GROVE, CALIF.

Thank you for your letter and material on drugs in our schools. I have always been alarmed at the quantity of drugs our pharmaceutical firms have been permitted to produce, and congratulate you on having reduced the amount. I would urge a further reduction as the most effective means of reducing drug use.

LETTER FROM EDWARD CEREGHINO, PRINCIPAL, RIO VISTA H. S.

You asked for a thought or two about drug abuse prevention; I have a few thoughts, some rambling, a few specific. I've asked myself: "Would I need to take drugs?" Unequivocally, no! But why? Because, at base, I have avenues for successful pursuit open to me; there are few experiences I cannot have—things are generally open to me, where they are not to many others. To Blacks, Chicanos, Women, Youth. Sure, I know we are making progress, but in an *instant* world the concepts of progress and future do not exist; now, Congressman, now is when I want access. To jobs, to homes, to better learning, and so on. And no amount of waiting is a substitute for now; no amount of drug ingestion is a substitute for meaningful and earned now. Some, I suppose, take drugs to make *now* more important than what it is. We live by an ethic—slowly changing, some believe—that says, "Earn it!" And, damned if I won't, if you will but let me.

Look at these young Americans in high school today: Child Labor Laws, once designed to protect, deny youthful access; instead of lowering the compulsory age of education in California, for example, we raised it. We keep them longer to better prepare for God knows what. We know that during the 18th century a boy's voice changed about the age of eighteen; today, at 13.3 years. We know that the age of menarche is being driven down, generation after generation. Yet, we treat young Americans as "old children, not as "young adults".

LETTER FROM KEITH LAWSON, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, WESTMINSTER SCHOOL DISTRICT

In response to your letter of September 10, 1973, regarding suggestions or proposals to combat the drug problem, I wish to offer these comments:

1. Drug abuse instruction for teachers results in knowledgeable drug users, not less drug abusers.

2. Better control of harmful drugs sounds good if it is economically possible.

I suggest that drug abuse is a result and not the problem. My experience has proven to me that young people will try drugs even though they know full well of the harmful effects of them. More "scare" education is not the answer. What can and has worked to prevent young people from trying the "bad things" in our society is a values approach to education.

LETTER FROM LESLY MEYER, SUPERINTENDENT, PETALUMA CITY SCHOOLS

I would hope the federal government would also find ways to support agencies that work closely with school districts in this problem. As an example, I mention the Sonoma County Drug Abuse Council, 1625 Franklin Avenue, Santa Rosa, California. This agency, although limited in personnel, has worked in all areas of the drug abuse program. Of special interest to us in the school districts in Sonoma County is that they have worked closely with our schools in developing instructional units for students and have assisted in inservice

education for our teachers to improve the implementation of these programs.

LETTER FROM DENNIS DAGGETT, PRINCIPAL, MORELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, SAN JOSE, CALIF.

I agree that the four recommendations cited in your letter are not specific enough and suggest the following:

1. Government recognition of the fact that recommended programs frequently fail for lack of funds in the so-called impoverished school districts—such as the one containing Castro Junior High.

2. Recognition that while schools remain the best supplier of drug abuse information to students and parents, the greatest abuse of drugs occurs after school is out and in the community. In spite of our efforts (and they are effective and extensive) students may walk in any direction from this campus and every other one in the San Jose area to purchase dangerous drugs.

3. Realization that while drug use on school campuses and/or by students has diminished, the problem remains as long as drug supplies (either illegally produced or illegally procured from ethical sources) remain available on the streets.

4. Assistance to overworked local police agencies—specifically narcotics divisions.

5. Assistance to juvenile departments to aid counseling programs.

I welcome your comments and hope for your continued attention to this problem. We feel we are winning more than we are losing but just one drug incident (alcohol, barbiturates, etc.) scares the *?! out of the community and they tend to over react.

LETTER FROM MR. LOWELL JACKSON, SUPERINTENDENT, CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT, HAWTHORNE, CALIF.

Centinela Valley Union High School District has been working under a Federal Grant, Omnibus Crime Bill, for the past three years. Its primary concern was drug abuse education for our staff. In order to be effective, we found it necessary to offer inservice training to our entire staff—administrators, counselors, teachers, custodians, clerks, cafeteria workers, and any aides. Just as it is going to take the cooperation of federal, state, and local efforts in helping to alleviate drug abuse, we felt it necessary to educate our entire staff and even community leaders to help us with our drug abuse problem. Our school district found a decrease in the use of drugs and fewer arrests. Without a federal grant, this program would not have been possible. So, federal assistance aided our district greatly.

LETTER FROM MR. JAMES RIEWER, SUPERINTENDENT, SOUTH BAY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT, HERMOSA BEACH, CALIF.

Training teachers and installing drug education programs are essential steps, but that is not enough!

In my opinion, there are three other critical facets to this problem, only one of which is touched on in your committee's recommendations. You did advocate cutting back on the production of certain drugs. That is fine, but it only solves part of the problem. Controls on the distribution of what is manufactured are equally important. Simply cutting production will be meaningless unless you can control distribution.

Secondly, we must go to work on clarification of harmful drugs and the nightmare of ambiguities that are written into the various State laws. School age children find it difficult to understand why something that is "harmful" or "dangerous" in one state is not equally harmful or dangerous in another state.

Thirdly, the lack of uniformity in apprehension and enforcement by both the police and the courts has created a game in which the kids are beating "the system."

LETTER FROM OMER WESTON, PRINCIPAL, BO-HANNON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, SAN LORENZO, CALIF.

In addition to the stated recommendations, I certainly feel that your attention should be given to an additional one.

I am speaking of the decriminalization of marijuana use and possession. We are not, in my opinion, helping youth with their drug problems by categorizing them as criminals for experimenting with this relatively minor drug.

LETTER FROM GARTH HANCHETT, PRINCIPAL, PARKWAY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, LA MESA, CALIF.

I have felt for a long time that young people have a perfect set-up for the distribution of drugs in such places as local drive-in restaurants and places of business located near school grounds where youngsters gather before and after school. Seldom ever do the business people supervise these gatherings nor do they try to discourage them from gathering.

Young people have great strength in numbers. Drugs can pass among them when they gather in such groups and the older people who are supposedly responsible seem to do little about it.

How many people with cigarette vending machines prevent young children from purchasing from the machine? State laws are constantly being broken.

What can the congress do to help establish a more responsible business group especially in areas located near schools?

FREE CHINA: "NO" TO APPEASEMENT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 17, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on October 9 Chiang Kai-shek, President of the Republic of China, released a speech in commemoration of the founding of that Republic on October 10, 1911. In part, he stated:

In celebrating this 62nd anniversary of our national day, we are demonstrating to the world that we can surmount any tests of the times. We are also displaying the Chinese people's great spirit of self-reliance and dedication.

His words are true. The Free Chinese have not given in to despair although their international position has been weakened by American moves and those of other countries. The Free Chinese have remained dedicated to the struggle against communism, having experienced first-hand the Communist threat. The Free Chinese have continued to be an example for other developing countries throughout the world. They stand as proof of what a free enterprise system can produce in drastic contrast to the totalitarian system on the Chinese mainland.

In his speech, Chiang Kai-shek further warned about the dangers that the world faces from various movements toward appeasement of the Communist. Unfortunately, it seems that many in the world do not learn from the lessons of history.

At this point, I wish to include in the Record the full text of President Chiang Kai-shek's message:

My fellow countrymen:

Erratic and deceptive changes in the world situation have so confused the minds of many people that they do not know where they are going or what they are doing. Our own people, military and civilian alike, have nevertheless always had firm confidence in our revolutionary causes. We have not budged from our stand. We have been angered but not frightened by developments. In celebrating this 62nd anniversary of our national day, we are demonstrating to the world that we can surmount any tests of the times. We are also displaying the Chinese people's great spirit of self-reliance and dedication.

The battle of 1911 brought to realization for the first time in Asia the ideals of national independence and democracy. Subsequently, in the last 50 years of bitter struggle, we have consistently taken a stand as the anti-Communist vanguard of all mankind. In taking this stand, we have been inspired by the spirit of the 1911 Revolution and have persisted in carrying out the ideals of national independence, democracy and social well-being.

History and fact verify that since the founding of the republic and onward through the Northern Expedition and the War of Resistance Against Japan we have won every battle of the national revolution by persevering in the face of mounting difficulties and amidst the international appeasement of our enemies. The international force of appeasement has at times gone all out to divide and attack us. We have rolled back the tides of adversity by fearlessly sticking to our own way, even when some of the international forces rejoiced in our predicament and encouraged our enemies to isolate and blockade us. We have opened up new vistas, reversed the tides and won through although outnumbered by enemies. Many people believed the enemies were stronger, that our situation was hopeless, that our resources were insufficient, that our hinterland was limited and that our position was so precarious that we could not hold out for another day.

Our monetary setbacks of today have led these people to the further conclusion that our national revolution is on the brink of isolation. In actuality, resistance to communism and brutal force is an innate reaction of human nature and conscience, so we are not isolated spiritually and morally. To the contrary, we may say that we have plenty of help. This is exemplified in the 700 million people of the mainland, who are turning their hearts to us. We command an absolute and overwhelming advantage, we know that while our situation looks bad externally, it is good internally. Even the external adversity is a temporary phenomenon. For the Communists, the situation appears to be good on the surface but is bad at the heart. Their superficial advantage is temporary. The exacerbation of their internal crisis will crack and destroy the false front of their advantage.

Did we have any land under our control at the start of the 1911 Revolution before the establishment of our republic? Before the Northern Expedition, we controlled only a small corner of the Whampoa District. During the War of Resistance, we were beleaguered and encircled again and again as

traitors and Chinese Communists attacked and closed in upon us from all sides. Although our present bastion of freedom is limited to Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu, we are far stronger than we were during the periods when we were establishing the republic, carrying out the Northern Expedition and fighting the War of Resistance. Consequently, our confidence and determination will never change, no matter how great our adversity or how precarious the situation.

I know you will remember that before the 1911 Revolution not only San Min Chu I (Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People) but also the Hsing Chung Hui and Tung Meng Hui revolutionary organizations were besmirched as illusions and myths. These insults and slanders were refuted by Dr. Sun Yat-sen and the revolutionary martyrs as they wrote a new page in the book of history with iron and their blood. Today, our undaunted determination to sustain the ambitions, careers, fortitude and perseverance of Dr. Sun Yat-sen and the revolutionary martyrs will never be undermined by dark and ambiguous developments on the international front. We shall not be discouraged nor lose our way, even though justice wears a shroud and the atmosphere is temporarily contaminated and polluted by appeasement. We shall eventually answer the insults and slanders of illusion and myth with courageous action in our revolution against communism, for the suppression of Mao and for national recovery.

Peking's internal crisis, which is also its internal adversity, is correctly expressed in the word "disorder." Mao Tse-tung borrowed Lin Piao's hand to struggle down Liu Shao-chi in the "disorder" of the Red Guards. Now he has presented the hodgepodge false front of the "10th National Congress" in order to borrow the hands of Chou En-lai and Wang Hung-wen to liquidate Lin Piao. The Chinese Communists have rantingly maintained that "the great disorder will continue" and that "all monsters and demons" will "jump out themselves." Additionally, they have urged the Communist military and cadres to "dare to go against the tide, fearing neither removal from his post, expulsion from the party, imprisonment, divorce nor guillotine." This indicates that on the one hand the influence of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao is being uprooted, and that on the other the supporters of Liu and Lin are being grappled with and struggled against jointly by Chou En-lai and Mao's wife, Chiang Ching. These developments will bring removal from posts, expulsion from the party, imprisonment, divorce and death for group after group of Communist chieftains and cadres. Like Lin Piao, they will be tracked down, killed, drummed out of the party and subjected to posthumous attack. Even after ten, twenty and thirty times as many massacres on this scale, the Chinese Communists still cannot prevent themselves from "changing their color." Nor can they prevent our mainland compatriots from sudden uprising to topple Mao Tse-tung and his tyrannical regime.

Most of the appeasers in today's world believe that if only they can herd the alligator into a pond, they can coexist with it peacefully. They do not understand that the ferocious alligator will fatten itself at the expense of the fish in the pond. Chou En-lai pointedly remarked at the "10th National Congress" that the "present international

situation is one characterized by great disorder on the earth." He said that "such great disorder is a good thing for the people, not a bad thing." Why is it good? It is because this great disorder wrought by the Peking regime "throws the enemies into confusion and causes division among them." This is especially true in the pond of international appeasement. When the alligator has eaten all the fish and fattened itself, it will crawl out of the pond and become more ferocious. To appease the Chinese Communists is nothing less than to connive in crime. To appease them is tantamount to the indirect murder of our mainland compatriots. To the appeasers, appeasement is rather like seeing themselves slowly poisoned as they sit there unconcerned.

My fellow countrymen: Our present struggle against communism and appeasement and our national recovery is the common responsibility of our government and people to the people of the world and to history. We must:

—Assure popular and modern rule in the service of the people by establishing a responsible, honest and competent government.

—Build a harmonious, balanced, developing economy based on Dr. Sun Yat-sen's principle of social well-being.

—Dedicate ourselves and fulfill our responsibilities in the struggle against communism and for national recovery by coming to a real understanding of the revolutionary situation.

—Augment our positive program of pursuing construction through renovation and renovation during construction in endeavors of continuing renovation and continued construction.

To summarize, the stronger we become, the more important will be our bastion of national recovery to the world and the greater our anti-Communist responsibility to the people of the world. Consequently, we must persevere in revolutionary action, work harder with every passing minute and exert the potential of our strength to the full in order to strengthen the roots of our social welfare economy and increase our anti-Communist and revolutionary combat capability.

As an old saying has it, "historically, the great events of national revival have always hinged on the necessity of one heart and one will among the people at the top and at the bottom and at home and abroad." Today's struggle for national recovery is a life-or-death struggle. It is a decisive and sacred task. Our people and government have only one will; the people at home and abroad share one heart. Our unity has never been firmer or stronger. Our people, military and civilian alike, have been tested in the crucible; their calm confidence and courage have never been greater. Our "wholehearted loyalty to the country and the people" is the best assurance of overcoming adversity and opening up a new vista.

My fellow countrymen: We must join together in pursuing renovation and construction and in launching another Northern Expedition to accomplish national reunification. The destiny of China is in our hands. The power of decision for victory and national recovery is in the hands of the revolutionary and benevolent warriors who fight together with common will.